APPENDIX 3 DARFIELD LAND SUPPLY AND TAKE UP

The Section 42A Report relies on its analysis of land availability data to conclude that Plan Change 63 should be declined. That data comes from the Malvern Area Plan ('MAP') and projected population growth rates published by the Council.

The applicant is relying on capacity and take-up data for all the main townships in Selwyn sourced from the Council earlier this year (not necessarily just for the purpose of this Plan Change). There is a significant difference between the two in terms of land availability, although the conclusion from both is the same: that there is sufficient Living 1 land to meet anticipated demand until at least 2031.

The Reporting Officer invited the applicant to provide alternative analysis on development capacity. This led the Applicant to source additional data (eg recent sales trends), employ more precise forecasting techniques than in the Officer's Report, and broaden some assumptions, all with the purpose of helping inform the decision making process.

Malvern Area Plan

The extracts relied upon by the Section 42A Report are as follows:

'There are approximately 827 standard residential sections in Darfield, which are contained in the Living 1 zone. There is the potential to further develop 70 of these sections for residential purposes. These sections comprise some 97 hectares with a potential yield of 1047 households'.

These standard residential properties are supplemented by 292 low-density residential sections within the Living 2, Living 2A and Living 2A1 zones, of which 24 are able to be further developed for residential purposes. These sections comprise 201 hectares with a potential yield of 127 additional households.

In addition there is further significant capacity in the Deferred Living X, Living 2 and Living 2A zones. In total these Deferred areas comprise some 649 hectares with a potential additional yield of 1100 households.'

It concludes that*, overall there is considered to be sufficient available land to accommodate projected population growth through to 2031 without Council proactively zoning additional residential 'greenfield' land. The maximum potential yield for infill subdivision on Living zoned land, including deferred zoned land but excluding any Council reserves zoned for residential purposes, is some 2,274 households. In addition, there are currently 87 vacant lots available in existing and established residential areas'.*

More recent data.

The capacities and rates of take-up until early 2021 are in the following tables. The capacity is 361 dwellings in the Living 1 Zone plus 758 sections in the Living X deferred zone. The proposed plan removes the deferment off the LX, although this has been opposed through submissions Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency.

Final Town Areas	Zone	Infill	Vacant	Resi Rural	Greenfield	Total
Darfield	Living 1	12	53	0	296	361
Darfield	Living 2	0	0	33	0	33
Darfield	Living 2A	0	0	177	0	177
Darfield	Living 2A1	0	0	20	0	20
Darfield	Living 2 Def	0	0	0	0	0
Darfield	Living 2A Def	0	0	0	0	0
Darfield	Living X Def	0	0	0	0	758

Residential Capacity
(Dwellings)

Capacity by Zone

Township	Zone	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Grand Total
Darfield	Business 2										1						1
Darfield	Living 1	26	11	5	9	7	12	13	13	18	6	14	16	1	8	1	160
Darfield	Living 2	7	10	3	5	5	8	3	5	4	2	8	2		3		65
Darfield	Living 2 Def			1	3		4	7	5	15	9	15	7	5	1		72
Darfield	Living 2A													2			2
Darfield	Living 2A1	14	4	4	6	3	2	1		2	6	2		1	3	1	49
Darfield	Living X Def												1				1
Darfield	Living 2A Def														1	1	2

Take up by Zone

Source: Selwyn District Council 2021.

Even allowing for take up over the past six or so years, the gap between the current data and MAP is significant for the L1 Zone and difficult to explain. One of the possible reasons for this is the different methodologies used. It is not clear from the extracted statement from the MAP how the data was sourced and what was excluded other than 'Council reserves zoned for residential purposes'. There is no mention of other land being excluded from assessments such as other designated and non-designated Council land, other non-Council designations, and non-residential uses in the Living 1 zone such as churches. Taking these areas out could explain much of the difference, although I have not done the calculations needed to quantify this in the time available.

The data relied on by the Applicant is derived from the Selwyn Growth Model. I understand that this was developed in 2018 and recently updated to meet the requirements of the Housing and Business Capacity Assessments under the National Policy Statement -Urban Development Capacity 2016, and the recent National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020. The methodologies specified in these documents are highly prescriptive and require rigorous evidence-based analysis. My understanding is that the figures contained in the data exclude all the non-residential area referred to above, not just Council reserves. I would also assume development feasibility has also been considered to give effect to the NPS's.

The recent data also includes past take up rates which can be extrapolated into the future using population and household assumptions from the most recent projections undertaken by the Council. These are not included in the MAP.

The conclusions for the short to medium term are the same in terms of theoretical land supply. However, as explained in the body of my evidence, other nuances come into play such as land banking, time periods between rezoning and people in houses, and housing needs over the thirty year plan horizon. Neither data sets account for these but they are all factors that need to be considered, along with others I mention my evidence, in making an overall determination as to whether Plan Change 63 promotes the purpose of the Resource Management Act.