

# **Selwyn Residential Capacity and Demand Model – 2023**

**Post DPR and IPI decision update**

**Selwyn District Council**

**Updated 1 March 2024**



## Authors

Rodney Yeoman

[rodney@formative.co.nz](mailto:rodney@formative.co.nz)

021 118 8002

Michael Gordon

[michael@formative.co.nz](mailto:michael@formative.co.nz)

021 053 6287

## Disclaimer

Although every effort has been made to ensure accuracy and reliability of the information provided in this report, Formative Limited and its employees accepts no liability for any actions or inactions taken based on its contents.

© Formative Limited, 2021

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	Background.....	5
1.2	Scope .....	6
1.3	Structure .....	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Selwyn Residential DPR, IPI, and Future Growth.....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Selwyn District Plan Review.....	7
2.2	Selwyn Intensification Planning Instrument.....	8
2.3	Future Growth Areas .....	10
2.4	Partially Operative District Plan.....	16
2.5	Summary – Residential DPR, IPI, and Future Growth.....	25
<b>3</b>	<b>Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model.....</b>	<b>26</b>
3.1	Residential Demand Projections .....	26
3.2	Capacity Assessment Model .....	30
3.3	Feasibility Assessment Model .....	33
3.4	Sufficiency Modelling .....	35
3.5	Summary – Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model.....	36
<b>4</b>	<b>SCGM22 Results .....</b>	<b>38</b>
4.1	Selwyn District .....	38
4.2	Rolleston Situation .....	40
4.3	Lincoln Situation .....	42
4.4	Prebbleton Situation.....	43
4.5	West Melton Situation .....	44
4.6	Urban Environment Situation.....	44
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>46</b>
	<b>Appendix A – Zone Density Assumptions .....</b>	<b>48</b>
	<b>Appendix B – NPS-UD Requirements .....</b>	<b>49</b>
	Implementation.....	49
	Demand Projections .....	51

Supply Capacity .....	53
Sufficiency Assessment .....	55
Ministry for the Environment Guidelines.....	56
Framework .....	57
<b>Appendix C – Other Settlements.....</b>	<b>58</b>

## Figures

Figure 2-1: Proposed Selwyn District Plan Subdivision and Building Rules by Zone .....	7
Figure 2-2: Intensification Planning Instrument MRZ Extents .....	9
Figure 3-1: Population, Family, Household, and Dwelling Projections .....	28
Figure 3-2: Geospatial Property Model.....	32
Figure 4-1: Selwyn District Residential Dwelling Demand Projections, including Competitive Margin. .....	38
Figure 4-2: Selwyn District Residential Dwelling Capacity, Plan Enable, Reasonably Realised and Feasible .....	39
Figure 4-3: Selwyn District Dwelling Demand (+Margin) and Feasible Supply .....	40
Figure 4-4: Rolleston Residential Dwelling Demand (+Margin) and Feasible Supply .....	41
Figure 4-5: Lincoln Residential Dwelling Demand (+Margin) and Feasible Supply .....	42
Figure 4-6: Prebbleton Residential Dwelling Demand (+Margin) and Feasible Supply .....	43
Figure 4-7: West Melton Residential Dwelling Demand (+Margin) and Feasible Supply .....	44
Figure 4-8: Urban Environment Residential Dwelling Demand (+Margin) and Feasible Supply .....	45
Figure C-1: Other Residential Dwelling Demand (+Margin) and Feasible Supply – Short-Medium term .....	59
Figure C-2: Other Residential Dwelling Demand (+Margin) and Feasible Supply – Long term .....	60



# 1 Introduction

Over the last two decades, Selwyn District has experienced rapid growth in population, from around 27,600 in 2000 to 81,300 in 2023. Population in the District has grown by 4.8% per annum, which is much faster than almost every other district in New Zealand, only Queenstown Lakes grew at a faster rate. Furthermore, there has been a rapid increase in residential development activity, in terms of dwelling construction, which has consistently outpaced Statistics New Zealand projections (both medium and high 2018 based projections).

Selwyn District Council (SDC) has been continually monitoring and planning for this growth. The Council has commissioned research on different aspects of residential capacity to ensure that there is sufficient supply to meet demands in the future. Most relevant research is the Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model (SCGM) and associated research on commercial feasibility, which is described in this report.

## 1.1 Background

The National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) includes a set of reporting requirements relating to urban development capacity, both in terms of residential and business activity. A key part of the requirements is that Tier 1 councils must investigate how much capacity is enabled within their planning frameworks and the extent to which this capacity maybe developed by the market. Councils are also required to assess the potential future demands of the community.

The comparison of the developable supply and the demand projections provides an indication of whether there is sufficient urban development capacity to meet the needs of the community. In the case that there is deemed to be insufficient supply then the local council must act to provide more capacity.

SDC is a Tier 1 council, as such it has commissioned the development of the SCGM and research on commercial feasibility. Over the last seven years the research has been updated to match changes in demand and supply, with three significant updates being completed in 2017, 2019, and 2022. In terms of residential component of the models, the early version of the models indicated that there was sufficient supply to meet demand in the short-medium terms and potential shortages in the long term.

Since the first model was completed a number of things have changed, with the most important changes being:

- ❖ population growth and dwelling building activity has greatly exceeded all expectations.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Statistics New Zealand (2022) Subnational Population Estimates.

- ❖ global pandemic and border closures, which impacted immigration.
- ❖ Covid Fasttrack and several private plan changes, has resulted in an increase in capacity.
- ❖ planning process (DPR and IPI) have contributed to considerable increase in capacity.

In summary, over the past seven years there has been unprecedented change in both demand and supply within the Selwyn District. This has meant that SDC has needed to continually update the research on the residential market, and the Council has exceeded the requirements set out within the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.

The model and report have been updated to account for the recently released decisions on the DPR and IPI (August 2023) and the associated appeals (October 2023), which broadly adopted much of the planning framework proposed through the DPR and IPI. However, in a few instances the independent commissioners have decided that the zoning of urban land be changed and that some of the Future Growth Areas be live zoned for urban use. Combined, these additional changes have increased the capacity for residential development in the District.

## 1.2 Scope

The scope of this report is to provide a summary of the SCGM22. Council has requested that Formative develop a written report that provides:

- ❖ A summary of the approach adopted in the residential components of the model;
- ❖ The assumptions used within the modelling, including demand (location, typology, etc) and capacity (plan enabled, feasibility, etc);
- ❖ Specific outputs for urban environments within Selwyn (Rolleston, Lincoln, Prebbleton, and West Melton) for the residential components of the model.
- ❖ The latest version of the report also provides an estimate of the capacity that has been enabled in via the decisions on the DPR and IPI and the associated appeals, as shown in the Partially Operative District Plan.

## 1.3 Structure

This report is structured into four subsequent sections, as follows:

- ❖ Section 2 briefly discusses key aspects of the District Plan Review, Intensification Planning Instrument, Future Growth areas, and the recent additional changes adopted in the Partially Operative District Plan that are reflected within the model.
- ❖ Section 3 outlines the findings of the nature of the Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model 2022, which covers method and assumptions used within the model.
- ❖ Section 4 describes the District and township level residential outcomes for Selwyn.
- ❖ Section 5 provides the findings of this report.

## 2 Selwyn Residential DPR, IPI, and Future Growth

The following section provides a brief summary of the local planning framework, which includes the key aspects of the DPR, IPI, Future Growth, and the recent additional changes adopted in the Partially Operative District Plan which have been included within the SCGM22. The focus of the discussion is on residential zones only.

### 2.1 Selwyn District Plan Review

The Council is proposing to shift to the standard zones within the National Planning Framework, with the residential zones changing to General Residential, Low Density Residential, Settlement, and Large Lot. The change will reduce the number of zones and associated rules that apply within the District. On balance, the proposed changes to zones and the associated rules will allow a small increase in capacity within the existing urban areas in the District.

The General Residential and Low Density Residential zones enable development to a level that is slightly more enabling than the existing density provided for in the operative District Plan. The Settlement zone provides for activity that is equivalent to that observed in most of the smaller townships, which results in little change in capacity. The Large Lot zone provides for semi-rural lifestyle living sites, which in most areas will allow for sites that are similar to that enabled within the operative District Plan. This means that the change in the zone definitions (and associated rules), in of itself, will not result in a significant increase in development capacity. The table below shows the proposed rules that have been adopted within the SCGM22.

**Figure 2-1: Proposed Selwyn District Plan Subdivision and Building Rules by Zone**

Subdivision and Building Rules	Boundary setback (m)	Road setback (m)	Minimum Average Lot (m <sup>2</sup> )	Site Coverage	Height (m)	Minimum Building Sqaure
General residential zone	2	4	650	40%	8	10x15m
General residential zone (in Castle Hill)	2	4	500	40%	8	10x15m
Low density residential zone	2	4	750	40%	8	15x15m
Settlement zone	2	4	1,000	40%	8	15x15m
Large lot residential zone	5	10	5,000	20%	8	15x15m

The proposed extents of the zones provide a much simpler spatial coverage, with most towns shifting from three or more residential zones under the operative District Plan, to less than three. This means that in most cases the proposed rules will be more enabling, however in some instances the rules are less enabling. Also, the Council proposed to increase the area covered by residential zones, which can be expected to enable more capacity. Overall, the change in extents (and proposed rules) of the zones

is expected to increase capacity within the District, the map below shows the zone extents that have been adopted within the SCGM22.

The model also includes several areas that have been granted consent for residential development via Covid19 Recovery (Fast-Track Consenting) Act and the Housing Accords and Special Housing Act, all of which are currently under development. This includes:

- ❖ Faringdon South Special Housing area in Rolleston
- ❖ Acland Special Housing area in Rolleston.
- ❖ Faringdon South West Fast-track area in Rolleston.
- ❖ Faringdon South East Fast-track area in Rolleston<sup>2</sup>.
- ❖ Faringdon Oval Fast Track area in Rolleston.

The model also includes the two Plan Changes 68 (Prebbleton) and 71 (Rolleston), which were approved in August 2022. However, both are now subject to Variation 1, with the zone in these areas changing to Medium Density Residential zone.

The combination of the change in zones to the National Planning Standards, changes in rules in the DPR, change in zone extents and additional Private Plan changes that have been approved, have all contributed to providing additional capacity within the District.

## 2.2 Selwyn Intensification Planning Instrument

The NPS-UD and the subsequent Housing Enabling Act placed a legislative requirement on Tier 1 councils to produce an IPI to give effect to nationally defined intensification requirements. For Selwyn there was mandatory requirement that the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) would be adopted in the residential zones of the Urban Environment.

As required, the Council notified the Variation 1 to the Proposed District Plan (IPI) in August 2022, which proposes that MDRS is adopted in Rolleston, Lincoln, and Prebbleton. Importantly, the IPI and the associated standards have immediate legal effect for sites within relevant residential zones. This means affected landowners have the opportunity to utilise the new development potential that is enabled in the IPI.

The MDRS allows landholders to build up to three levels and three units per site, which is much more intensive than is enabled in the DPR zones. Based on the average size of new dwellings in the district<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Excluding parcel of land which will be used for a school.

<sup>3</sup> Statistics New Zealand (2022) Residential Dwelling Floorspace.




and the rules<sup>4</sup> within the standards, it would be possible development one dwelling for every 125m<sup>2</sup> of land.

The variation applies to land that is within the existing urban areas (Rolleston, Lincoln, and Prebbleton) and proposed development on the edge of these urban areas. This has meant that a number of Private Plan changes are now subject to the IPI and MDRS. This includes PC69 in Lincoln, PC68 and PC72 in Prebbleton, and PC71, PC75, PC76, and PC78 in Rolleston, all of which are included within Variation 1, and are assumed to be developable in the short and medium term.

Below is a map of the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) areas, which shows the areas with immediate legal effect as purple and the areas without immediate legal effect in blue. The legislation framework requires that existing residential zones that are changed to MDRS would have immediate effect, while areas that were not previously zoned for residential which now have effect after the decisions (excluding areas under appeal).

**Figure 2-2: Intensification Planning Instrument MRZ Extents**



---

<sup>4</sup> Maximum building coverage of 50%, minimum front boundary 1.5m, minimum internal boundary 1m, and height of 11m.

The extents of the MRZ and the increase in development potential enabled by the rules in the IPI suggests that there will be a significant increase in additional capacity within the District. However, we note that while plan enable capacity can be expected to increase by a large amount that much of this capacity **will not be** commercially feasible or reasonably realisable, which means that it will not be developed in the medium or long term. This is a common outcome, which is observed in other urban environments in New Zealand, with the MDRS providing capacity that is well above the level of conceivable demand and/or much of the capacity is not currently commercially feasible. These aspects of the capacity is discussed further in Section 3.

## 2.3 Future Growth Areas

The Council is also planning for additional growth areas, which are indicated via Urban Growth Overlays in the DPR. This includes the remaining land within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary (PIB) around Rolleston (184ha) and Lincoln (11ha). The following points outline the Urban Growth Overlays in the DPR which are expected to be zoned for residential activity and does not present the areas that are intended or business activity (potential industrial land around Rolleston, Lincoln, Doyleston, etc).

There are also the following growth areas:


- ❖ **Prebbleton:** a 22ha area to East of Edward Law Boulevard and North of Tosswill road, which will be available in the long term and is currently signalled to be Large Lot Residential zone. In the PDP the land is defined as “Urban Growth Overlay”, which does not define which type of zone will be adopted. If required this land could be zoned for more intensive urban activity in the future.



- ❖ **Lincoln:** a 31ha area adjacent to Ararira Springs Primary School and Matuku lakes, which will be available in the long term and is currently signalled to be Large Lot Residential zone. In the PDP the land is defined as “Urban Growth Overlay”, which does not define which type of zone will be adopted. If required this land could be zoned for more intensive urban activity in the future.



- ❖ **West Melton:** two sites totalling 16ha on Weedons Ross Road, which is surrounded by existing development Wilfield, which will be available in the long term and is currently signalled to be Large Lot Residential zone. In the PDP the land is defined as “Urban Growth Overlay”, which does not define which type of zone will be adopted. If required this land could be zoned for urban activity in the future.



- ❖ **Kirwee:** two areas totalling 66ha, either side of Hoskyns Road, west of Kirwee Cemetery, which will be available in the long term and is currently signalled to be Settlement zone.

- ❖ **Darfield:** five areas totalling 95ha, between West Coast Road and Clintons Road (green area) and also 111ha north of Horndon Street (red area), which will be available in the long term and is currently signalled to be Large Lot Residential zone.



- [illegible]

- 
- A map of Southbridge, Massachusetts, showing a network of streets and several colored overlays. The central area is labeled "Southbridge". Streets shown include Main Street, North Street, South Street, West Street, East Street, and others. Parks include Southbridge Park and others. Colored overlays include a large green area in the north, a purple area in the south, and a pink area in the east. A river is shown in the southeast corner.







- ❖ **Glentunnel and Coalgate:** three areas around the east, south and north of the townships, with total land area of 48ha. The area north of Glentunnel will be available in the long term and is currently planned to be Settlement zone. The area to the west of Coalgate will be available in the long term and are currently signalled to be Low Density Residential zone. While the area to the south of Coalgate is signalled to be Large Lot Residential zone.



- ❖ **Sheffield and Waddington:** three areas around the west and north of the townships, with total land area of 44ha. The areas in the north will be available in the long term and are currently signalled to be Settlement zone, while the large triangular area signalled to be Large Lot Residential zone.



- ❖ **Springfield:** two areas around the west and south of the township, with total land area of 52ha. The areas will be available in the long term and are currently signalled to be mostly Large Lot Residential zone and some Settlement zone.



- ❖ **Castle Hill:** 8ha to the north of the township, which will be available in the long term and signalled to be General Residential zone.
- ❖ **Lake Coleridge:** 9ha to the south of the township which will be available in the long term and signalled to be Settlement zone.


The Council has identified a considerable amount of land for residential growth in the future. In the Greater Christchurch area there is 194ha that is already within the PIB and a further 70ha outside of

the PIB. There is also a considerable amount of land (654ha) provided around the smaller townships in the rest of the wider district.

## 2.4 Partially Operative District Plan

The decisions on the DPR and IPI have increased the amount of capacity that will be available for residential development beyond what was proposed by the SDC. The SCGM22 has been updated to include the following changes for residential development:


- ❖ **Rolleston:** the following zones changes have greatly increased medium term capacity.
  - ❖ **Medium Residential Zone:** 92ha of the Growth Overlay area has been changed from General Rural Zone to MRZ (shown as area outlined red below). This change will significantly increase medium term capacity.
  - ❖ **Town Centre Zone:** fifteen parcels (1.6ha) on State Highway 1 changed from MRZ to Town Centre Zone (shown as area outlined blue below). Most of this land is currently used for business purposes and did not provide much additional residential capacity either in the medium term (4 dwellings) or long term (17 dwellings).



- ❖ **Lincoln:** the following zones changes have increased medium and long term capacity.
  - Medium Residential Zone:** there have been three additions that have increased the amount of land in the MRZ. First, 17ha of the Growth Overlay area to the west

of Liffey Stream, has been changed from General Rural Zone to MRZ (shown as area outlined red below). This change will increase medium term capacity. Second, 13ha of the General Industrial Zone land on Springs Road changed to MRZ (shown as area outlined orange below). This change will increase both medium and long term capacity. Third, 5ha of the Lincoln University land on the corner of Springs Road and Gerald Street changed to MRZ (shown as area outlined green below). This change will increase medium and long term capacity.


- ❖ **Town Centre Zone:** one parcel on the corner of Vernon Drive and Kakahi Street changed from MRZ to Town Centre Zone (shown as area outlined blue below). At 0.6ha this site provided a small amount of residential capacity.



- ❖ **Prebbleton:** the following zones changes have increased medium and long term capacity.
- ❖ **Medium Residential Zone:** there have been three additions that have increased the amount of land in the MRZ. First, 16.5ha of the Growth Overlay area to the east of Tosswill Road, has been changed from General Rural Zone to MRZ (shown as area outlined red below). This change will increase medium term capacity. Second, 12ha of the Large Lot Residential Zone land on Trices Road has been changed to MRZ (shown as area outlined orange below). This change will increase both medium and long term capacity. Third, 529 Springs Road (1.3ha), has been changed



from General Rural Zone to MRZ (shown as area outlined green below). This change will increase medium and long term capacity.






- ❖ **West Melton:** the following zones changes have increased medium and long term capacity.
- ❖ **General Residential Zone:** there have been three additions that have increased the amount of land in the GRZ. First, 10.1ha of the Growth Overlay area to the west of Weedons Ross Road, has been changed from General Rural Zone to GRZ (shown as area outlined red below). This change will increase medium term capacity. Second, 13ha of the General Rural Zone to GRZ on State Highway 73 east (20.7ha) and west (13.1ha) of West Melton have changed to GRZ (shown as area outlined orange below). This change will increase both medium and long term capacity. Third, 30ha of the Large Lot Residential Zone land south of State Highway 73 changed to GRZ. This change will increase medium and long term capacity.
- ❖ **Local Centre Zone:** three parcels on the corner of State Highway 73 and Weedons Ross Road changed from GRZ to Local Centre Zone (shown as area outlined blue below). At 0.4ha this land provided a small amount of residential capacity.




- ❖ **Darfield:** the following zones changes have increased medium and long term capacity.
  - ❖ **General Residential Zone:** all of the residential zoned land is up zoned from Low Density Residential Zone to GRZ, which will increase both medium and long term capacity. Second, 12ha of the Growth Overlay area to the south of State Highway, has been changed from General Rural Zone to GRZ (shown as area outlined red below). This change will increase medium and long term capacity. Third, 55ha of the Growth Overlay area to the east of Kimberley Road, has been changed from General Rural Zone to GRZ (shown as area outlined orange below). This change will increase medium and long term capacity. Fourth, 3.4ha of the General Industrial Zone land changed to GRZ (shown as area outlined green below). This change will increase both medium and long term capacity.




- ❖ **Leeston:** the following zones changes have increased medium and long term capacity.
  - ❖ **General Residential Zone:** there have been three significant changes in Leeston. First, all of the Low Density Residential Zone has been up zoned to GRZ, which will increase both medium and long term capacity. Second, 17.4ha of the Large Lot Residential Zone has been changed to GRZ (shown as area outlined red below). This will increase the amount of development potential in this site for both the medium and long term capacity. Third, 3.3ha of the Growth Overlay area to the north of

High Street, has been changed from General Rural Zone to GRZ (shown as area outlined orange below). This change will increase medium and long term capacity.


- ❖ **Large Lot Residential Zone:** 10.2ha of the Growth Overlay area to the north of High Street, has been changed from General Rural Zone to LLRZ (shown as area outlined green below). This change will increase medium term capacity.



- ❖ **Doyleston:** 8.7ha of the General Industrial Zone land on Drain and Leeston Roads changed to Low Density Residential Zone. This change will increase both medium and long term capacity.




- ❖ **Kirwee:** 50ha of the Large Lot Residential Zone land between State Highway 73 and Hoskyns Road changed to Settlement Zone. This change will increase both medium and long term capacity.



- ❖ **Waddington:** 27ha of the Growth Overlay area to the north of Tramway Road, has been changed from General Rural Zone to Large Lot Residential Zone. This change will increase medium term capacity.




- ❖ **Coalgate:** 0.9ha of the Growth Overlay area on the corner of State Highway 77 and Bridge Street, has been changed from General Rural Zone to Low Density Residential Zone. This change will increase medium and long term capacity.





- ❖ **Castle Hill:** 6ha of the Local Centre Zone has been changed to General Residential Zone. This change will increase medium and long term capacity.



There were 25 appeals to the DPR and IPI decisions, of these most related to topics that do not impact residential development in the urban areas. There were 10 appeals that relate to residential areas of the District, of which four are associated with the smaller towns outside the Urban Environment (Darfield 3 and Dunsandel 1) and six are associated with the larger towns in the Urban Environment (Rolleston 2, Prebbleton 2, and West Melton 2).

For Rolleston the appeals cover land outside of the urban boundary – i.e. land under the air noise boundary in PC71 and land to the west of Dunns Crossing Road in PC73, PC81, and PC81. Therefore, our understanding is that the DPR and IPI zones and decisions discussed above are now operative and unchallenged. This means that the capacity assessment in the following report correctly accounts for the appeals processes. The appeals in Rolleston represent additional capacity which is not shown within this report.

For Prebbleton the appeals cover land outside of the urban boundary – i.e. land in Kingcraft rural density area RD14 and land to the west of Birchs Road in PC79. Therefore, our understanding is that the DPR and IPI zones and decisions discussed above are now operative and unchallenged. This means that the capacity assessment in the following report correctly accounts for the appeals processes. The appeals in Rolleston represent additional capacity which is not shown within this report.

For West Melton the appeals cover land inside of the urban boundary – i.e. land in Urban Growth Overlay on the corner of State Highway 73 and Weedons Ross Road (5.8ha) and the Large Lot Residential zone land to the north of Brampton Drive (16.8ha). The applicant for the Urban Growth Overlay land is merely requesting that the land be live zoned General Residential Zone, which would mean that this capacity would shift from long term to medium term. In the following modelling and report has continued to include this land as Long term capacity because this land will be developable regardless of the outcome of the appeal. The applicant for the Large Lot Residential land is requesting that the land be upzoned to General Residential Zone, which would allow more infill or intensification in the future. In the following modelling and report has continued to include this land as Large Lot Residential zone, which has no capacity for further development in the medium or long term. This means that the capacity assessment in the following report correctly accounts for the appeals processes. The appeals in West Melton represent additional capacity (or bring forward capacity) which is not shown within this report.

There were no residential related appeals for Lincoln. This means that the capacity assessment in the following report correctly accounts for the appeals processes.

## **2.5 Summary – Residential DPR, IPI, and Future Growth**

In summary, the Council has provided a considerable amount of additional development capacity within the District. The combination of the DPR, recent Plan Changes, IPI, Future Growth areas and the decisions on the DPR/IPI processes have combined to result in a substantial change in the planning framework within the District. This is understandable as Selwyn area is facing unprecedented levels of residential growth, even when compared to the wider region or nationally. The following section describes the modelling method used to estimate the capacity that would be enabled by the planning framework described in this section.

### 3 Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model

The Tier 1 councils are required under NPS-UD to undertake research of housing demand and development capacity assessment. These assessments are defined within the NPS-UD and the Ministry for the Environment provides guidelines on the development of the assessments. We have provided modelling for the NPS-UD and/or reviewed modelling for most Tier 1 councils in the country. Broadly, each Tier 1 Council maintains a similar model as we have provided for Selwyn.

In summary, each council either relies directly on Statistics New Zealand population projections for their demand projections, or commissions bespoke demographic projections, all of which use a similar methodology as is adopted in the SCGM22 (i.e. Cohort Component Projection). Also, for Capacity Assessment most councils either develop their own internal GIS based spatial model or commission the development of a model, both of which estimate the amount of development potential spatially (i.e. Geospatial Property Model). The assessment of feasibility is conducted either using case study approach (i.e. subset of the total property base is tested) or property level assessment, however both adopt the same simple approach of assessing the likely sale price and costs of development to establish feasibility.

Broadly, the key difference between the modelling methods adopted by each Tier 1 council relates to the assumptions that are input into the model. Inherently there must be differences in the assumptions as these must vary to match the local planning framework and market conditions. While some assumptions will be the same (e.g. interest rates), there must be differences between each Tier 1 council for other assumptions (e.g. sales prices).

The following discussion outlines the method that is adopted in the SCGM22 and key assumptions.

#### 3.1 Residential Demand Projections

The residential demand projections used within the model use the same approach as Statistics New Zealand Projections, which is called Cohort Component Projection. Simply, this method accounts for the fundamental aspects of population change, which is driven by three factors: births (fertility), deaths (mortality), and migration. Specifically, the population in a given year is equal to the population in the previous year plus births, less deaths, and plus net migration.

This simple account of population is shown in the equation form below.

$$\text{Pop}_y = \text{Pop}_{y-1} + B - D + \text{NM}$$

Where:

$\text{Pop}_y$  is the population at end of year

$\text{Pop}_{y-1}$  population at start of year

B births during year

D deaths during year

NM net migration (arrivals – departures) during year.



For the projections, the population is rolled forward by calculating the effect of recorded deaths and migration within each age-sex group (or cohort). New birth cohorts are based on recorded births.

The model uses the official Statistics New Zealand Estimated Residential Population as the base population (2022). The assumptions for fertility, mortality and net migration are set for three scenarios, (low, medium, and high), using the official Statistics New Zealand assumptions from the 2018-based projections.<sup>5</sup>

This means that the projections are consistent with the Statistics New Zealand projections, however they have been updated to a newer base year which provides a contemporary set of projections that reflect the growth that has eventuated between 2018 and 2022. For Selwyn this means that our projection set is higher than what was shown on Statistics New Zealand official projections.

The population is then converted to families, households and dwellings. The number of households is estimated by converting the population by age cohort group into families and households using living arrangement propensities from the Census<sup>6</sup> and household formation rates<sup>7</sup>. The resulting households are used to establish the number of dwellings, both occupied and unoccupied, again based on utilisation recorded in the Census.<sup>8</sup>

The projection of households and dwellings is shown in the equation form below.

$$\text{Household}_{type} = \frac{\sum_{age} \text{Pop}_{age} \times \text{LATR}_{b_{age}}}{\text{Formation}_{type}}$$

$\text{Pop}_{age}$  population in each age cohort group.

<sup>5</sup> Statistics New Zealand (2022) Updated Population Projections.

<sup>6</sup> Statistics New Zealand (2022) Family and household projections - Living Arrangement Type Rates.

<sup>7</sup> Statistics New Zealand (2022) Family and household projections - Average Family per Household Rates.

<sup>8</sup> Statistics New Zealand (2022) Census 2018 Occupied dwellings and unoccupied dwellings.

$LATR_{b_{age}}$  the propensity of each age cohort group to live in a family type.


$Formation_{type}$  the conversion factors between family members to household types

$$Dwelling = Household_{type} \times Utilisation_{use}$$

$Utilisation_{use}$  the rates of occupied and unoccupied dwellings.

This model uses the official Statistics New Zealand assumptions for living arrangement and formation rates. This means that the projections are consistent with the official projections, however they have been updated to a newer (2022) base year which provides a contemporary set of projections that reflect the growth that has eventuated since 2018. The demand was then allocated to locations in the District using a midpoint between the demand shares in the Statistics New Zealand projections SA2 and recent building consents (2019-2022). The demand by dwelling type has been estimated using the shares provided in the Greater Christchurch housing need assessment.<sup>9</sup>

**Figure 3-1: Population, Family, Household, and Dwelling Projections**



Commonly, councils use a medium projection from Statistics New Zealand as the standard projection that is the best estimate of growth. However, for Selwyn the medium projection has been far too low. In the last assessment of residential capacity, the Greater Christchurch Partnership and SDC elected to use a high projection. This position acknowledged the level of growth that had been observed in Selwyn, but was cognisant to the then expected impacts of the border closure and the impacts of the

<sup>9</sup> Livingston and Associates (2021) Housing Demand and Need in Christchurch.



Covid19 pandemic. As it transpired the border closures and Covid19 pandemic had minimal negative, and maybe even a positive effect on the growth in Selwyn, with residential development continuing at high levels. Importantly the medium projection has been consistently been surpassed in recent years.

We consider that the Council should adopt a conservative stance and apply a High projection as the basis of planning. We acknowledge that no other Tier 1 council has adopted a High Projection as their baseline for planning. However, we consider that Selwyn is in a unique position and there is a likelihood that demand continues at high levels, which Council should plan for so as not to underestimate future growth.

Over the past six years the population of the District has grown by 3,800 per annum<sup>10</sup>, while the number of dwellings consented grown by 1,500 per annum<sup>11</sup>. Most of the population growth has been driven by net internal migration (approximately 80%), with people moving to the District from Christchurch and other areas in New Zealand. The remainder of the growth is related to natural growth and to a lesser extent international migration. If the migration trends and associated development continue at these levels then there is a chance that the demand could exceed the High projection. We consider that there is a low chance that demand will exceed the High projection for such an extended period and that if growth does continue at this level that there will be sufficient opportunity over the coming three decades to adjust the planning framework to ensure that demand is catered for within the District.

We note that there are several signs that point towards a potential decline in residential dwelling construction in the coming years. We consider that the following issues that influence demand should be considered as part of the demand projections:

- ❖ The residential market is cyclical, with peaks and troughs in activity. This means that outcomes within the market will vary from the projections, with overs and unders. Importantly, in the last year residential dwelling growth has reached a record level of activity, nationally (50,000 new dwellings), in Greater Christchurch (8,000 new dwellings) and in Selwyn District (2,000 new dwellings). There are signs that the peak has been reached, with the last few months showing declining numbers and value of consents. It may be that growth rates could decrease from current levels in the coming years.
- ❖ The value of new mortgage lending hit peak levels in 2021, with households borrowing record amounts. The amount of new mortgages has been consistently dropping in 2022. The most recent data shows that the value of new mortgage lending has dropped to

---

<sup>10</sup> Statistics New Zealand (2022) Subnational Population Estimates.

<sup>11</sup> Statistics New Zealand (2022) Building Consents New Dwellings.

less than 60% of the value a year ago (January 2023).<sup>12</sup> This significant decrease in borrowing can be expected to have an impact on the number of houses that can be purchased in the coming months and years.

- ❖ The growth in the economy appears to be slowing, with the potential for negative quarters in the future. The banks and government are predicting slower growth in the coming year. However, the amount of unemployment is low, and we are optimistic that a recession may be avoided, but that growth can be expected to decline which will have implications for household incomes and the housing market.
- ❖ The RBNZ has signalled that it is expecting to maintain the Official Cash Rate. This is likely to result in continued high interest rates from record lows two years ago, both for mortgages and businesses. The result is that housing will become more expensive to afford and suppliers of houses may face increased costs of capital.
- ❖ Recent house sale prices have declined, which will influence outcomes in the market. The feasibility of developments could change rapidly.
- ❖ The post-Gabrielle cyclone rebuild that is required will draw a considerable amount of resources into the areas affected. Similar to the post-earthquake rebuilds in Christchurch and Kaikoura, it may be that construction workers are drawn out of unaffected areas which impacts outcomes in the rest of New Zealand.

Taking these factors into consideration, we consider that it is likely that demand in Selwyn in the short and medium term cannot be expected to continuously reach the high population projection. However, it is a conservative position to adopt these projections.

The Statistics New Zealand December 2022 projections show population reaching almost 150,000 in the District by 2053, which compares to 137,000 in the 2018 Statistics New Zealand High projection. This increase in population projection and change in demographics will result in additional demand for dwellings, which is shown with higher dwelling demand shown in SCGM22 than was shown in the SCGM19.

## 3.2 Capacity Assessment Model

The capacity assessment used in the SCGM22 was developed using our proprietary Geospatial Property Model (“GPM”). The GPM provides estimates of the number of additional dwellings that can be developed on each property within the urban areas of the district. The GPM applies a two-stage process, involving a first stage of GIS processing of properties to establish the nature of each property

---

<sup>12</sup> Reserve Bank of New Zealand (2023) New Mortgages Issued.

and a second stage that estimates the different types of capacity (as required in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development).

For stage 1, a geospatial analysis was conducted to draw together data for all the properties within the urban areas that could be used for residential and business activities. The geospatial analysis had the following steps:

- ❖ **Urban Land:** extract land that is currently zoned urban or expected to be zoned urban. A spatial join between LINZ primary parcels (which is a complete and unique record of all land) and the District Plan zones and any proposed new urban areas. The output from this step is a set of parcels that can be used for urban activities.
- ❖ **Developable Urban Land:** remove land that cannot be used for residential and business activities, which includes roads, waterways, openspace, reserves, walkways, rail lines, cemeteries, places of worship, and special purpose activities (universities, schools, military, ports, airports, hospitals, etc). The output from this step is a set of parcels that are developable for residential and business activities.
- ❖ **Developable Urban Properties:** establish the nature of the activity that is currently located on each developable urban property. Spatially join data to each property, which includes building footprints, rateable property, building consents, and land use surveys. This step also included both desktop and field trip validation of the data sets, with a focus on new activity in known development areas – both business and residential. The output from this step is a set of properties that are developable for residential and business activities, along with existing activities.

The Developable Urban Properties list is a critical element of the assessment as it forms the baseline from which the Capacity Assessment is conducted. Much of the processing conducted in the Capacity Assessment is focused on ensuring that information recorded for each of the Developable Urban Properties is accurate and contemporary.

**Figure 3-2: Geospatial Property Model**



For stage 2, the assessment calculates the different types of capacity as required under the NPS-UD which includes Plan Enabled, Infrastructure Ready, and Reasonably Expected to be Realised, while feasibility was calculated using an additional module. The following steps were used to estimate each of the capacity types:

- ❖ **Plan Enabled:** applies the rules within the local planning framework (DPR and IPI) to establish the maximum theoretical capacity that can be developed on each urban site, which includes height limits, setbacks, minimum site size, etc.
- ❖ **Infrastructure Ready:** draws from Council's infrastructure information and planning to establish the capacity that will be able to be serviced.
- ❖ **Reasonably Realised:** as discussed in the previous section the amount of plan enabled capacity is significantly larger than will ever be realised within the foreseeable future. It is likely that a large share of the capacity will not be developable, either because of demand side constraints<sup>13</sup> or supply side constraints<sup>14</sup>. For this assessment the model draws from recent developments, both consents and 224c subdivision data to establish the development patterns that are being realised by the market, now and in the future. Broadly, the model assumes that development intensity will not increase markedly in the future. To be clear, we consider that most of the development potential enabled by

---

<sup>13</sup> Given the scale of demand it is likely that only a small share of development will conceivably be needed. Also, households will demand a range of dwelling types, which means that the maximum potential would not be demanded.

<sup>14</sup> There are a range of reasons why development potential may not be achieved by the market. Common examples are that developers tend to subdivide to provide a range of options to maximise the potential market that they can serve. Another example is that landholders choose to keep land for their own reasons (aging in place, cultural reasons, etc) which means that development is not achievable on some land. The model includes two constraints that remove residential capacity on properties with high improvement value (over \$500,000 or improvement value to capital value ratio over 0.5). This constraint remove 2.3% of capacity in the medium term. The setting of these constraints are conservative, as it likely that some of this capacity could be developable in the coming medium and long term.



the IPI within the MRZ areas will not be reasonable realisable, either in the medium or long term.

The output of the Capacity Assessment is a property-level estimate of the potential development that could be accommodated in the urban parts of the District. It is beyond the scope of the capacity assessment to establish the intentions of landholders, who may or may not develop a site.

We note that in the previous assessments the capacity was measured according to the rules set out in the Operative District Plan (ODP). In the case of Rolleston, Lincoln and Prebbleton developers generally achieved a density of 12 dwellings per hectare, which is equivalent to an average site size of 600m<sup>2</sup> to 700m<sup>2</sup>. Historically there has been a trend towards increasing density, which has continued. Most recently the development density has increased to 15 dwellings per hectare, which is which is equivalent to an average dwelling size of 500m<sup>2</sup> to 550m<sup>2</sup> per site. The MDZ which applies to much of the existing and future urban areas in the District provides for density which is much higher than what is currently achieved in Selwyn. We would expect that the introduction of the MDZ would at least allow a continuation of this process and may potentially encourage development density trend to increase even faster, with the most recent fast-track development expected to reach 18 dwellings per hectare.

In summary, the SCGM22 applies the most recent density data, which has resulted in the greenfield areas providing more capacity. For the longer term developments a higher density has been applied, which accounts for change in density over the coming three decades. This has meant that the growth overlay areas are estimated to provide more capacity than under the previous model and the previous zones provisions.

### 3.3 Feasibility Assessment Model

The structure of the Feasibility Assessment model is similar to most feasibility tools – i.e. it tests whether a commercial developer could purchase the land, invest money to undertake subdivision or dwelling construction and then on-sell at a price that will return sufficient profit. The nature of this process is the same as for most feasibility models – i.e. simply a financial or accounting assessment of costs and revenues to establish whether a return is sufficient to warrant investment.

The module allows the testing of thirty-six dwelling types, which is defined to reflect both the existing types of dwellings built in the District as well as the types that may be built in the future. The model includes:

- ❖ four typologies of dwelling (detached, attached, townhouses and apartments),

- ❖ three dwelling sizes (large, medium and small)<sup>15</sup> and
- ❖ three build qualities (premium, average and budget).

The assessment tests the feasibility of land development and build development within the greenfield areas and urban areas differently. Specifically, the greenfield development is tested using a 'group home builder' business model, where the developer reduces the risks and capital requirements by selling home-and-land or design-and-build packages.<sup>16</sup>

For brownfield development the model applies speculative builder model, where the developer buys the existing dwelling, either subdivides for infill or demolition for intensification. In both options the speculative build must invest more capital and bears more risk, with uncertainty around sale period and price.

The key inputs into the modelling have been drawn from research conducted for the GCP on subdivision costs<sup>17</sup> and build costs<sup>18</sup>. The sales prices have been estimated using sales data from Quotable Value<sup>19</sup>. In the short and medium term the model is run with no inflation adjustments, which is required under the NPS-UD. In the long term the model has been using business-as-usual scenario, which assumes that land, construction and sales prices continue into the future.<sup>20</sup> Other key assumptions include the cost of capital (10%)<sup>21</sup>, profit margin<sup>22</sup>. For brownfield sites the value of the existing dwelling and land are estimated for each site using capital value and the change in values

---

<sup>15</sup> Defined based on the floorspace sizes of new builds in the District. Sourced from Quotable Value (2022) Residential Sales Records – 2018-2022.

<sup>16</sup> In this business model the customer agrees to a price and pays instalments throughout the build, which reduces the risk to the developer and capital requirement.

<sup>17</sup> Harrison Grierson (2021) NPS-UD Input Review – Update: Land Feasibility calculator Inputs.

<sup>18</sup> WTP (2021) NPS-UD Input Review – Update: Build Feasibility calculator Inputs.

<sup>19</sup> Quotable Value (2022) Residential Sales Records – 2018-2022.

<sup>20</sup> Specifically, in real terms the costs associated with development of a greenfield subdivision increases by 0.7% per annum and the sale price per site is assumed to increase by 1.7% per annum. In real terms the costs associated with dwelling construction increase by 0.7% per annum and sale price per dwelling is assumed to increase by 4.1% per annum.

<sup>21</sup> Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (2017) NPS-UDC Development Feasibility Tool 3.

<sup>22</sup> Statistics New Zealand (2021) Business Performance Benchmark 2017-2020. For land developers was set at 23%, which is the average of land development company profits. The development of detached, attached, and townhouses was set at 7%, which is the average of Residential Building company returns. Finally, developers of apartments are assumed to require 9%, which is the average of Other Residential Building company returns. In the 2021 HBA the GCP undertook discussions with developers who noted that there are considerable amounts of contingencies set aside for risk at each stage of the project, and these costs may or may not arise during the project. Therefore, the return that the developer is expected to receive will be higher than simply profit margin alone, as only some of these contingencies will be spent. The feasibility model is a detailed account of all costs, even uncertain costs, which means that total expected return (combining profit margin and contingencies not required) from land and building development will be higher profit margin alone. The MFE guidelines on feasibility assessment suggest that "this rate of return may vary according to the perceived risks of the project" and mentions 20% return with no reference, or discussion of how this rate was derived or what type of project it relates. This rate is lower than our land developer rate (which are comparatively more risky) and higher than builder developer rate (which are comparatively less risky) within the model.

since the last valuation data. This assessment was completed in June 2022, and all assumed costs and revenues were converted to this point using available inflation information.

In summary the results of the assessment show that greenfield development opportunities are all feasible currently, although the profit achieved from detached and attached are higher than townhouses, which means that for the medium term that there are unlikely to be many townhouses or apartments, developed within the greenfield areas. In the longer term the profitability of these other denser typologies increases. However for the most part the modelling indicates that the MRZ is unlikely to result in a considerable amount of intensive development.

For the existing urban areas (brownfields), infill development is currently viable, although there is not much potential for this type of development. Intensification within the existing urban area is for the most part not financially feasible, which is driven by the high value of the existing dwelling stock (being relatively new), the high cost of constructing multi-level dwellings and the low sales price that will be achieved. From a pure commercial viability perspective, most of the existing land that is proposed for intensification development is unlikely to be developable over the coming decade. In summary, the existing urban areas are unlikely to provide much additional capacity for residential intensification (as compared to maximum that is plan enabled). However, towards the end of the long term intensification may become viable.

Also at this time, greenfield developments in the district can be developed to provide dwellings at a price that is comparatively affordable and is commercially feasible. This situation will not always be the case, in the future when prices of greenfield increase then intensification will start to become a viable alternative.

Therefore, we conclude that changes the IPI that will enable intensification in the existing and future urban areas in the district are unlikely to greatly modify the supply situation in the district over the coming decade. We note that this outcome will be reviewed every three years (as required in the NPS-UD), so if this situation changes the Council will have another opportunity to act.

### **3.4 Sufficiency Modelling**

The SCGM22 compares the expected demand for dwellings with the supply<sup>23</sup> within the urban parts of the district, to establish whether there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the expected growth.

The SCGM22 applies a two-stage process, involving a first stage that converts demand to types and locations within the urban areas and a second stage that assesses whether there is sufficient supply to accommodate the demand (as required in the NPS-UD).

---

<sup>23</sup> The capacity that is plan-enabled, infrastructure-ready, and feasible and reasonably expected to be realised.

The first stage is to assess and convert the demand into key typologies and locations within the urban areas. In summary, this stage takes the demand from the Residential Demand Projections and converts it into typologies and locations, which can then be compared to the Capacity Assessment. The Dwelling demand is converted into types of dwellings, standalone and attached using a set of assumptions – which have been set as baseline preferences observed in the Census and can be varied to allow the user to test different scenarios. These dwellings are then allocated spatially to urban areas in the District based on the observed patterns in building consents. The output of this step is detailed demand by typology and location, for both dwellings and business land.

The second stage is to assess the sufficiency of the supply to meet demands, which compares the demand from the first stage with the supply from the Feasibility Assessment. The SCGM22 applies the Competitiveness Margin, 20% for short-medium term and 15% for long terms as defined in the NPS-UD, which provides a measure of the minimum amount of dwellings that is required to be ‘Sufficient’ – i.e. expected demand plus the Competitiveness Margin. The key output of this assessment is to show when and where there may be a need for more supply of developable land within the urban areas.

### 3.5 Summary – Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model

Broadly, the SCGM22 uses the same approach to assess demand and capacity as the other Tier 1 councils. The difference between the modelling methods adopted by each Tier 1 council relates to the assumptions that are input into the model. Inherently there must be differences in the assumptions as these must vary to match the local planning framework and market conditions. While some assumptions will be the same (e.g. interest rates), there must be differences between each Tier 1 council for other assumptions (e.g. sales prices).

In summary the SCGM22 has the following modelling:

- ❖ **Residential Demand Projections:** which is standard cohort component model. However, Selwyn unique situation means that we consider that it should adopt a conservative stance and use High growth projections. We acknowledge that it is not common for a Tier 1 council to adopt a High Projection as their baseline for planning, however we consider that the high growth has been persistent in Selwyn and there is a risk that demand continues at high levels, which Council should plan for.
- ❖ **Capacity Assessment Model:** which is a GIS processing of properties to establish the nature of each property and to estimate the different types of capacity that are enabled by Council. The method adopted in the SCGM22 is similar to the methods applied by other Tier 1 Councils.

- ❖ **Feasibility Assessment Model:** which is a financial or accounting assessment of costs and revenues to establish whether a return is sufficient to warrant investment. This method is a standard method, which is adopted by all Tier 1 councils.
- ❖ **Sufficiency Modelling:** converts demand to location and type of dwelling based on existing preferences, which is then compared to the amount of capacity available in each location. This method is applied in the absence of consumer preferences data, and is the method suggested in the MFE guidelines.



## 4 SCGM22 Results

The following section provides a brief summary of the results from the SCGM22. The results are from a model run which has the following key assumptions:

- ❖ Residential Demand set at Formative High Projection and recent development shares scenario.
- ❖ Competitive Margin of 20% for short-medium term and 15% for long term, all figures presented include appropriate margin.
- ❖ Urban zone in the Partially Operative District Plan are available for development in the medium term.
- ❖ Urban zone in the Partially Operative District Plan and Growth Areas, are available for development in the long term.
- ❖ Commercial feasibility is calculated using current prices for medium term and Business-as-usual for the long term.

### 4.1 Selwyn District

The SCGM22 projects that over the coming decade there is demand for over 12,550 new dwellings in the residential areas of the District and most will be standalone. The High projection is equivalent to an average demand per annum of 1,260 new dwellings over the next 10 years. In the long term there will be demand for over 32,760 new dwellings, and again most are expected to be standalone. The High projection is equivalent to an average demand per annum of 1,090 new dwellings over the next 30 years.

**Figure 4-1: Selwyn District Residential Dwelling Demand Projections, including Competitive Margin.**

	2023-2033 Short-Medium	2023-2053 Long
Selwyn District Dwelling Demand		
Standalone	11,995	31,322
Attached	552	1,441
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,547</b>	<b>32,763</b>
Average demand per annum	1,255	1,092


Compared to the 2021 demand projections used in the GCP Housing Assessment, the SCGM22 High projection has a new dwelling demand which is 25% higher in the coming decade and 10% higher over the long term.

The capacity assessment shows that there is a large increase in plan enabled capacity from previous version of the SCGM, which as discussed above mostly relates to the changes required in the IPI and

to a lesser extent the DPR and new Plan Change areas that have been adopted. In total there is capacity for 147,900 new dwellings in Selwyn, which is almost 5 times the number of dwellings currently in Selwyn. Alternatively, this is almost 12 times more than projected dwellings under the high growth scenario in the medium term, and 4.5 times the long term demand.

Clearly, **most** of this supply will not be reasonably developable or feasible, either in the medium or long term. In total the assessment shows that less than 13% of total plan enabled capacity is feasible in the medium term and 20% in the long term. Also, most of the feasible capacity is within the greenfield areas, with some infill or redevelopment being either reasonably realisable or feasible. This report provides more detail on the four towns in the Urban Environment (Rolleston, Lincoln, Prebbleton, and West Melton) and summary results for the other settlements in Appendix C.

**Figure 4-2: Selwyn District Residential Dwelling Capacity, Plan Enable, Reasonably Realised and Feasible**



However, we acknowledge that there are already proposals for development of residential within the MRZ parts of the District that have density of development that is close to the plan enabled rules. For example, AgResearch has requested (in a submission to Variation 1) to rezone a 4.7ha site in Lincoln, which it expects will yield 220 dwellings, which would be equivalent to an average site size of less than 170m<sup>2</sup> or a density of 46 dwellings per hectare.<sup>24</sup> Another example is the recent Faringdon Oval Fast-

<sup>24</sup> Variation 1 to the Proposed Selwyn District Plan – AgResearch Ltd Submission V1-0055.

track area in Rolleston which is proposing a density of over 15 dwellings per annum or average site size of less than 400m<sup>2</sup>. While not as dense as what is enabled within MRZ there is a clear trend towards smaller sites. There have also been a small number of comprehensive developments which shows that infill and intensification (comprehensive) has been occurring in the District. While not to the level enabled within the MRZ, it can be expected that some of capacity which is deemed to be infeasible in the existing urban areas is likely to be developable.

These examples suggest that the feasibility assessment within the SCGM22 may be overly conservative, and that a larger share of plan enabled capacity maybe feasible in the medium and long terms as dwelling typology preferences change and purchasers become more accepting of higher density living (see Appendix A).

In total terms the amount of feasible capacity has increased (from the previous version of the SCGM) in the medium term and long term, which is mostly driven by the additional land that is being brought forward for development and the trend towards smaller sites resulting in greenfield land yielding more supply.

In conclusion, the large changes made to the local planning framework can be expected to provide sufficient supply to meet demands in the coming decade. In the long term there may be some shortages in parts of the District and that these may eventuate from 2050 onwards.

**Figure 4-3: Selwyn District Dwelling Demand (+Margin) and Feasible Supply**

Selwyn District Dwelling Demand	Demand +Margin	Feasible Supply	Sufficiency
Short-Medium	12,547	19,522	6,975
Long	32,763	29,401	- 3,362

However, as has been seen as a result of the earthquakes, Covid19, and recent weather events, the demand situation can change rapidly with people changing preferences to live in new locations than was previously anticipated. This inherent uncertainty is important issue for Selwyn. While the Council is required by the NPS-UD to update the assessment of demand and supply every three years we support the proactive stance of updating the assessment more regularly. This will ensure that the Council can pivot and change to match demand needs as they arise.

## 4.2 Rolleston Situation

Rolleston is the largest town within the District and is part of the wider Christchurch Urban Environment, as such all residential zones within the existing and greenfield areas are proposed to be changed to MRZ via the IPI. This is an immense change in the planning framework, with total plan enabled capacity now estimated to be around 68,640 new dwellings, or around 7 times the existing number of dwellings in the town. The government has also approved two developments via Covid19

fast track and there have been several Private Plan Changes approved, all of which have brought forward a significant supply of new dwellings in the short term.

In total the demand projections suggest that there is a need for around 6,980 new dwellings in the coming decade and 18,230 in the long term.<sup>25</sup> The projection suggests that just over half (55%) of growth in residential dwellings in the District will be located in Rolleston and that the town would grow by 181% in the coming three decades, which is equivalent to 3.5% per annum.

The assessment of feasibility shows that there is a capacity for 7,920 new dwellings in the medium term and 13,230 in the long term. The assessment shows that only a small share of capacity will be feasible in the medium term (12%) and long term (19%), which relates to various factors which mean that much of the intensification enabled by MRZ is not viable for most of the area in either the medium or long term.<sup>26</sup> Most of the capacity is located in new urban areas, with almost 85% of medium term capacity in the greenfield areas and a density of under 15 dwellings per hectare.

The model suggests that some infill redevelopment is financially feasible, where properties are subdivided and additional dwelling(s) are added. In the medium term there is potential for 1,172 new dwellings in the existing area, of which 92% are on sites with more than 400m<sup>2</sup> and remainder being slightly denser at more than 300m<sup>2</sup>. As discussed above these densities are much lower than is enabled in the MRZ<sup>27</sup>, and more akin to either standalone houses or low density attached units. In the long term there is potential for 5,281 new dwellings in the existing area, of which 68% are on sites with more than 400m<sup>2</sup> and remainder being slightly denser at more than 300-400m<sup>2</sup>. Again, these densities are much lower than is enabled in the MRZ.

The comparison of demand and supply results suggest that there is sufficient supply in Rolleston in the medium term. We note that beyond the medium term there could be also be a shortfall, which may eventuate around 2045. While this point is nearly three decades away, it is a situation that should be monitored and if growth exceeds the High projection then the Council may need to provide more capacity, either by zoning more greenfield land or via encouraging more intensification.

**Figure 4-4: Rolleston Residential Dwelling Demand (+Margin) and Feasible Supply**

	2023-2033 Short-Medium	2023-2053 Long
Rolleston Dwelling Situation		
Demand +Margin	6,980	18,230
Feasible Supply	7,920	13,230
<b>Sufficiency</b>	<b>940</b>	<b>- 5,000</b>

<sup>25</sup> Demand plus required competitiveness margin.

<sup>26</sup> Importantly, the high density dwelling types that are enabled within the MRZ (i.e. intensification) are not shown to be commercially viable in the District for the medium or long term.

<sup>27</sup> i.e. three dwellings of three levels per site.

### 4.3 Lincoln Situation

Lincoln is the second largest town within the District and is also part of the wider Christchurch Urban Environment, as such all residential zones within the existing and greenfield areas are proposed to be changed to MRZ via the IPI. This is an immense change in the planning framework, with total plan enabled capacity now estimated to be around 32,970 new dwellings, or almost 9 times the existing number of dwellings in the town.

In total the demand projections suggest that there is a need for around 2,510 new dwellings in Lincoln in the coming decade and 6,550 in the long term. The projection suggests that just over 20% of growth in residential dwellings will be located in Lincoln and that the town would grow by 174% in the coming three decades, which is equivalent to 3.4% per annum.

The assessment of feasibility shows that there is a capacity for 3,970 new dwellings in the medium term and 5,290 in the long term. The assessment shows that only a small share of capacity will be feasible in the medium term (12%) and long term (16%), which relates to various factors which mean that much of the intensification enabled by MRZ is not viable for most of the area in either the medium or long term. Most of the capacity is located in new urban areas, with 72% of medium term capacity in the greenfield areas and a density of under 12 dwellings per hectare.

The model suggests that some infill redevelopment is financially feasible, where properties are subdivided and additional dwelling(s) are added. In the medium term there is potential for 1,131 new dwellings in the existing area, of which 96% are on sites with more than 400m<sup>2</sup> and remainder being slightly denser at more than 300m<sup>2</sup>. These densities are much lower than is enabled in the MRZ, and more akin to either standalone houses or low density attached units. In the long term there is potential for 2,107 new dwellings in the existing area, of which 69% are on sites with more than 400m<sup>2</sup> and remainder being slightly denser at more than 300-400m<sup>2</sup>. These densities are much lower than is enabled in the MRZ.

The comparison of demand and supply results suggest that there is sufficient supply in Lincoln for most of the coming decade. However, after the medium term there may be a shortfall which could occur after 2047. While this point is nearly three decades away, it is a situation that should be monitored and if growth continues at or exceeds the High projection then the Council would need to provide more capacity.

**Figure 4-5: Lincoln Residential Dwelling Demand (+Margin) and Feasible Supply**

Lincoln Dwelling Situation	2023-2033 Short-Medium	2023-2053 Long
Demand +Margin	2,510	6,550
Feasible Supply	3,950	5,270
<b>Sufficiency</b>	<b>1,440</b>	<b>- 1,280</b>



## 4.4 Prebbleton Situation

Prebbleton is the third largest town within the District and is part of the wider Christchurch Urban Environment, as such all relevant residential zones within the existing and greenfield areas are proposed to be changed to MRZ via the IPI. This is a large change in the planning framework, with total plan enabled capacity now estimated to be around 15,940 new dwellings, or just under 9 times the existing number of dwellings in the town.

In total the demand projections suggest that there is a need for around 420 new dwellings in the coming decade and 1,100 in the long term. This would mean that Prebbleton would grow by 62% in the coming three decades, which is equivalent to 1.6% per annum.

The assessment of feasibility shows that there is a capacity for 1,970 new dwellings in the medium term and 2,440 in the long term. The assessment shows that only a small share of capacity will be feasible in the medium term (12%) and long term (15%), which relates to various factors which mean that much of the intensification enabled by MRZ is not viable for most of the area in either the medium or long term. Most of the capacity is located in new urban areas, with 63% of medium term capacity in the greenfield areas and a density of under 12 dwellings per hectare.

The model suggests that some infill redevelopment is financially feasible, where properties are subdivided and additional dwelling(s) are added. In the medium term there is potential for 719 new dwellings in the existing area, of which 98% are on sites with more than 400m<sup>2</sup> and remainder being slightly denser at more than 300m<sup>2</sup>. These densities are much lower than is enabled in the MRZ, and more akin to either standalone houses or low density attached units. In the long term there is potential for 1,186 new dwellings in the existing area, of which 78% are on sites with more than 400m<sup>2</sup> and remainder being slightly denser at more than 300-400m<sup>2</sup>. These densities are much lower than is enabled in the MRZ.

The comparison of demand and supply results suggest that there is sufficient supply in Prebbleton. However, it is a situation that should be monitored and if growth exceeds the High projection then the Council may need to provide more capacity.

**Figure 4-6: Prebbleton Residential Dwelling Demand (+Margin) and Feasible Supply**

Prebbleton Dwelling Situation	2023-2033 Short-Medium	2023-2053 Long
Demand +Margin	420	1,100
Feasible Supply	1,970	2,440
<b>Sufficiency</b>	<b>1,550</b>	<b>1,340</b>

## 4.5 West Melton Situation

West Melton is relatively small compared to the other towns in the wider Christchurch Urban Environment. The settlement will mostly be zoned General Residential with some Large Lot Residential, which will provide almost enough plan enabled capacity to allow the settlement to double in size.

In total the demand projections suggest that there is a need for around 460 new dwellings in the coming decade and 1200 in the long term. This would mean that West Melton would grow by 135% in the coming three decades, which is equivalent to 2.9% per annum. The assessment of feasibility shows that there is a capacity for 910 new dwellings in the medium term and 940 in the long term.

The comparison of demand and supply results suggest that there is sufficient supply in West Melton for the medium term. However, we note that in the long term the SCGM22 suggests that there could be a shortage of supply in West Melton, and that this could eventuate around 2047. While the SCGM22 suggests that the shortage is unexpected to occur for decades, this situation should be monitored.

**Figure 4-7: West Melton Residential Dwelling Demand (+Margin) and Feasible Supply**

West Melton Dwelling Situation	2023-2033 Short-Medium	2023-2053 Long
Demand +Margin	460	1,200
Feasible Supply	910	940
<b>Sufficiency</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>- 260</b>

## 4.6 Urban Environment Situation

Finally, we present results for the Urban Environment which is the urban zoned land in Rolleston, Lincoln, Prebbleton, and West Melton. This area is defined as set out in the NPS-UD and is the same geography used within the Greater Christchurch housing capacity assessments.

There is demand for 10,370 dwellings in the medium term and 27,090 in the long term. The SCGM22 estimates a capacity of 14,740 dwellings in the medium term and 21,880 in the long term. This means that there is sufficient capacity within the Urban Environment to meet expected demand for the medium.

In long term there is a small technical shortfall, and Council should monitor the situation. This technical short fall is smaller than the competitiveness margin, i.e. excluding competitiveness margin the demand for dwellings in Urban Environment would be 23,180 in the long term. Comparing this demand to the supply shows there will be sufficient supply to meet demands until 2050. Specifically, there would still be enough supply to meet expected demand (capacity of 21,880 – demand 23,180 = -1,300), however the technically not enough to meet the requirements of the NPS-UD.

**Figure 4-8: Urban Environment Residential Dwelling Demand (+Margin) and Feasible Supply**

Urban Environment Dwelling Situation	2023-2033 Short-Medium	2023-2053 Long
Demand +Margin	10,370	27,090
Feasible Supply	14,740	21,880
<b>Sufficiency</b>	<b>4,370</b>	<b>- 5,210</b>

Also as noted above that development intensity has been increasing in the Urban Environment since the MRZ was adopted. Therefore, it is likely that there will be more than sufficient capacity in the long term as SCGM22 is likely to underestimate the amount of capacity that is developable.

## 5 Conclusion

Selwyn District has experienced rapid and unexpected growth which has exceeded the levels predicted by Statistics New Zealand or the Greater Christchurch Partnership. While there have been several unprecedented natural events (earthquake and Covid19) that have affected dwelling demand in ways that was not anticipated, we consider that it would be prudent for Selwyn District Council to continue using the High population projection. While we acknowledge that this is not a common position for a Tier 1 council, that all signs point towards continued high growth in the District.

The changes in the local planning framework that have been proposed (DPR and IPI) and approved (Fasttrack, Private Plan Changes, and mostly adopted via the Partially Operative District Plan), have combined generated an immense increase in the development potential in the District. While only a small share of the development potential will be required in the coming decades to meet the demand needs, these changes are significant.

The changes in demand and local planning framework have meant that the 2019 and the 2022 modelling is now out of date. While not required under the NPS-UD, Selwyn District Council commissioned an additional update of the demand and capacity modelling after the release of the DPR and IPI decisions. The SCGM22 has been updated using methods which follow the MFE guidelines and is broadly consistent with the other Tier 1 assessment models. The main difference being the input assumptions, which are set according to the local situation in the residential market.

The results from the SCGM22 update, shows that at the District and Urban Environment level there is sufficient supply to accommodate demand in the medium (2023-33). After the medium term there may be shortages in some locations in the District (2033-53), and these may not occur until the end of the long term (2045 and beyond). Also, there are some local instances where there maybe be shortages in the long term, Rolleston, Lincoln and West Melton. The Council should monitor these situations to ensure that a shortage does not arise.

However, only a small share of the plan enabled development capacity will be required to meet expected demand – 8% in the medium term and 22% in the long term. The shortfall is predicted because most of the intensification development opportunities created in the three main towns are estimated to not be commercially feasible, with 20% of plan enabled capacity being feasible in the long term.

However, we acknowledge that there are already proposals for development of residential land within the three main towns that have a density of development that is closer to the plan enabled rules or much higher than the density assumptions in the SCGM22. These examples suggest that the capacity

and feasibility assessment within the SCGM22 may be conservative, and that a larger share of plan enabled capacity maybe feasible in the medium and long terms.

Also, there are some local instances where there maybe be technical shortages in the long term. The Council should monitor these situations to ensure that a shortage does not arise. We consider that given the scale of development potential around the District that these small shortages could be accommodated either within other towns or by development of a small amount of intensification. Both of which could occur and these technical shortages may not occur.

Finally, we note that the NPS-UD sets out minimum requirements for sufficiency within urban environment. We consider that these minimums are not a target to be reached and are rather a floor which should be exceeded. Therefore, it is reasonable for the Council to provide more capacity for urban growth than is required to meet expected demand, both within the urban environment and other townships in the District, while also balancing and taking into account other social, economic and cultural well beings, environmental outcomes<sup>28</sup> and the wider goal of contributing to well-functioning urban environments.

---

<sup>28</sup> For example the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land.



## Appendix A – Zone Density Assumptions

Township	Zone	Type	Plan Enabled (lot m <sup>2</sup> )	Reasonably Expected to be Realised (lot m <sup>2</sup> )
Rolleston	Medium density residential zone	Existing	125	300
Rolleston	Medium density residential zone	Recent	125	500
Rolleston	Large lot residential zone	Existing	5000	6000
Lincoln	Medium density residential zone	Existing	125	300
Lincoln	Medium density residential zone	Recent	125	650
Lincoln	Large lot residential zone	Existing	5000	6000
Prebbleton	Medium density residential zone	Existing	125	300
Prebbleton	Medium density residential zone	Recent	125	700
Prebbleton	Large lot residential zone	Existing	5000	6000
Prebbleton	Large lot residential zone	Recent	5000	6000
West Melton	General residential zone	Existing	650	700
West Melton	Large lot residential zone	Existing	5000	6000
Darfield	General residential zone	Existing	650	700
Darfield	Large lot residential zone	Existing	5000	6000
Dunsandel	Low density residential zone	Existing	750	800
Dunsandel	Large lot residential zone	Existing	5000	6000
Doyleston	Low density residential zone	Existing	750	800
Kirwee	Settlement zone	Existing	1000	1200
Kirwee	Large lot residential zone	Existing	5000	6000
Coalgate	Low density residential zone	Existing	750	800
Coalgate	Large lot residential zone	Existing	5000	6000
Castle Hill	General residential zone	Existing	500	600
Glentunnel	Settlement zone	Existing	1000	1200
Hororata	Settlement zone	Existing	1000	1200
Hororata	Low density residential zone	Existing	750	1500
Authurs Pass	Settlement zone	Existing	1000	1200
Lake Coleridge	Settlement zone	Existing	1000	1200
Leeston	General residential zone	Existing	650	700
Leeston	Large lot residential zone	Existing	5000	6000
Rakaia Huts	Settlement zone	Existing	1000	1200
Sheffield	Settlement zone	Existing	1000	1200
Southbridge	Low density residential zone	Existing	750	800
Southbridge	Large lot residential zone	Existing	5000	6000
Springfield	Settlement zone	Existing	1000	1200
Springfield	Large lot residential zone	Existing	5000	6000
Springston	Settlement zone	Existing	1000	1200
Tai Tapu	Settlement zone	Existing	1000	1200
Tai Tapu	Large lot residential zone	Existing	5000	6000
Waddington	Settlement zone	Existing	1000	1200
Waddington	Large lot residential zone	Existing	5000	6000
Whitecliffs	Settlement zone	Existing	1000	1200
Hororata	Low density residential zone	Recent	750	800
Kirwee	Settlement zone	Recent	1000	1200
Lincoln	Large lot residential zone	Recent	5000	6000
Prebbleton	Large lot residential zone	Recent	5000	6000
Springfield	Large lot residential zone	Recent	5000	6000

## Appendix B – NPS-UD Requirements

The SCGM22 was developed to meet some of the requirements of the NPS-UD, and its predecessor NPS Urban Development Capacity. Importantly, no model can provide outputs for every aspect of the NPS-UD, and that most councils have adopted different research methods to meet the various requirements in the NPS-UD.

The focus of this report is on the SCGM22 which provides an assessment of the demand for housing and capacity within the District, and the sufficiency assessment required in the NPS-UD. The concept of “sufficiency” is outlined in Policy 2 and then implemented in clause 3.2, and defined further in clauses 3.24, 3.25, and 3.27.

Also of importance is that the National Policy Statement of Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL) refers directly to the NPS-UD, stating that Highly Productive land (HPL) can only be rezoned for urban use if it gives effect to the NPS-UD<sup>29</sup>. Also that even if there is a need for more urban land, that an assessment of alternatives should be undertaken<sup>30</sup> and this assessment should look at areas where there is demand in the HBA completed for NPS-UD<sup>31</sup> and for types of dwellings in the HBA completed for NPS-UD<sup>32</sup>. While not directly stated in the NPS-HPL, we consider that this new requirement is referring to clause 3.2 and associated clauses 3.24, 3.25 and 3.27 of the NPS-UD.

Therefore, it is important to establish what is required under the NPS-UD, and then this is used as a framework from which the SCGM22 was developed.

### Implementation

Policy 2 requires that Tier 1, 2, and 3 local authorities, at all times, provide at least sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand for housing and for business land over the short term, medium term, and long term. For housing the implementation of this policy is set out at Part 3 Subpart 1 of the NPS-UD which is repeated below (emphasis added):

#### **3.2 Sufficient development capacity for housing**

(1) Every tier 1, 2, and 3 local authority must provide at least sufficient development capacity in its region or district to meet expected demand for housing:

- (a) in existing and new urban areas; and
- (b) for both standalone dwellings and attached dwellings; and
- (c) in the short term, medium term, and long term.

---

<sup>29</sup> NPS-HPL 3.6(1)(a).

<sup>30</sup> NPS-HPL 3.6(1)(b).

<sup>31</sup> NPS-HPL 3.6(3)(a).

<sup>32</sup> NPS-HPL 3.6(3)(b).

(2) In order to be sufficient to meet expected demand for housing, the development capacity must be:

- (a) plan-enabled (see clause 3.4(1)); and
- (b) infrastructure-ready (see clause 3.4(3)); and
- (c) feasible and reasonably expected to be realised (see clause 3.26); and
- (d) for tier 1 and 2 local authorities only, meet the expected demand plus the appropriate competitiveness margin (see clause 3.22).

Selwyn is defined as a Tier 1 urban environment<sup>33</sup>, so it is required to meet this obligation.

First, the implementation section of the NPS-UD refers to different geographies “region”, “district”, and “urban areas”. Also, the focus of the NPS-UD is on “Urban Environment”, with many aspects of the NPS referring to the Urban Environment as the key geography, which can exclude smaller settlements that are not predominantly urban in character or are not within a housing or labour market (of at least 10,000 people).

In terms of geography, the most relevant section of NPS is set out in subpart 5, which outlines the obligations to undertake a housing development capacity assessment (such as the SCGM22) and it notes that (emphasis added):

### **3.19 Obligation to prepare HBA**

(2) The HBA must apply, at a minimum, to the relevant tier 1 or tier 2 urban environments of the local authority (ie, must assess demand and capacity within the boundaries of those urban environments), but may apply to any wider area.

Therefore, SDC must at least model the Urban Environment within the District. It is clear that rural areas in the District are not within the Urban Environment, but there may be some small towns that are non-rural zoned that are also not part of the urban environment.

As an example, Darfield which is approximately an 45 minute drive from Christchurch (50km) and has a population of around 3,000. While it has non-rural zoning it may not be part of the urban environment as defined in the NPS-UD. SDC and GCP have chosen to exclude Darfield from the Urban Environment, however the SCGM22 includes information for this town. This is acceptable as SDC may use the SCGM22 to plan for Darfield, even though it is not part of the Urban Environment for the purposes of the NPS-UD.

---

<sup>33</sup> NPS-UD – Appendix: Tier 1 and tier 2 urban environments and local authorities – Table 2.

The second element of 3.2(1) refers to two types of dwellings that must be considered - “standalone” and “attached”. This requirement is straightforward and would be defined as follows:

- ❖ **Standalone:** a dwelling that has no adjoining walls with another dwelling. However, there may be multiple standalone houses on one property (i.e. detached dwellings on a cross lease or granny flat).
- ❖ **Attached:** a dwelling that has one or more adjoining walls, which includes units, townhouses, duplex, apartments, etc.

Thirdly, the time periods used in the NPS-UD are important, which includes short term, medium term, and long term. These periods are defined in the NPS-UD as 3 years, 3-10 years and 10-30 years respectively. These periods are important as they have implications for what capacity is considered under 3.2(2) in each period, which is discussed further in the following subsections of this appendix.

Fourth, there is a requirement that Tier 1 and Tier 2 councils include a “competitiveness margin” when assessing the sufficiency of capacity. The competitiveness margin is defined as 20% above the expected demand in the short-medium term and 15% above the expected demand in the long term (3.22). The purpose of this margin is to ensure that there is choice and competitiveness in the housing market.

The NPS-UD provides further details on the aspects of the Housing Capacity Assessment in Subpart 5, that covers the requirements of the demand projections, supply capacity, and sufficiency, which are outlined in the following three sections.

## Demand Projections

The NPS-UD outlines the requirements for demand assessment in Subpart 5 at 3.24 which is repeated below (emphasis added).

### 3.24 Housing demand assessment

(1) Every HBA must estimate, for the short term, medium term, and long term, the demand for additional housing in the region and each constituent district of the tier 1 or tier 2 urban environment:

- (a) in different *locations*; and
- (b) in terms of dwelling types.

(2) Local authorities may *identify locations in any way they choose*.

(3) Local authorities may identify the types of dwellings in any way they chose but must, at a minimum, distinguish between standalone dwellings and attached dwellings.

(4) The demand for housing must be expressed in terms of numbers of dwellings.

(5) Every HBA must:

- (a) set out a range of projections of demand for housing in the short term, medium term, and long term; and
- (b) identify which of the projections are the most likely in each of the short term, medium term, and long term; and
- (c) set out the assumptions underpinning the different projections and the reason for selecting the most likely; and
- (d) if those assumptions involve a high level of uncertainty, the nature and potential effects of that uncertainty.

Most of the terminology used in this clause is consistent with the implementation clause 3.2. The clause refers to demand for dwelling types needs which should identify and distinguish between “standalone” and “attached”, which is consistent with the sufficiency test in 3.2(1), as such the discussion in the previous subsection of this appendix applies. The same applies to the time periods that must be assessed, being short term, medium term, and long term.

The clause does introduce new concepts as follows:

- ❖ **Locations:** the requirements set out in 3.24(1)(a) are that the demand assessment includes “locations”, which may be identified by councils as they choose (3.24(2)). Based on our experience with other HBA around the country we note that the publicly available demand assessments have generally defined locations as groupings of towns or suburbs which are sub parts of the wider urban environment, and in some instances that individual townships have been defined as a single location. Importantly, the NPS-UD sufficiency requirement in 3.2(1) does not refer to “locations” which implies that they may not be required for this test.
- ❖ **Most Likely:** the demand assessment must identify which projection is the “most likely” 3.24(5)(b). The concept of “most likely” is consistent with the sufficiency test in 3.2(1) which refers to “expected” demand. The expected outcome is a commonly applied concept in economics, statistics, and mathematics, which is applied when dealing with probabilities and future outcomes that are uncertain. The expected outcome is the outcome that has the highest probability of occurring. As an example, if a person was to flip two coins at the same time then the event with the highest probability of occurring is one head and one tail (probability of 50%). While the probability of flipping two heads (or two tails) is a lower probability of 25%. In economics, statistics, and mathematics the expected outcome is the most likely outcome. Therefore, this concept is relatively clear and that while clauses 3.2(1) and 3.24 use different terminology, they refer to the same concept.

In conclusion, the NPS-UD requirements mean that the SCGM22 should include the following dwelling demand metrics:

- ❖ short term, medium term, and long term,
- ❖ distinguish between standalone dwellings and attached dwellings,
- ❖ geographies that include at least the urban environment, and can include locations,
- ❖ most likely projection that represents the expected demand.

Finally, the NPS-UD has other requirements that relate to other aspects of demand as well, such as intensification (Policy 5 – density relative to demand), monitoring (3.9 – prices, rents, housing affordability), and impacts of planning (3.23 – housing demand of Māori, older people, renters, homeowners, low-income households, visitors, and seasonal workers, lower-cost housing, papakāinga, student accommodation, housing affordability, price efficiency indicators). Generally, councils have conducted these other types of demand assessments using bespoke research methods which is outside of the HCA. Specifically, the SCGM22 should not be required to carry out these other assessments of policy or submarkets.

## Supply Capacity

The NPS-UD outlines the requirements for supply assessment in Subpart 5 at 3.25 which is repeated below (emphasis added).

### 3.25 Housing development capacity assessment

(1) Every HBA must quantify, for the short term, medium term, and long term, the housing development capacity for housing in the region and each constituent district of the tier 1 or tier 2 urban environment that is:

- (a) plan-enabled; and
- (b) plan-enabled and infrastructure-ready; and
- (c) plan-enabled, infrastructure-ready, and feasible and reasonably expected to be realised.

(2) The development capacity must be quantified as numbers of dwellings:

- (a) in different locations, including in existing and new urban areas; and
- (b) of different types, including standalone dwellings and attached dwellings.

As with the demand, most of the terminology used in this clause is consistent with the implementation clause 3.2. The clause refers to development capacity for dwelling types including “standalone” and “attached”, which is consistent with the sufficiency test in 3.2(1). The same applies to the time periods that must be assessed, short term, medium term, and long term. The clause also refers to four types of capacity “plan enabled”, “infrastructure-ready”, “feasible” and “reasonably expected to be



realised” which are also included in 3.2. Finally, the assessment in 3.25 also includes “locations”, which is the same as the demand assessment in 3.24.

The four concepts of capacity are important and they are defined further within the NPS-UD as follows:

- ❖ **Plan Enabled:** is the theoretical maximum development capacity that is enabled within the planning framework. The definition of plan enabled is provided in 3.4(1)-(2) and it is different for each of the time periods in the NPS-UD, as follows:
  - ❖ **Short term:** land that is zoned in the operative district plan (permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary).
  - ❖ **Medium term:** land that is zoned in the operative district plan or proposed district plan.
  - ❖ **Long term:** land that is zoned in the operative district plan, proposed district plan, or identified for future urban use.
- ❖ **Infrastructure-ready:** is the share of plan enabled capacity that can be serviced by development infrastructure to support the development of the land<sup>34</sup>. The definition of plan enabled is provided in 3.4(3) and it is different for each of the time periods in the NPS-UD, as follows:
  - ❖ **Short term:** development infrastructure exists.
  - ❖ **Medium term:** development infrastructure exists or funding is identified in Long Term Plan.
  - ❖ **Long term:** development infrastructure exists, funding is identified in Long Term Plan, or identified in the local authority’s infrastructure strategy.
- ❖ **Feasible:** is defined in the interpretation section of the NPS-UD as commercially viable to a developer based on costs and revenue from the development of the land and is different for each of the time periods in the NPS-UD, as follows:
  - ❖ **Short term or Medium term:** requires model based on the “current relationship”, which means that costs and revenue must remain static at the base year.
  - ❖ **Long term:** allows the model to apply “any reasonable adjustment”, which means that the costs and revenue can be adjusted for future changes in the market.

---

<sup>34</sup> Development infrastructure means the following, to the extent they are controlled by a local authority or council controlled organisation - network infrastructure for water supply, wastewater, or stormwater and land transport (as defined in section 5 of the Land Transport Management Act 2003).

❖ **Reasonably expected to be realised:** is not defined in the NPS-UD and local authorities “may use any appropriate method” and “must outline and justify the method” 3.26(1). The NPS-UD provides example methods at 3.26(2)-(3):

- ❖ **Uptake:** an assessment of past capacity that was enabled and building consents to establish realisation rates achieved (i.e. share of opportunity that is developed each year).
- ❖ **Developer Intentions:** use information about the intentions of developers to establish the proportion of capacity that could be realised (i.e. stated market intention).
- ❖ **Modifying:** use past development trends to modify densities and timing of development (i.e. projecting past development trends).

The NPS-UD states that different methods may be appropriate when various types of development (greenfield, brownfield, infill)<sup>35</sup>.

The assessments of plan enabled and infrastructure-ready capacity are comparatively straightforward, and is inherently based on robust input data. Conversely, the assessment of feasibility and reasonably expected to be realised is more complex, and is inherently based on modelling and assumptions.

## Sufficiency Assessment

The NPS-UD outlines the requirements for the sufficiency assessment in Subpart 5 at 3.27 which is repeated below (emphasis added).

### 3.27 Assessment of sufficient development capacity for housing

(1) Every HBA must clearly identify, for the short term, medium term, and long term, where there is sufficient development capacity to meet demand for housing in the region and each constituent district of the tier 1 or tier 2 urban environment.

(2) The requirements of subclause (1) must be based on a comparison of:

- (a) the demand for housing referred to in clause 3.24 *plus the appropriate competitiveness margin*; and
- (b) the development capacity identified under clause 3.25.

(3) If there is any insufficiency, the HBA must identify where and when this will occur and analyse the extent to which RMA planning documents, a lack of development infrastructure, or both, cause or contribute to the insufficiency.

---

<sup>35</sup> NPS-UD 3.26(4).

As with the supply and demand, the terminology used in this clause is consistent with the implementation clause 3.2. The clause includes the requirement to include the appropriate competitiveness margin on top of the demand.

## Ministry for the Environment Guidelines

The Ministry for the Environment released guidelines on how to undertake an assessment of housing capacity and demand for the NPS Urban Development Capacity.<sup>36</sup> Since then no new guidelines have been provided for the NPS-UD, as such these previous guidelines are still be relevant to the SCGM22.<sup>37</sup> These guidelines provide additional detail on demand projections and some aspects of the supply assessment.

In terms of demand, the guidelines suggest that Statistics New Zealand population projections are a starting point, or if available household projections, for understanding demand for dwellings. However, the guidelines acknowledge that local authorities may commission bespoke projections. It also notes that *“Should a local authority wish to depart from using a medium projection, the rationale should be explained in the assessment in a way that can be traced and audited.”*

Most Tier 1 and Tier 2 councils have adopted the Statistics New Zealand medium scenario projection, however some have commissioned bespoke projections or adopted Statistics New Zealand high scenario projection (or even medium-high projection). Generally, this decision to adopt other projections has been driven by the fact that Statistics New Zealand only produces projections every 3-4 years and that in high growth areas, the official projections can become out of date quickly.

In terms of the allocation of demand to location and dwelling type, the guidelines suggest that a good assessment applies current and recent patterns of consumption for housing. The guidelines refer to this use of recent patterns as revealed preferences of the existing households within the current market. There is no discussion of what current or recent means, however it is likely between short and medium term periods – i.e. 4-5 years.

The guidelines also suggested that the allocation could be augmented with information about unmet demand for particular types of housing. The guidelines reference the Housing We’d Choose methodology which was first applied in Auckland<sup>38</sup> and has since been adopted in numerous other cities in New Zealand. In summary, this method collects primary data on housing preferences via a

---

<sup>36</sup> Ministry for the Environment (2017) National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring.

<sup>37</sup> However, some aspects of the NPS-UDC were changed in the NPS-UD, importantly price point assessment was dropped and feasibility assessment was changed to allow changes in the relationship between revenue to costs in the long term.

<sup>38</sup> Yeoman, R and Akehurst, G (2015). *The housing we’d choose: a study of housing preferences, choices and trade-offs in Auckland*. Auckland Council technical report, TR2015/016.

survey which can then be used to model future demand for location and dwelling type. The model includes two other scenarios – Statistics New Zealand Population projections and Strategic Direction. After the SCGM22 was developed, Statistics New Zealand released population projections for subareas (Statistical Area 2), which has a much lower share of demand allocated to main four towns in the urban environment (66%). The model also includes a scenario that applies the distribution of growth shown in the Long Term Plan 2021, which is referred to as Strategic Direction and has a share of demand allocated to main four towns in the urban environment which sits between the recent demand patterns and the Statistic NZ projections (75%).<sup>39</sup> This report has presented the results from the recent demand share scenario.

Turning to the supply assessment, the guidelines suggest that feasibility be tested according to the difference between costs (as estimated by Quantity Surveyor) and revenue using real estate sales price data, with a profit margin. The guidelines note that “rate of return may vary according to the perceived risks of the project” and that a profit margin could be 20%. However, no reference is provided for the target rate suggested and it is unclear what type of development project this relates to. While the guidelines are clear that profit margin varies according to development project type, there is no guidance on what or how the profit margin should be set in the modelling.

Finally, in terms of the modelling approach the guidelines suggest that parcel level models be used in areas with brownfield development and case study representative models be applied to areas with greenfield developments. However, local authorities are advised to use the modelling approach that best suits the nature and complexity of development capacity in the assessment study area. Generally, larger urban environments have adopted models that use a parcel level assessment, while smaller urban environments have adopted the case study approach.

The directions within the guidance are not binding, however they are useful points from which the SCGM22 framework can be defined.

## Framework

The discussion above provides a framework from which the SCGM22 was undertaken. This framework provides direction on how the modelling should be defined and some of the key assumptions should be set. However, it is important to note that the NPS-UD and the guidelines do not provide all the information from which a model can be built. There are other inputs and assumptions which must also be set and these are discussed in the body of this report.

---

<sup>39</sup> Selwyn District Council (2023) Selwyn District Growth and Demand – 30 year Infrastructure Strategy 2021-2051.

## Appendix C – Other Settlements

This appendix provides demand and capacity results for the other smaller settlements in the District – Darfield, Leeston, Southbridge, Kirwee, Tai Tapu, Dunsandel, Springston, Coalgate, Springfield, Doyleston, Hororata, Whitecliffs, Sheffield, Glentunnel, Rakaia Huts, Waddington, Lake Coleridge, Castle Hill, and Arthur's Pass.

These 19 settlements account for less than 15% of the population in the district. With an average population of around 600 people in each, they are relatively small and slow-growing compared to the Urban Environment. While the NPS-UD only requires councils to monitor and report on demand and capacity in the Urban Environment, it does not preclude assessments of the small settlements outside of the Urban Environment. The following appendix provides results from the SCGM22.

These settlements are slow-growing compared to the four towns in the Urban Environment of Selwyn District. Therefore, it is reasonable to plan for the medium growth future, rather than a high growth future. However, this appendix presents high growth projections in order to be consistent with the remainder of the report. Additionally, we acknowledge that for many of the small settlements that there has been limited development capacity available in the past which has influenced how demand has been accommodated in the District. Providing more capacity within these settlements could result in more demand being attracted to these areas. However, we would expect that demand is more likely to be attracted to areas within the four main towns, because of their proximity to Christchurch, relative accessibility to services and job opportunities in those towns, and the large increase in development potential that has been enabled in the four towns. Therefore, allowing additional capacity in the smaller settlements is unlikely to materially alter the distribution of demand in the future.

The medium growth projection would suggest a demand for 1,820 dwellings in the other settlements over the coming ten years which is equivalent to 182 dwellings per annum. While not required, if the NPS-UD competitiveness margin of 20% is applied, then there would be a need for 2,180 new dwellings in the coming medium term.

This compares to the total feasible capacity of 4,790 in the medium term, with most capacity in the main settlements of Darfield (3,050), Leeston (940), Southbridge (130), Kirwee (100), Doyleston (120), Castel Hill (110), and Coalgate (230). The other settlements have capacity for less than 50 new dwellings.

There is more than sufficient capacity to meet the demand across most of the settlements. There may be small shortfalls in some of the smaller settlements, however this is well within the expected margin of error.

**Figure C-1: Other Residential Dwelling Demand (+Margin) and Feasible Supply – Short-Medium term**

Other Settlements Dwelling Situation	2023-2033 Short-Medium Term		
	Demand +Margin	Feasible Supply	Sufficiency
Darfield	630	3,050	2,420
Leeston	150	940	790
Southbridge	170	130	- 40
Kirwee	270	100	- 170
Coalgate-Glentunnel-Whitecliffs	110	230	120
Tai Tapu	250	-	- 250
Sheffield-Waddington-Springfield	210	70	- 140
Dunsandel	130	40	- 90
Springston	40	-	- 40
Doyleston	40	120	80
Hororata	130	-	- 130
Castel Hill-Authur's Pass	40	110	70
Rakaia Huts	-	-	-
Lake Coleridge	10	-	- 10
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,180</b>	<b>4,790</b>	<b>2,610</b>

In the long term the medium growth projection would suggest a demand for 4,850 dwellings in the other settlements over the coming 30 years which is equivalent to 162 dwellings per annum. While not required, if the NPS-UD competitiveness margin of 15% is applied, then there would be a need for 5,670 new dwellings in the coming medium-long term.

This compares to the total feasible capacity of 7,560 in the long term, with most capacity in the main settlements of Darfield (3,310), Leeston (1,090), Southbridge (510), Kirwee (820), and Coalgate (660). The other settlements have capacity for less than 400 new dwellings. There is more than sufficient capacity to meet the demand across most of the settlements. There may be small shortfalls in some of the smaller settlements, however this is well within the expected margin of error and may be accommodated either in the other settlements or with the urban environment.



**Figure C-2: Other Residential Dwelling Demand (+Margin) and Feasible Supply – Long term**

Other Settlements Dwelling Situation	2023-2053 Long Term		
	Demand +Margin	Feasible Supply	Sufficiency
Darfield	1,640	3,310	1,670
Leeston	380	1,090	710
Southbridge	450	510	60
Kirwee	700	820	120
Coalgate-Glentunnel-Whitecliffs	300	660	360
Tai Tapu	660	40	- 620
Sheffield-Waddington-Springfield	550	320	- 230
Dunsandel	340	40	- 300
Springston	110	10	- 100
Doyleston	90	120	30
Hororata	340	350	10
Castel Hill-Authur's Pass	90	220	130
Rakaia Huts	-	-	-
Lake Coleridge	20	70	50
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,670</b>	<b>7,560</b>	<b>1,890</b>

The potential small shortfall in Dunsandel could be easily accommodated within either Leeston or Rolleston. Also, the potential shortfall in Tai Tapu and Springston could be accommodated within either Lincoln or Rolleston. These shortfalls are relatively small in the context of the growth outlook for the district (1% of demand) and the long time period assessed (three decades). While the assessment shows a shortfall for some small settlements it is not material and within the expected margin of error.

Therefore, we consider that there is no need to provide additional capacity in these specific settlements. However, it would be sensible to monitor the situation over the coming decade and if the high growth outcome is achieved then Council could consider providing more capacity.