

Meeting notes for the meeting of the CERA Community Forum
Thursday 17 November 2011, 7.30pm
Christchurch Boys High School Hostel, Harakeke Street, Christchurch

Present: Community Forum Members
Hon Gerry Brownlee (late)
Jane Bryden, Office of Hon Gerry Brownlee
CERA:

- Benesia Smith, Chief Advisor of the Chief Executive
- Mike Shatford, GM Communications
- Withheld under section 9(2)(g)(i)

Apologies: Maria Godinet-Watts
Gill Cox
Richard Ballantyne
Paul Lonsdale
Ross Brereton

Chair Trevor McIntyre

1 Minister of Earthquake Recovery – Gerry Brownlee

Trevor welcomed the Minister.

The Minister thanked the Forum and acknowledged the work it had done to develop a structure which it felt would be of the greatest value to the recovery in the coming years.

1.1 Insurance

The Minister commented that most in Canterbury are insured and insurers are sticking with them, however, all major insurance companies feel exposed as a result of the earthquakes and aftershocks. There are significant commercial pressures.

The Minister noted he had led a delegation to the Rendezvous at Monaco (reinsurance conference), to address perceptions about the level of disaster and what is being done by Government and other agencies to address the impacts.

The delegation challenged the modelling of ongoing seismic risk in Canterbury based on earthquakes in other parts of the world only. Dr Kelvin Berryman of GNS was able to tell attendees what we see happening here and provide a credible story about the decline of seismic activity over time.

In the past few weeks, insurance underwriters and other industry representatives have been in Christchurch, clarifying their picture of how the recovery is going and putting together insurance books. They are coming into the market and are starting to write contracts, which will encourage others.

A number of building companies are offering to insure buildings they build.

Innovative solutions will start to emerge and that will lead the market.

The Minister shared a view that for the betterment of Canterbury and the whole of New Zealand there is a need for a better tension between new insurers coming in and the old insurers.

1.2 Summer Events

The Minister expressed his concern about the impact of the Christmas break, school holidays, financial pressures, etc. on people already dealing with the impact of the earthquake and land zoning decisions.

He has asked his staff and CERA to consider augmenting the current programme of activities provided by the three Councils and other agencies with activities which would be cheap or free, easily accessible, etc.

Jane Bryden confirmed that a calendar of events was in development and would be disseminated to the Forum as soon as it is available.

The Minister confirmed that money and capacity will be committed to this and that input from the Forum would be welcomed and considered.

Action: Jane to provide events programme as soon as it is available

1.3 Land zoning announcements

The Minister confirmed the decision and rationale for the decision to zone Brooklands red. The bearing capacity of land is very low and **Withheld under section 9(2)(g)(i)**
Withheld under section 9(2)(f)(v). To repair the land would be difficult, expensive and the community would have to be relocated for some significant period of time. Across the board, expensive remediation would not guarantee the land would survive in another earthquake

He commented on the requirement for TC3 geotechnical assessments, noting much is normal practice already.

Remaining orange areas on the flat have remained that way as they are more complex than previous zoning decisions and that the Government must credibly consider options for remediation and not just write off areas because its difficult.

The Minister reassured Forum members that remaining orange areas are being addressed as a priority, the goal is that remaining flat land decisions will be finalised by Christmas but that this would depend on a number of factors.

1.4 Port Hills

The Minister noted also that over 3000 properties are still zoned white in the Port Hills and are also a priority – primarily CCC is responsible for natural hazard management but CERA is taking a stronger role to bring a result sooner.

There was a discussion about the different challenges in zoning the hills, compared to the land on the flat, and the impact of the decision-making process.

1.5 Community Strategy presentation from Forum

The Forum tabled a paper (Appendix 1), for the Minister to have regard to, which was prepared following presentations detailing community engagement strategies from the Christchurch CC, Selwyn DC and Waimakariri DC, along with Forum members' own observations and experience.

The main points of the Forum's paper:

- good general support from Selwyn and Waimakariri with clear strategies
- a desire for more support from CCC in communication strategy
- a need to collaborate more
- tensions between recovery strategy and planning
- leadership tensions need to be addressed to help leadership in city
- there is a gap that everything out of the CBD is falling though and there is a lack of clarity of leadership and conduits with which people can communicate
- greater partnership with communities is needed from the CCC
- a sense the CCC is managing its responsibilities in a "business-as-usual" model and areas such as consenting not working well and impeding community response and recovery

The Minister responded that CERA was set up because there are lots of aspects of recovery that the CCC couldn't be expected to pick up. The CCC still exists and still has the same responsibilities, but a number of those have been exacerbated and have to be done at a greater pace than was possible.

Responsibility for developing the draft CBD recovery plan should not take the CCC away from other business.

He acknowledged frustration around consenting and noted that Roger Sutton now meets with Councils' senior management regularly.

Withheld under section 9(2)(f)(iv)
Withheld under section 9(2)(g)(i)

He agreed that CCC's business-as-usual approach was a challenge but acknowledged the challenge for CCC of the size difference compared to the other Councils.

He further agreed that response and recovery is about people and said CERA does have a role in making this clear in the recovery strategy.

The Minister suggested the Forum meet with CCC CEO Tony Marryatt and advised to prepare well for that meeting with questions and suggestions to present to him.

Action: The Forum to reissue the invitation to CCC CEO to discuss concerns. Minister to write to CCC CEO Tony Marryatt supporting the Forum's invitation.

1.6 A number of questions were put to the Minister and attached as Appendix 2.
Actions points:

Action: Jane to ask CERA to investigate plans for temporary stage currently in Lyttelton, and report back

Action: Forum members to provide anecdotal examples of challenging issues for the Minister and staff to raise directly with EQC and insurers

The Minister closed by thanking the Forum for its considerations and feedback, and noted the importance of this feedback from representatives of their communities to the work of recovery.

2 Central City Tours

It was proposed the tour begin 3pm and follow a route which would demonstrate the range of damage to the city; CBD, Avonside, Wainoni, Avondale, and Sumner, and possibly go to Fendalton, Parklands, Brooklands and Kaiapoi depending on time.

Withheld under section 9(2)(f)(iv)

A secondary, back-up option could be arranged for those unable to attend on the proposed date, depending on demand.

CBD security would be arranged by CERA and Warwick Isaacs, CERA GM Operations and Demolitions, would escort the group in the CBD.

Dr Jan Kupec (geotech engineer specialist) would provide some technical commentary in other areas.

It was agreed Forum members would provide commentary on social impact on their communities.

Action: Jane to confirm dates and Forum members to confirm attendance.

3 Notes of the last meeting 3rd November

It was noted there was an omission around the discussion on leadership:

- Notes should read leadership is divided between recovery authorities (CERA/CCC/EQC) rather than local leaders in the communities and should read "strong recovery authority leadership" from "strong community leadership" (community boards/representatives)
- It was noted that there were two conversations, one about community leadership and the other about lack of local authority leadership
- Point three needs to say recovery authorities
- True and accurate record of the last meeting
- Timely delivery of the notes to occur

4 Themes and Issues for future focus and work streams

4.1 Brian Parker summarised as follows:

- 18 people submitted info into the online form
- Info provided and contact information was collated onto excel spreadsheets
- Prioritised by Brian in excel (handout to Forum members)
- Major themes include (in order of priority based on comments received):
 - Community focus
 - Communication
 - Insurance
 - Vision/leadership
 - Land
 - Business

4.2 The Forum agreed it would like to prioritise all the issues submitted, which could be done online.

Action: To develop a programme for 2012 to plan input needed, after documents are read by members and so they can work our workstream for next year

5 Media Policy Draft

Deferred.

6 Matters outstanding from the last meeting

Deferred.

7 Other items tabled

7.1 Notice of disability forum coming up on 14 Dec

Invitation from Community resilience and Human Rights Commission, extended to CanCERN as well as Forum members

8 Next Meeting

1 December 2011 at Adams House, Harakeke Street.

Remaining items on this Agenda to be carried over.

The meeting closed at 9.30pm

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

Appendix One
(meeting 17 November 2011)

Community Strategy Presentation

Forum comment:

There is general satisfaction with Selwyn and Waimakariri DC presentations. Waimakariri was doing it by the principle of listening. Selwyn is a very community based district and listens to its grass roots. It is felt that these two are successful as they know their community and their actions were relevant and appropriate. It was acknowledged that Selwyn and Waimakariri were doing a good job and they had gathered together a lot of resources and were set up after September, so had a head start.

Selwyn and Waimakariri had separate earthquake divisions as apposed to CCC who continued a day to day, business-as-usual running of earthquake recovery work without a separate division or distinct set of workers designated to the earthquake recovery. In Waimakariri the people got the information and communication engagement strategy, they talked about it and it was principle based. Selwyn talked about it but it was relatively ad hoc, but they knew their community and it worked.

On the other hand it was acknowledged that the CCC had challenges. There is an issue with size, the CCC being substantially larger. From CCC we got a list of what they had done, but they did not present what Forum asked for – their communication and engagement strategy. There was some stuff at the end 'enhancing the safety of communities and neighbourhoods' – if this was expanded upon there may have been a more satisfactory answer. It appeared the CCC did not have a focus on the people, rather on the roading etc

It seems there has been a shift in CCC to a more executive approach, no one cared about being disengaged before but now there is an attitudinal change and the people want to be engaged again. If the CCC is prepared to look at where they delegate decisions to, engagement will be much better. It would seem since the presentations that there has been a positive shift in CCC involvement with residents' associations and community boards eg Sumner and Ferrymead. On the other hand Avondale has had no community consultation i.e. Sewer decisions without consultation because of the difficult times, so are not getting a feeling from the Council that they are trying to communicate. The attitude is that the decisions are more important than taking the people with them

Some members gave feedback that CCC was very receptive to constructive comment so Council does want to do the right thing - they just need to make the connections. The Community Boards need a role in the process/they need to be resourced, they need to be given decision making in their communities and financially they need to hold the resources and that is the things that the people decide are needed to recover - it is about delegating powers down to Community Boards. CHCH in its totality is just too big, so need to break it back down into community based recovery. Forum has a strong sense that if they break up into communities there will be a larger level of engagement. Removing public consultation to make decisions runs the risk of doing the wrong thing. There needs to be a buffer which is strong community leadership

so decisions are reflecting what the people want. Community Boards need to be re-empowered through delegation.

Main Points in summary:

1. General support for Selwyn and Waimakariri with their clear strategies and good communication which has focused on recovery
2. The desire for more delegation from CCC to Community Boards and Residents associations of the consultation and planning needed for their communities recovery
3. There is a need for the various local organisations to collaborate, the dysfunction and tension between these groups is preventing good effective leadership. This would also alleviate the variability that exists.
4. Acknowledgement that the tensions between getting the recovery process started and consultation/planning is a very challenging and difficult timeline.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

Appendix Two

(meeting 17 November 2011)

Who is responsible for identifying risks on hills and land decisions?

The CCC is responsible for determining life safety risk, and has the authority to make decisions as a direct result of determining that life safety risk, such as whether or not a house is reasonably safe to live in based on that risk. It has not yet done so, so CERA is assisting the CCC to make this decision a lot quicker

Once a life safety risk and related decisions are made, further decisions on other issues that are relevant can be made

Dr Jan Kupec is leading the Port Hills Geotech Group

Lyttelton

A letter was tabled for the Minister, noting that Lyttelton people are returning to the community and rebuilding but are encountering problems with CCC consenting, resourcing, funding, etc. Time is wasted on consenting issues and the concern is that people will leave. Particular concern was expressed about the removal of the temporary stage due to a lack of consents.

The Minister responded that in his view permanent building requirements for the stage are unnecessary and it should be reinstated and undertook to have CERA look into it. Action point referred to Minutes.

Concerns about frustrations with CCC consenting processes

Arts Voice has submitted that resource consent processes should be reviewed and streamlined for arts activities at least. The Minister suggested that these are the issues the Forum can push.

There are too many "business as usual" hoops impeding community representatives from helping their communities

It was acknowledged that criticism of consenting processes needs to be careful and checked, but that the process aren't working and the attitude needs to change

It was noted that following the meeting with Councils where there was criticism about consenting issues, they agreed to establish within the next couple of weeks a group to remove process obstacles and get things happening, with a consents person put alongside events and planning people so they can all work together.

A suggestion from the Forum was to place a planner/consents person in a mobile unit in communities like Lyttelton, get them out there in communities.

The Minister acknowledged the concerns expressed and expressed a view that in principle, if communities want to do something then Councils should facilitate.

What is the Minister's general observation about CERA management of the recovery process?

Like any new organisation, CERA is increasingly working out what it needs to get the job done. It is developing and along the way there is a huge amount of effort around very practical things like land decisions and making land available, around demolitions, around sorting out different interests, etc.

As an example, CERA's Community Wellbeing is ensuring normal agencies of government are aware of, and anticipate support requirements for Christchurch, such as health and education services.

A clearer picture of what needs to be put in place in next few years is also developing.

Behind all decisions are the questions is this the best way to do it? is this the fastest way? is there a better way to do it?

It is the Minister's view that overall, CERA is doing a pretty good job considering the significant challenges.

He proposed getting Roger Sutton to come and talk about medium to mid term goals.

EQC / Fletchers / insurance / builder processes and tensions

A number of concerns about the EQC-Fletchers Alliance with the overriding themes:

- a lack of transparency
- the rights of the property owners
- quality of workmanship and unethical behaviours
- quality of processing
- lack of coordination within the organisations and between the organisations
- inconsistencies between EQC and insurers holding up processing of assessments and claims
- with the new technical category zoning and a large number of green-blue category properties, delays in reassessments

The Minister agreed multiple assessments by different assessors and builders is a problem and is concerned at the disempowerment of property owners.

He expressed some sympathy with EQC which is experiencing its own frustrations since the High Court Declaratory judgement in favour of the insurers, particularly as the public were told the decision wouldn't affect policy-holders.

The Minister commented that the Fletchers arrangements are for work up to \$100,000 but there is work being done on this issue.

He expressed concern about the issues of multiple claims, individually all under cap but collectively come to an accumulative position of complete rebuild/ destroyed position. The Minister noted that the current arrangements are not suitable and government is trying to move on this at the moment. The process was agreed to in response to insurers' concerns about individuals taking money for back pocket and not fixing houses.

The challenge is how to both audit the work and getting onto the work.

The Minister commented that discussions such as this are useful as they indicate how serious an issue might be and how big it might become, and endorse other feedback, etc. He requested some further feedback to assist with discussions with other agencies such as EQC, Fletchers, insurers, etc. He asked for anecdotal

examples of issues to assist discussions with EQC and insurers. The action point was referred to the Minutes.

Foundation Technical Categories

The Minister reiterated that technical categories are guidance only and are there to indicate possible requirements in accordance with these guidelines.

TC1 and 2 are really regular building standards, TC3 is only an indication. There will be lots of TC3 areas where, when assessed, it will be found that TC2 standards are adequate.

Technical categories should not appear on the LIM as they are guidance only.

It is intended to release a map that shows areas where there is no land damage to encourage insurers.

What is the process for the Central City Plan?

The Minister confirmed that he expects to receive the draft mid-December and it will then be publically notified so people can comment, the comments will be considered and the final Central City Plan will be in place approx April 2012, around the same time as the cordon is reduced.

It is the Minister's view that once the Central City Plan is published people make quicker and more substantial progress

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982