

# CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

## NOTES OF A SEMINAR OF THE COUNCIL

Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices  
on Tuesday 26 June 2007 at 1.30pm

- PRESENT:** Councillor Sue Wells (Chair),  
Councillors Sally Buck, Helen Broughton (until 2.45 pm),  
Barry Corbett (until 2.55 pm), David Cox, Carole Evans,  
Pat Harrow, Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff (until 2.50 pm),  
and Norm Withers.
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Community Board members: Tony Sutcliffe.  
Environment Canterbury: Ken Tremain and  
Laurie McCallum.  
City Council Officers: Carolyn Ingles and  
David Mountfort.
- APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted by  
Mayor Garry Moore, Councillors Graham Condon,  
Anna Crighton and Bob Parker.

	ACTION
<p>2. <b>REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT (RPS)</b></p> <p>City Council officers David Mountfort and Carolyn Ingles, in conjunction with Ken Tremain and Laurie McCallum from ECan, spoke to a paper which had been circulated prior to the seminar, entitled, "<i>Version - 22 JUNE 2007, UDSIC, Version 2 - CONSULTATION DRAFT.</i>" This encapsulated the Proposed Change No 1 (Development of Greater Christchurch) to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. The change noted is: "<i>Insert new Chapter 12A, Development of Greater Christchurch</i>". (Hard copy on file).</p> <p>The presentation provided an overview of the working draft of the Regional Policy Statement. This statement is the first statutory implementation mechanism to give effect to the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy.</p> <p>ECan sought endorsement from the Christchurch City Council of the RPS change before it is adopted for notification. The RPS will come back to the Christchurch City Council prior to the notification date of 28 July 2007.</p> <p>A PowerPoint (hard copy on file) presentation captured the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Background</li><li>● The Document</li><li>● Issues</li></ul>	<p></p> <p>Carolyn/David</p>

	ACTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Objectives</li><li>● Policies</li><li>● Additional Material</li><li>● Other Challenges</li><li>● Achievements</li><li>● Key features for Christchurch</li></ul> <p>A map was tabled, entitled “<i>Regional Policy Statement Proposed Change #1 Working Draft</i>”. This map was considered in conjunction with the tables shown on page 14 of the draft consultation document.</p> <p>The following questions and points were raised during the presentation:</p> <p><b>Rural Residential</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Could be confusing to the layman – eg the status of areas such as Lower Styx/Marshland, Yaldhurst, Banks Peninsula and near Selwyn border - not within urban boundaries. Noted the 2009/10 review would cover some of this: the RPS will only apply to those areas covered by UDS.</li><li>● Urban boundary versus city boundaries - definition needs to be clear.</li><li>● Noted Clause 13.1.1 not generic: “<i>must be outside Urban Limits</i>” - check wording for clarification.</li></ul> <p><b>Tabled Map</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● The map identified with table on page 14 and shows current situation. Notation for Table 2 will explain RMA focus, and that certain growth pockets are undergoing a process for confirmation of the boundaries, eg Notation: Port Hills West (Kennedys Bush) will be subject to being approved.</li><li>● Why are the lines of demarcation shown on the (tabled) map? A: All green areas subject to process.</li><li>● Question regarding “<i>Intensification: All L2,3,4, and Central City</i>” – does not change the zoning. It was pointed out that L2 areas are available to the private market.</li><li>● Include wording on the map to make it clear, “<i>This map reflects EXISTING ZONING</i>” – it was also clarified that those boundaries shown on the map are not likely to change in the short term.</li></ul> <p><b>UDS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● How much weight to be given to the UDS until this is confirmed as a RPS?</li><li>● How does that fit with the existing CCC policy on whether or not Plan Changes should be welcomed, given RPS?</li></ul>	<p>Ken/wparty</p> <p>Ken</p>

	ACTION
<p><b>Central City Intensification</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Where is the priority for SAMS, heritage, amenity and how will these be protected? Need clear link back to discussions around protecting character of precincts.</li> <li>● Kennedys Bush issue - where at? Need to make it clear that the RPS does not zone land (the Plan Change process does this). Should be spelt out in bold letters at the start eg include on Page 2 of introduction.</li> </ul>	Ken/wparty
<p><b>Urban Limit</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provides broad principles where development is allowed to occur within region. Community might say, <i>“If already decided in principle why should I participate in detailed process?”</i> Need to make it clear, precise, and easily understood.</li> <li>● Do not assume everything inside the fence is going to be urbanised: referred to Page 9.</li> <li>● Amend map to include a black line which clearly defines Christchurch City.</li> <li>● Little pocket of tangerine depicted on the tabled map has no key reference.</li> <li>● List policies and how they relate to each other. Protect areas people have asked for eg greenfields, inner city, and need to be assured development will be of good quality. Urban development protocols would assist.</li> <li>● SAMs need to be concentrated on.</li> <li>● Communications aspect needs to be focused – need explanation.</li> <li>● Insert a bold heading at the top of the document explaining what this is not about! Explain that SAMs etc fall under City Plan framework.</li> <li>● Explain these are the good things that can happen to the city in the next 35 years.</li> <li>● Noted 11 July 9.30am Council seminar on SAMS. (Apology from Councillor Withers, all papers please.)</li> <li>● Urban development ‘shall only’ occur within that red line/leads to ‘can/must’. To put red line where it is, it looks as though it will occur. Check wording, eg ‘Urban development could not occur outside...?’ Concern at legal interpretation. Could it be linked back to other processes that have to follow ie methods, district plans etc page 9 refers. Don’t want it to look compulsory or pre-empting city plan decision.</li> <li>● Plan changes that are not within the red line, where will they sit? – more within city, less within SDC and WDC and greenfields? Noted need to recognise the status of the RPS going from ‘proposed’ until ‘operative’ and the gradual increase in weighting. Also nothing to preclude someone from applying for a private plan change – will no doubt be tested in the future.</li> </ul>	<p>Ken/wparty</p> <p>Ken/wparty</p> <p>Ken/wparty</p> <p>Ken/wparty</p> <p>Ken/wparty</p> <p>Ken/wparty</p> <p>Ken/wparty</p> <p>Ken/wparty</p> <p>Dale</p> <p>Ken/wparty</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Noted some work still to be done re Hendersons Basin rezoning. Map not quite correct.</li><li>● Need to ensure it is a clear, concise document which is easily understood by the general public/lay people.</li><li>● Introduction – important people are told they must read the introduction. Has this been to Selwyn and Waimakariri district Councils yet – what are their views?</li><li>● Transport issues – eg why not cover development and land use pattern on existing corridors to Rolleston, Lincoln, Prebbleton? It was explained this will be considered as part of urban form for the future.</li><li>● Remember the Pegasus development and resulting transport problems.</li><li>● Big tick for work done – will assist submission process.</li><li>● The collaborative work of staff, and successful exercise was acknowledged.</li></ul>	<p><b>ACTION</b></p> <p>Ken/wparty</p> <p>Ken/wparty</p>
<p><b>OUTCOME</b></p> <p>There was support from the elected members present for the draft consultation document provided some of the concerns raised during the seminar were addressed by the working party.</p>	<p>Carolyn/David/ Ken/Laurie</p>

The seminar concluded at 3.12 pm.