

**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**  
**NOTES OF A SEMINAR MEETING**  
**OF THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

**Held in the Council Chamber**  
**on Tuesday 14 March 2006 at 9.30 am**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Sue Wells (Chair),  
 Councillors Sally Buck, Graham Condon, Barry Corbett,  
 Anna Crighton, Pat Harrow, Bob Parker, Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff,  
 Norm Withers, and Community Board members Yani Johanson,  
 Brenda Lowe-Johnson and Don Rowlands.

**APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from the Mayor,  
 Councillors Helen Broughton and Carole Evans, and Community  
 Board member Carmen Hammond.

Apologies for lateness were accepted from Councillors Bob Shearing,  
 and Gail Sheriff.

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Jonathan Clease, Maurice Roers, Carolyn Ingles, Miranda Charles,  
 Brendan Smyth, Hugh Nicholson and Jenny Ridgen.

	ACTION	GENERAL MANAGER RESPONSIBLE	COMPLETION DATE
<p><b>1. QUALITY URBAN DESIGN IN OUR HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL AREAS</b></p> <p>Elected members heard a PowerPoint presentation from Maurice Roers and Jonathan Clease on this topic.</p> <p>The seminar looked at the issues surrounding the design and appearance of multi-unit developments in the Living 3 and Living 4 zones, with a view to beginning public consultation as part of the S. 32 process of preparing a Plan Change. The Plan Change will ensure that the City Plan both enables higher density development and that such development is of a high standard.</p> <p>The following points were noted during the presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How much land has been taken up within the zoning which will allow an increase in density, i.e. is there a map of “built density” available?</li> <li>• The design issues as identified in the presentation were considered valuable tools for raising awareness of the public and those involved in development generally. It was suggested that the presentation be made available to the public through the Council’s website, and consideration be given to an item for CTV along similar lines.</li> </ul>			

	ACTION	GENERAL MANAGER RESPONSIBLE	COMPLETION DATE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City Plan requires provision of garaging on-site for each apartment. A rule change could allow flexibility, including off-site parking provision and this could be explored through the Issues and Options exercise.</li> <li>• Issues surrounding the amalgam of titles, and barriers to comprehensive development will also be considered as part of the Issues and Options.</li> <li>• Investigate if the Council could make “brownfields” development more attractive to developers.</li> <li>• Also, should there be a minimum scale on development in both the L3 and L4 zones?</li> <li>• The Banks Peninsula experience with design and appearance rules was described: one option brought architects, elected members and the community together with a good outcome.</li> <li>• Compare/draw on international and national frame works, and review design rules in other cities</li> <li>• Consider noise/quality of life issues i.e. Port zone/air conditioning units.</li> <li>• Established that the Building Act requires a 50 year lifespan for buildings which may raise some assessment issues.</li> <li>• The feeling was that market forces would affect design, but how to promote financial benefit aspects in order to enhance quality and cost recovery aspects were discussed, in context of S. 32. Studies have been carried out in several major overseas cities, and it was proposed to commission a similar study for Christchurch City.</li> <li>• A query re Elderly Person Housing in L3 –is there much movement? No – tends to be in lower density suburbs. EPH will be considered by the Council in due course.</li> <li>• The two choices for the Council to move forward were discussed, and it was considered a blend of the best of both options would be possible.</li> <li>• Concern was expressed that once it became general knowledge that the Council intended to “tighten things up” speculators would rush in. Staff explained the Council needs a robust process which would stand up to legal challenge – and part of this would involve public consultation.</li> <li>• Potential conflict with “building to the street” design and appearance rules and energy efficiency issues (i.e the necessity in this climate to build towards the sun) – will need to be catered for.</li> <li>• Potential effect on the L2 parts of Christchurch which can be built to similar levels in L3 and L4 in terms of urban development needs to be recognised.</li> <li>• SAMS – move forward separately, as SAMS are not restricted to the L3 and L4 zones.</li> </ul>			
	Maurice/ Jonathan	Carolyn	Pending

	ACTION	GENERAL MANAGER RESPONSIBLE	COMPLETION DATE
<p><b>2. PROTOCOL FOR SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>Environmental Scientist Jenny Ridgen provided a PowerPoint presentation on the Protocol. This will provide an agreed approach on how the City Council and Environment Canterbury will work together to bring about integrated catchment management. The Protocol will be a “living document” to guide Council processes when developing the first Integrated Catchment Management Plan (ICMP) for South West Christchurch.</p> <p>The following points were noted during the presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision in the LTCCP was queried. Jenny advised that the South West Area Plan was a Council priority, and funding has been set aside for this purpose, along with ICMP funding for land use investigations. It was recognised that retrofitting urban areas to meet the WQL7 rule could have financial consequences for the city.</li> <li>• No significant new zoning is proposed without ICMP, and changes to the amount of permeable surfaces in the L3 and L4 zones are unlikely to alter. However, concern was expressed at the state of some of the infrastructure and the capacity to cope with infill.</li> <li>• Individual discharge consent will be surrendered once the relevant ICMP is in place, by way of a letter.</li> <li>• Concern expressed that river water quality may not improve through storm water proposals, and the Council could be “stuck” with existing issues for the next 10 years. Overseas experience with the placement of gauze netting over sumps was cited as an effective way to improve water quality during summer storm situations.</li> <li>• Suggested that some zoning/rezoning issues could be dealt with by reserve contributions. The SWAP will be dealt with first, within two years as per the agreement with ECan.</li> <li>• It was noted the Protocol is not a statutory document – if a Plan Change is sought, what will it mean, when tested against the City Plan? Feedback is to be sought on this aspect.</li> <li>• It was proposed that ways of using surface water as a resource be investigated (rather than pumping it away.)</li> </ul>	<p>Jenny/ Carolyn</p>	<p>Carolyn</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

The seminar concluded at 12 noon.

# **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

## **NOTES OF A SEMINAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL**

**Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices  
on Tuesday 14 March 2006 at 1.30pm**

### **PRESENT:**

#### **Christchurch City Council**

Mayor Garry Moore (Chairman)  
Councillors Helen Broughton, Sally Buck, Barry Corbett,  
(from 1.45pm), Graham Condon, David Cox,  
Anna Crighton, Pat Harrow, Bob Parker (from 2.50pm),  
Bob Shearing and Sue Wells.

#### **Community Board**

Yani Johanson, Don Rowlands and Ngaire Button.

### **APOLOGIES:**

An apology for absence was received and accepted from  
Councillor Norm Withers and an apology for lateness was  
received from Councillor Barry Corbett.

## **1. RELATIONSHIP WITH SUSTAINABLE OTAUTAHI CHRISTCHURCH**

The Mayor welcomed members of the organisation and briefly backgrounded how it had come into being.

### **What matters to Councillors and Community Board Members?**

Katherine Peet, Executive Committee member, sought from each members present, three things that mattered most to them.

From the list drawn up, it was noted that one could not place a dollar value on them, they were each priceless.

### **About Sustainable Otautahi Christchurch**

Chrissie Williams, Chair of the organisation, provided information on:

- Who we are
- Our vision for the future
- Objectives
- What we have achieved
- Some possibilities

### **What is Sustainable Development? – Critical Global Issues**

Roger Buck, Vice Chair, spoke on what the term “sustainable” meant including:

- Implies what we need to adapt
- Human resource use is growing exponentially on most indications
- More and more growth, not development
- Hierarchical relationships exist
- Demand for resources growing
- Magnifying effect, ie climate change
- Growth has no limits
- We are reaching “peak oil”
- We have to rethink – replace with something we are inexplicitly part of
- Messages in bookshops suggest different lifestyle
- Suggest that Council and their group come together to achieve these things

### **Is Sustainable Attainable? If so, how?**

Dr John Peet, Treasurer, commented that the issue is extremely complex and he referred to:

- Diagrams of goods and services and energy and matters
- Strong sustainability
- The fourth institutional dimension model
- Four policy imperatives of sustainability
- Governance for sustainability (10 criteria)
- Draft New Zealand sustainability assessment
- Have to say New Zealand is not sustainable
- Shifting mindset
- Time for us to work together

### **What we can offer the Council and how we might work together**

Arthur Williamson, Vice Chair, referred to past track record of the two organisations, SCT and Agenda 21 Forum who now made up the current organisation, and further commented:

- Where next?
- Future projects and collaboration

He recommended that a representative of SOC be appointed to the Urban Development Strategy Forum as a first step.

### **Reflection and Summary**

Rhys Taylor referred to:

- SOC strengths
  - in the community
  - independent
  - intellectual clout
  - intent on long term view

- Making links
  - early adviser, not late submitter
  - sounding board on sustainable strategy and policy
  - technical briefing available
  - protocol for staff collaboration

He concluded by asking the question “Do you see the SOC having a role in assisting the Council and Community Boards with the changes we need to make in response to the threat and challenges that lie ahead?”

Questions and comments were then inviting including:

- You have identified the UDS – what about other groups?
- Was the matter of political affiliation covered in the group’s constitution?
- A range of intellectual views was needed on various subject matter before the Council.
- A role could be found with the design of new buildings, ie Urban Design Advisory Panel.
- There were issues for which the answers were not currently known on mobility management, compact city, vast West Coast coal reserves, pothole or oil discovery and global warming.

The Mayor concluded the session by advising that the Council would look at its representation on the UDS Forum and that he had:

- Challenged the Portfolio Groups as to who they engage with.
- A charet was planned for the south of Lichfield. An urbanist was being brought over from New Orleans.
- The matter of our protocol would be looked at.

The seminar concluded at 3.25pm