

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

NOTES OF A SEMINAR OF THE COUNCIL

Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices
on Tuesday 5 June 2007 at 9.30 am

- PRESENT:** Councillor Bob Parker (Chair),
Councillors Graham Condon, Barry Corbett, Carole Evans
(from 10 am), Bob Shearing, (from 9.46 am), Gail Sheriff,
Sue Wells, and Norm Withers.
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Community Board members: Yani Johanson, Steve
Lowndes, and Stewart Miller.
- Council Officers: John Allen, Alan Bywater, Kay Holder,
Gary Lennan, Terry Moody, Alice Mortlock, and Mark
Vincent.
- APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from
Mayor Garry Moore and Councillors Helen Broughton,
Anna Crighton, and Pat Harrow.

1. DOG CONTROL POLICY AND BYLAWS

The purpose of the seminar was to advise elected members on the need for a review of the Council's dog control policies, as required under the Dog Control Act 1996, and to determine those matters to be controlled by bylaws. Included were matters of possible prohibited and leashed dog areas.

The dog control bylaws of both the former Christchurch City and Banks Peninsula District Councils are required to be reviewed under the Local Government Act 2002, and can only be introduced subject to a policy setting out the matters to be covered. This policy must be subject to public consultation, in addition to the normal special consultative process for the bylaw, once the coverage required has been determined.

Mark Vincent, supported by Terry Moody and Alan Bywater, presented by way of a Power Point display, information related to the review process of the dog control policies. (Copy on file – No. 1).

John Allen then spoke to his tabled paper, "Discussion on Criteria for Assessing Dog Control Areas on Council Owned or Controlled Park and Reserve Land". (Copy on file - No. 2).

Questions and points raised included:

ACTION

	ACTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What engagement/discussions are planned/have been initiated with the Community Boards as part of this review process? • “Minimum voice control” requirement – how strong/effective in reality? • Cited Brooklands area where birdlife is endangered: signs not in place due to halt in review of sign policy. • Ensure sign policy is sorted prior to review of dog control bylaw. A report was sought on the signage policy review progress as well as time frames. Then appropriate signs can be put in place in conjunction with new dog control bylaw coming into effect. • Financial question: A report was sought providing financial breakdowns, i.e. current ratepayer subsidy and costs to the council resulting from implementation of the policy. • Signage – implementation costs of the policy – is there going to be sufficient budget provision? Importance of education established. • It was noted the last time this issue arose the council received 1500 submissions on four proposed changes to policy: presentation is missing the point. Are we happy with the policy or do we want it changed? We need to think how we’re going to handle the development of the policy. • How will the Council develop the policy in terms of at the public level? Need to identify the key pressure points on this bylaw. Need to remember consultation and transparency. Fear of media glare if go via Community Board level instead of resident level. • Council should undertake “market research type thing” at resident/ratepayer level to identify those issues which affect them. • Will consultation be based on what is in place at present with some tidying up? Broader discussion at community board level? • Comment: danger in revisiting areas already dealt with • “Voice control as a minimum” measure of control as required by the bylaw – questioned if this an adequate and effective means of control? • Congratulations to team re. seminar and work resulting in less complaints • Information sought on the number/type of complaints since implementation (has there been a change in complaints) – attach to discussion document? • Sought breakdown of statistics into local areas/parks relevant to community boards (- via presentation or to be circulated), and statistics/funding broken down to enable a community level approach • Extension of walkways on the Peninsula has raised the issue of uncontrolled dogs – ensure policy covers “other animals” and livestock e.g. during lambing time. • Issue of uncontrolled walkways, especially in Banks Peninsula, raised. • Also need to look at assessing wildlife issues – Canada geese problem in Robinsons’ Bay cited, also issues at Children’s Bay. Who’s responsible for wildlife assessment? • Quality of Life survey – include effects of dogs? Get statistics back on dog fouling questions etc • If dogs are covered in this survey gather the information and construct into a report for feedback. 	<p>Alan/Terry</p> <p>Mark</p> <p>Alan</p> <p>Mark</p> <p>John</p> <p>Alan</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none">Clarified 8% rates split is the “public good’ rates component of the former Christchurch city policy. The seminar was advised the former Banks Peninsula District Council allowed 40-50% which covered rural matters relating to stray sheep, stock issues etc. <p>Expression of thanks Elected members expressed thanks and appreciation for the work done by the animal control team.</p> <p>OUTCOME:</p> <p>It was agreed by consensus that a team of elected members be established to work with staff to develop an agreed consultation process with community boards and the wider community. Issues to be considered would include <i>inter alia</i> a review of the level of funding available and the cost of implementation, signage etc</p> <p>The seminar concluded at 10.20 am.</p>	<p>ACTION</p> <p>Mark</p>
--	----------------------------------

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

NOTES OF A SEMINAR OF THE COUNCIL

Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices
on Tuesday 5 June 2007 at 1pm

PRESENT: Councillor Carole Evans (Chair) and
Councillors Sally Buck (from 2.30pm), Barry Corbett,
David Cox, Anna Crighton (from 2.20pm), Bob Parker,
Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff (from 2.22pm), Sue Wells, and
Norm Withers.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received and accepted from
Mayor Garry Moore, Councillors Helen Broughton,
Graham Condon and Pat Harrow and for lateness from
Councillors Sally Buck and Gail Sheriff.

1. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Stephen McArthur introduced the topic providing an overview of the stage the strategy had now reached.

The session today would take members through the key recommendations and changes made to the draft document.

A PowerPoint presentation given by Alan Bywater followed, covering:

- Today's focus,
- Community Development Strategy diagram,
- Process,
- Draft strategy vision,
- Draft strategy principals,
- Draft strategy goals,
- What will remain the same,
- What will change,
- Consultation findings,
- Major strategy changes recommended.

Questions and comments followed, including:

- There was need to distinguish between the two strategies being developed, that of development contributions and community development - need to avoid confusion.
- A preference was seen for using the term 'strengthening communities'.
- Was the word 'vulnerable' the right word to use, and what was trying to be conveyed.

It was **agreed** that staff look at this issue raised further.

Goal Two

- Was emphasis being lost by using the term ‘promoting collaborations’?
- The use of the word ‘issues’ or ‘focus’ could be better, and staff were left to look at this.

Goal Four

- The word ‘identity’ was preferred instead of ‘connectedness’.

It was **agreed** that this be amended.

Goal Six

- It was seen? that a framework should be put in place.
- The word ‘leisure’ was to be added to the other group of activity types.

Goal Eight

- Action points should be added and these actioned for any further research work in this area carried out.
- The idea of suite of implementation measures was favoured.
- The reference to 2004 on page 33 was to be removed as was that of the words ‘Buy in’ on page 36.
- On page 37 there is no need to refer to ‘including Banks Peninsula’.
- The reference to defining evidence base needed to be tested.

Strategy Monitoring and Evaluation

- Measures would be on the basis of population rather than services.

It was noted that when the community outcome review is carried out, there are measures that will flow through.

Clarification was sought on whether any additional cost had been identified in respect of implementing the strategy.

Community Group Grants Review

Lincoln Papali’i provided a PowerPoint presentation covering:

- Timeframe,
- Draft grants review,
- Consultations findings,
- Maori consultation findings,
- Major grants review - changes recommended,
- Changes recommended - grant outcomes.

Questions and comments followed covering:

- Environmental projects were seen as just as important and should be added.
- The Council restricting the Community Board’s delegations in terms of where it could or couldn’t spend the money in this matter.

Outcome

Information was to be forwarded to members showing grant information as it was and as it is proposed on the same page, so that comparisons can easily be made.

Community Facilities Plans

James Ryan provided a PowerPoint presentation covering:

- Draft community facilities plan,
- Consultation findings,
- Changes to community facilities plan,
- Timeframe,
- There was the 'vulnerability' effect to consider,
- It was a question of Council rentals applying when the asset is owned by the Council.

It was suggested that such matters as the impact of the new policy on charges to groups, should be carried out at the time that the policy itself is discussed.

- The use of the term 'develop' was seen as a better option than that of 'implement'.
- Was there a possibility of closing up the timeframe from that of when the application is lodged to when the approvals are notified?

The seminar concluded at 2.55pm.