

# **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

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

**Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices  
on Wednesday 26 April 2006 at 9.30am**

- PRESENT:** Councillor Sue Wells (Chairperson),  
Councillor Helen Broughton (from 11.40am), Sally Buck,  
Barry Corbett, David Cox, Pat Harrow, Bob Parker (from  
11.45am), Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff and Norm Withers.
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Yani Johanson and Caroline Kellaway (Community  
Board), representatives of the Eureka Trust and Robbies  
Hotel Chain.
- APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from  
Mayor Garry Moore, Councillors Graham Condon,  
Anna Crighton and Carole Evans.

### **1. REVIEW OF GAMING VENUE POLICY**

In addition to the written report, Terry Moody provided a PowerPoint presentation covering:

- Policy Review background
- Options
  1. Go back to the number of machines and venues existing at September 2003.
  2. Set a limit on the number of machines on a population basis.
  3. Set a limit on the number of venues based on the number existing in 2003.
  4. Retain current policy of prohibition on any new venues (do nothing option).
  5. Approvals to be granted for any class 4 machine venue subject to premises being licensed.
- Preferred option
- Process from this point

In the discussion that followed, comment was made in respect of:

- Reason for carrying out the review at an early stage.
- There is a significant number of changes to gaming machine requirements and electronic monitoring over recent years.
- The current policy was in effect a sinking lid policy (puts a cap on the number of machines).
- There is high cost to any gaming machine operator, which will see small operators drop out.
- The preferred option would enable the same operator to transfer gaming venue machines between premises.

- The economics of operating machines was likely to see various sports clubs opt out of the operations.
- The requirements where clubs amalgamate.
- Whether there was a need to go through the special consultative process.
- The need for an appropriate funding regime to be put in place for a venue approval.
- The time frame proposed for consultation on the policy would see the hearings being conducted in August.
- The need to have regard to the policy of the former Banks Peninsula District Council which was different in some respects to that of Christchurch City's.
- Given the control of machines etc by the Department of Internal Affairs, why did local government need to be involved at all? Other local authorities may, however, feel differently inclined.

### **Conclusion**

It was concluded that the proposal put forward be referred to the Council for adoption and public consultation, taking into account the various comments made.

## **2. LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW REFORM BILL**

Chris Gilbert, Legal Services Manager, supported by Judith Cheyne, Solicitor, provided a PowerPoint presentation in addition to the memorandum on the subject circulated.

The Bill was basically a tidy-up of the various pieces of related local government legislation.

The comments in relation to the various clauses included:

### **1. Dog Control Act 1996**

- Once again, Central Government was legislating for local authorities who administer policies without any related funding.
- The neutering of menacing dogs should not be supported. It would be best carried out on a dog breed basis.
- Microchip implanting in dogs should not be applied to farm dogs.

It was **concluded** that:

1. The Council does not support the microchip implanting of farm dogs.
2. The current policy in relation to the neutering of dogs should not be changed.
3. The method by which the review of the Council's bylaw should be at the discretion of the local authority.

2. **Litter Act 1979**

- When did the Council last issue an offence notice?
- One of the main problems in administering the Act was trying to obtain the name and address of the offender.
- What was the age restriction on a person being issued with a notice?
- Parents should be made to pay the fines of minors.

It was **concluded** that:

1. The action needed to be looked at in terms of reducing the age limit application to that of a 10 year old person.

3. **Local Government Act 2002**

- The provision whereby bylaws have to be renewed after a five year period otherwise they expire in a further two years.
- The ability or otherwise for local authorities to determine whether it is appropriate for the special consultative procedure to be used in any bylaw review.

It was **concluded** that:

1. The Schedule of Bylaws currently in force by the Council be provided to Councillors along with their expiry date. This would enable the workload to be assessed.

4. **Rates Rebate Act 1973**

- In order to administer the Rebate Scheme, the Council would incur some costs by way of the administration work carried out.

It was **concluded** that an explanation of the Rates Rebate Scheme requirements should be provided by Central Government to support the scheme.

5. **Other Suggested Amendments**

- In addition to the Police, Council enforcement officers should have the ability to retain names and addresses of those contravening relative laws.
- To what ability could digital cameras be used in supporting enforcement measures?
- It appeared that the consultation process was now being added to other legislation which placed further burdens on local authorities.
- It was considered that there is a need to examine the whole rating philosophy.
- Should a local authority have the ability to freeze rents and rates for elderly persons on fixed incomes, in recognition of their senior citizen status?
- Another area was that of water supply where the average ratepayer was only meeting the half cost of supplying the water to the respective property.

It was **concluded** that there were a number of issues to be examined on a long-term basis and the support of the NZLGA zones should be sought:

- The need for local controlled licensing.
- The need for a national template in respect of the LTCCP process.
- Copies of the submissions made to the Select Committee should be sent to the local MPs.
- The matters identified by the meeting and others need to be conveyed to both the Department of Internal Affairs and more immediately to Chris Kerr for investigation.

The seminar concluded at 12.10pm

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

**Held in the Council Chamber**  
**on Wednesday 26 April 2006 at 1.30 pm**

**PRESENT:** Cr Sue Wells (Chair), Crs Helen Broughton, Sally Buck, David Cox, Anna Crighton, Pat Harrow, Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff, and Norm Withers, and Community Board members Jeremy Agar, Glenda Burt, and Claudia Reid.

**APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Mayor Garry Moore, Crs Barry Corbett, Carole Evans, and Bob Parker.

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Chris Hopman, Peter Mitchell, David Mountfort, and Jason Rivett.

	ACTION	GENERAL MANAGER RESPONSIBLE	COMPLETION DATE
<p><b>1. CITY PLAN WORKLOAD</b></p> <p>David Mountfort spoke to a power point presentation which described progress against the City Plan work programme adopted by the Council in March 2005, and an updated programme for 2006/2007, which included information on Banks Peninsula district planning issues.</p> <p>The following questions and points were noted during the seminar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>New Issues Arising:</b> Where do these fit with the 2005 work programme? The schedule from 2005 is being worked on, and the aim of this seminar is to identify priorities for the next 12 months, incorporated former Banks Peninsula issues.</li> <li>• <b>City Plan workload:</b> S 32 report on “Non-Family Residential Accommodation” should be available in last quarter of 2006 calendar year.</li> <li>• <b>Private Plan Changes:</b> Have to work within statutory time frames, and concern was expressed that this work would slow down progress on the list of priorities.</li> <li>• <b>Subdivisions:</b> Find a means of avoiding the council accepting land for environmental compensation which is no use to anyone (e.g. vertical cliff face)</li> <li>• <b>BPDC Plan:</b> May require a subcommittee to work through the issues?</li> <li>• The <b>Memorandum of Understanding</b> between BPDC and CCC covers the topics listed on Slice 14.</li> </ul>			

	ACTION	GENERAL MANAGER RESPONSIBLE	COMPLETION DATE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Slide 15:</b> Recognised the workload will exceed resources – suggested a rewrite which is “definite” rather than “suggestive” i.e. looks like what? ..and the cost?</li> <li>• <b>Wind turbines</b> – where they should be sited could be an issue? Chris Hopman advised this issue was not prioritised last year. Landscape study will overlap and cover this: study has to completed by the end of 2006 Environment Court requires regular reporting.</li> <li>• <b>BPDC variations</b> – where do they sit in priority lists? These will be processed in conjunction with the CCC list, and the council then make a call on priorities.</li> <li>• <b>Future planning:</b> Need to ensure planning in place for issues surrounding transport infrastructure, drainage, land acquisition etc</li> <li>• <b>Potential Variations:</b> Concern expressed should a number of Variations “pop out” of the four priority Area Plans which Planning Strategy are dealing with currently. Needs future planning, identification and budget provision.</li> <li>• <b>Northern Arterial</b> – No 1 rather than No 2 priority? Explained that the way forward for the City Plan team on this is governed by Transit New Zealand and the City Streets Unit.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Subsequent Seminar</b></p>			
<p>Second seminar to be arranged and include</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>New list of priorities</b> for further consideration – include a “refreshed” list of No 1 priorities from CITY PLAN WORKLOAD (CPW) document, plus those identified on slide 17, and additional issues, e.g. Elderly Persons Housing etc.</li> <li>• <b>BPDC priorities</b>, recognising links and effects of both plans.</li> <li>• Elected members sought <b>more information:</b> budget, “best estimate” of time frame indications.</li> <li>• <b>Work Plan</b> for next five years proposed.</li> <li>• <b>Section 32</b> report: Public expectation of Section 32 report on “Non-Family Residential Accommodation” first signalled 2005.</li> <li>• Review of <b>SAMS</b> – public expectation.</li> <li>• <b>Wind farms</b> – BPDC landscape plan – signal at the next seminar. May need rezoning for energy into the future.</li> </ul>			

The meeting concluded at 3.08 pm.