

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

NOTES OF A SEMINAR OF THE COUNCIL

Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices
on Friday 1 June 2007 at 1pm

PRESENT: Mayor Garry Moore (Chair),
Councillors Helen Broughton, Graham Condon,
Barry Corbett, Anna Crighton, David Cox, Bob Parker,
Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff, Sue Wells, and Norm Withers

IN ATTENDANCE: Community Board member Yani Johanson.

Council officers: Tony Marryatt, Roy Baker, David Dally,
Stephen McArthur, Catherine McDonald and Jason Rivett

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received and accepted from
Councillors Sally Buck, Carole Evans and Pat Harrow

1. CAPITAL ENDOWMENT FUND: CIVIC AND COMMUNITY

Roy Baker and Stephen McArthur, supported by Jason Rivett, spoke to a power point presentation (copy attached). In general terms the Council officers suggested methods of providing funding options to enable the “acceleration” of a project.

At the outset, it was verified that \$732,500 is currently committed for the Canterbury Museum in 2006/07 and \$250,000 in 2007/08. These amounts are held separately.

The **power point** presentation covered the following:

- Overview
- What is the Capital Endowment Fund?
- Fund components
- Civic and Community fund rules
- Examples of what the fund has been used for
- 27 July 2006 Council resolution
- Recent bids for the fund
- Strong Communities strategies and plans
- Known applications for Community Grants (capital for facilities)
- Suggested fund Criteria
- LTCCP view of Civic and Community Fund
- Fund affordability – option 1
- Fund affordability – option 2
- Where to next?

ACTION

	ACTION
<p>Questions raised during the presentation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Why not just pay interest?● Consider a Community Discretionary Funding facility?● Committing use of fund for future councils: is the current Council within its rights to do this by a single vote?● Only one project or a mix of events? <p>Advice: The seminar was then advised there is a pool of \$1.634m in 2007/08. The Council will need to decide:</p> <p>(a) how much to keep back for annual grants/one-off events with the balance to fund both interest and principle for community projects, or</p> <p>(b) provide for proposal in LTCCP to pay interest, and LTCCP to pay back.</p> <p>Further comments from elected members included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● It was suggested consideration also be given to signalling a review in three years as part of the Council’s decision-making process.● Why not use \$1.6 and commit for three years for community events and garden city image.● Is not the use of funding, in the way indicated, inappropriate for events? Concern this city lags behind others on economic development: decision for next LTCCP?● Strategies/Aquatic Facilities Plan : pay off over next 6 (to 10) years. 50-50 split supported. Do not use for events: funding should come from rates.● Will the Council need to revoke its resolution from 2006? Staff advised that the Council would need to revoke decision if intent was changed.● Is \$75m inflation-protected? Is this fund a rates subsidy? Need to debate whether fund is an accelerator or elevator?● Referred to Heartland projects and discussion with central govt agencies – potential for the city.● Fund earmarked for civic and community projects. Split will need to be decided as part of LTCCP process. Report will provide a range of scenarios.● Earthquake/heritage issues need resolution - sought coverage in mix of staff report. <p>OUTCOME:</p> <p>The information was received and the points above noted for staff to address in the forthcoming report.</p>	<p>Roy/Stephen/Jason</p>

The seminar concluded at 2.04 pm.