

Community Forum

Private Bag 4999

Christchurch 8140

Meeting notes for the meeting of the Community Forum**19 February 2015, 6pm****Cambridge Room, Canterbury Club, Christchurch**

Present:	Community Forum members: Leah Carr, Martin Evans, Ruth Jones, Tom McBrearty, Jocelyn Papprell, Faye Parfitt, Emma Twaddell (first item only), Brian Vieceli, Rachel Vogan, Darren Wright
Apologies:	Community Forum members: Richard Ballantyne, Weng Kei Chen, John Peet, Patricia Siataga, John Wong
Chair:	Darren Wright
In Attendance:	Benesia Smith, Deputy Chief Executive, Strategy and Governance (second item only) Sheridan Smith, Ministerial and Executive Services Director (second item only) s9(2)(a) [REDACTED], Advisor, Ministerial and Executive Services
Agenda	
Community Forum's perspective on their achievements Led by Darren Wright – Community Forum Chair	
Discussion:	
<p>The Community Forum agreed the best way to look at their achievements was to gauge what did and did not work well. The Forum added a third section for the Forum's future because the discussion naturally lent itself to those comments.</p> <p><i>What has worked well</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The diversity of Community Forum membership means members' backgrounds reflect the needs of the recovery process. Initially all resident's groups were represented and there was a strong focus on community matters. Now focus is shifting towards business and the central city as the recovery progresses and that is reflected in the group's membership.• The members respect and accept each other and individual views.	

- Facets of the community are well-connected in the Forum from a decision-making and strategy perspective. For example, the discussions around the Convention Centre helped unconvinced members understand why it was necessary.
- The Forum is a conduit between the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery and the community and has a unified voice. The group gelled quickly and confidential information has not been leaked. The members have increased faith in the decisions made in the course of the recovery.
- The Forum enables CERA and the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery to use section 27 of the CER Act, consult effectively and respond in the rebuild.
- The Forum makes organisations accountable. Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils, Christchurch City Council, Environment Canterbury and CERA are all effectively held to account for their actions.
- The Forum accelerates the recovery process. One of the community's biggest concerns is the delay in progress. The Forum is fast and assists recovery leaders by giving them confidence in their decisions, especially where consultation periods are foregone or shortened.
- The Forum effectively balances recovery acceleration with community engagement.
- The members advocate for the views of the parts of the community they represent.
- The Forum is impartial. They are not lobbyists for recovery actions and ask hard questions to ensure accountability.
- The Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery cites Forum consultation to help allay concerns about recovery decisions.
- Notable examples of the Forum's achievements in recovery planning are:
 - Metro Sports Facility; ensured that the presenters consulted their stakeholders.
 - Canterbury District Health Board and Cricket World Cup; ensured both groups reconsidered their car parking plans.
 - Property developers; ensured proposed density ratios were re-examined.

What could be improved upon

- The Community Forum is not able to pass information on to the community. It is particularly hard for members to demonstrate their faith in the recovery without divulging information from Forum meetings. The Forum feels much of the good from the process is lost on the community.
- The number of presentations from community organisations needs to increase. Recently the agenda has principally featured CERA presentations. This feeds into the Forum's desire to set more of their own agenda.
- The Forum is concerned they are not getting enough information about recovery actions in each presentation.
- There is awareness of, but limited representation on, the Forum for some sectors in the community, including, the homeless.
- Group representation could be managed better.
- The size of the initial group (at more than 30 members) was too large. The current size of the group (at just over 20 members) is conducive to constructive discussion and decision-making.
- Secretariat support is limited. This makes it difficult for the Forum to see the end product of their work and advice. For example, a letter was sent to the Minister about the Arts Precinct but the Forum has had little response on it. They would like feedback fully communicated.

The Forum's future

The Community Forum:

- Will continue to be a conduit between the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery and the community until the CER Act expires. Following the expiry of the Act there is agreement that a monitoring group such as the Forum will still need to exist while the Government stays involved with the Christchurch rebuild.
- Aims to be more directive and proactive.
- Wants to set the agenda more often.
- Will focus on holding the Christchurch City Council and CERA to account on their plans as the transition unfolds, with a desire to continue doing this after the CER Act expires.
- Acknowledges the need for CERA, the Christchurch City Council, Environment Canterbury and the Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to continue to be interdependent. The Forum is eager to get elected representatives, for example, Councillors and Community Board members, involved with the Forum to help strengthen those relationships. It is important this is monitored after the CER Act ends.
- Is concerned about who will be the watchdog and the community conduit to keep the Christchurch City Council and CERA accountable after the CER Act expires.
- Is concerned about the level of engagement and consultation with the community on the Anchor projects.
- Wants to contribute to establishing how the red zone is used in the future.
- Would like increased two-way communication with the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery.

Decisions taken:

The Community Forum:

- Requested updates on education, performing arts, well-being, the transition from the CER Act and a Treasury analysis of the recovery costs so far, including spends from the private sector, government and local government.
- Requested a tracker of queries to and responses from the Minister.
- Decided that members who weren't attending the Forum should be given the option to turn up or be retired.
- Wants to capture and record their legacy and the things they have learned for assisting in future national disasters.

CERA's perspective on the Community Forum's achievements

Led by Benesia Smith, Deputy Chief Executive, Strategy and Governance

Discussion:

Benesia Smith added further value to the Community Forum's prior discussion, with the Forum's input.

What has worked well

- The Community Forum has made presenters accountable. Presenters know that the Forum will put them under pressure and therefore have their "boxes ticked" or rationale for not ticking those boxes to hand when they present to the Forum.
- The Forum's advice goes to the Minister in briefings from the relevant presenters. The briefings confirm that they have sought the Forum's advice and explain what

that advice is.

- The Forum has got the balance between consultation and efficacy correct.
- Groups request to present to the Forum; they want to 'get in front of the Forum' even when not required to seek their advice under the legislation.
- Notable examples of the Forum's achievements in recovery planning are:
 - The sports and recreation programme disappointed the Forum at their first presentation. The Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Minister and Minister of Sport and Recreation refused to sign off on the programme's proposal due to the Forum's feedback. The programme ensured when they came back to the Forum the content of their presentation was improved.

What could be improved upon

- The Community Forum would like to do more in the arts, culture and heritage sector.
- When the Land Use Recovery Plan was designed, consultation with the Community Forum should have been incorporated into the document. This is a reflection of how important the Forum's work has become.
- The need to inform the community and the need to maintain confidence around information could be balanced better in favour of the community.
- Sometimes there isn't enough time for the Community Forum to respond fully to urgent items on the agenda.

The Forum's future

The Community Forum:

- Is concerned about the transition period.
- Suggested distributing a monthly or a newsletter for the community to read. It could include recovery facts and non-confidential information about what is happening at the Forum.
- Would appreciate certainty around the central city, hospitality and business parts of the rebuild.

Decisions taken:	
-------------------------	--

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Community Forum has asked to be copied into correspondence where the Minister mentions the Forum.• The efficacy of the Community Forum needs to be shared as a report. |
|--|---|

General business	
-------------------------	--

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• One of the Forum members raised an urgent item of business: car parking in central Kaiapoi. The member explained that no decision had been made to provide a solution for the lack of car parking. With the opening of the library and retail staff using on-street parking, off-street parking is needed to enable better economic activity in the rebuild. The parking should be on red-zoned, business land and would be temporary.• Benesia Smith made an undertaking to speak to the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery about the issue and report back at the next meeting. |
|--|---|

Meeting closed:	8.10pm
------------------------	--------

Next meeting:	6pm, Cambridge Room, Canterbury Club, 5 March 2015
----------------------	--