

Community Forum

Private Bag 4999

Christchurch 8140

Meeting notes for the meeting of the Community Forum**18 February 2016, 6pm****Level 2, Christchurch RSA, Christchurch**

Present:	Community Forum members: Leah Carr, Betty Chapman, Weng Kei Chen, Wendy Gilchrist, Maria Godinet-Watts, Ruth Jones, Andre Lovatt, Tom McBrearty, Deborah McCormick, Trevor McIntyre, Lesley Murdoch, Jocelyn Pappill, Faye Parfitt, John Peet, Patricia Siataga, Brian Vieceli, Rachel Vogan, Amanda Williams, Siong Sah (John) Wong,
Apologies:	Community Forum members: Emma Twaddell Weng Kei Chen (until 6.30pm) Martin Evans Hon Nicky Wagner, Associate Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery
Chair:	Darren Wright
In Attendance:	Greg Wilson, Deputy Director, Christchurch Central Project Delivery, CERA Byron Roff, Project Manager, Earthquake Memorial, CCDU, CERA Grega Vezjak, Christchurch Earthquake Memorial designer Gareth James, General Manager, South Island Waste Management Don Chittock, Programme Manager – Strategic Programmes, Environment Canterbury Daniel Murray, Principal Planner, AECOM John Moore, Manager, Planning and Delivery, Three Waters and Waste. Christchurch City Council Michelle Mehlhopt, Lawyer, Wynn Williams. Andrew Hammond, Principal Advisor, Recovery Plans, CERA. Benesia Smith, Deputy Chief Executive, Strategy and Recovery Policy, CERA (from 7pm) Sheridan Smith, Director Ministerial and Executive Services, CERA
Agenda	
Update on progress of Anchor Projects	
Greg Wilson, Deputy Director, Christchurch Central Project Delivery, CERA	
Discussion:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Greg Wilson took the Community Forum through the power point presentation on the Anchor Projects (refer Attachment A). Greg began by talking about the design and building work occurring on the Avon River at the moment. The work on the Terraces was also described. 2. The Forum was pleased that the Margaret Mahy Playground would be audited for accessibility. 3. The Forum asked about public engagement regarding the East Frame and was advised that there would be no specific consultation but that feedback was always welcome. They also 	

discussed the tender process, accessibility for the disabled and elderly, and affordable housing in the East Frame.

4. With 2000 people working at the Justice and Emergency Services Precinct, car parking was of particular interest to the Forum. While there will be a car parking element to the Precinct, workers need to utilities other car parks in the vicinity or use other means of transport. There was an ensuing discussion about the number of people it was anticipated would work at and use the Metro Sports Facility and Convention Centre.
5. Greg stated that approximately 18000 people per day were using the Bus Interchange. The Forum noted that there was no second floor for community facilities as its primary purpose is a bus interchange.
6. The Forum heard about aspects of the design of the Metro Sports Facility. The Forum encouraged active communication with the community via advertisements and on the CCDU website.
7. When speaking about An Accessible City, Greg noted that it is not expected that people will need to walk more than 200m from a bus stop to their destination.
8. The Forum noted that it was important, when the time is ready, for the Convention Centre story to be told. They also strongly encourage the Minister to expedite an announcement on it. The Forum and the presenter discussed this and he spoke about the detailed negotiations taking place which are preventing that announcement. The Forum also asked if the arts could be incorporated into the Convention Centre.
9. The Forum explained that accessibility to the Anchor Projects is a very important concern. The presenter assured the Forum that all will be accessibility audited.

Decisions taken:

1. The Forum agreed that:
 - there needs to be more communication with the public about the Convention Centre and Metro Sports Facility
 - accessibility needs to be top of mind when Anchor Projects are being completed.

Consultation on the Canterbury Earthquake Memorial

Byron Roff, Project Manager, Earthquake Memorial, CCDU and Grega Vezjak, designer of the winning memorial proposal

Discussion:

1. Byron Roff spoke to the power point presentation (**refer Attachment B**) and gave an overview of the EQM site, competition process for determining the design for the memorial, the key groups involved in construction and a construction update.
2. Grega Vezjak described his (winning) design of the Memorial Wall to the Forum. Byron also outlined the involvement of bereaved family members in the placement of names on the memorial wall and how a process is not under way to develop a Memorial Experience Strategy.
3. The Forum was asked for their input on what information in addition to names should be included on the memorial site and where this information could be located. The Forum commented that the earthquake story could be at both ends of the Memorial Wall with a flow to the names in the centre. There was a call for positive information on the wall about resilience and recovery and that any additional information should not be not be excessive and overwhelm the Memorial Wall.
4. The Forum reminded the presenters that the Memorial Wall needs to be accessible and that those with disabilities should be able to experience it the way others do. They suggested consulting with those less (physically) able.
5. Concerns were raised about the possible glare from the white marble. A suggestion was put forward to have something like a line Richter scale which children can also understand could run along the wall.
6. Upward lighting at night and safety lighting on handrails was discussed.

Decisions taken:	
1. The Forum congratulated the presenters on the work undertaken on the project to date.	
Burwood Resource Recovery Park – use of site B for the permanent disposal of earthquake waste Gareth James, General Manager, South Island Waste Management	
Discussion:	
1. Gareth James spoke about the use of site B at the Burwood Landfill for the permanent disposal of earthquake waste (refer Attachment C). 2. A site for the permanent disposal of earthquake waste was set up at the Burwood Landfill, including a processing plant. One of the key aspects of this was a place to store timber. In August 2015 the timber spontaneously combusted and that part of the Landfill was capped off and closed to manage the fire. This meant that part of the landfill was closed before it reached capacity. 3. An application has been sent to Environment Canterbury and Christchurch City Council to extend Site A and develop Site G but there is a desire to use Site B for the permanent disposal of earthquake waste. This is because it provides better environmental outcomes including that it is further away from residents. However using Site B requires a change to Environment Canterbury’s Land and Water Regional Plan because it would be a prohibited activity. One way to make the change would be to ask the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery to exercise his powers under section 27 of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011 to amend Environment Canterbury Resource Management documents. 4. The Forum discussed the use of the Minister’s powers for this purpose.	
Decisions taken:	
1. The Forum recommend that the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery exercise his powers under section 27 of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011 to amend Environment Canterbury’s Regional Plan to allow the use of Site B.	
Meeting closed:	8.15pm
Next meeting:	3 March 2016 (agreed to do one last meeting).

Released under the Official Information Act 1982