
POST ENGAGEMENT PREFERRED OPTION UPDATE REPORT TO DISTRICT PLAN COMMITTEE

DATE:	5 December 2018
TOPIC NAME:	Business and Residential
SCOPE DESCRIPTION:	Requests for Rezoning of Land for Urban Development
TOPIC LEAD:	Jocelyn Lewes
PREPARED BY:	Jocelyn Lewes (Strategy and Policy Planner) and Jessica Tuilaepa (Senior Strategy and Policy Planner)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<i>Summary of Preferred Options Endorsed by DPC for Further Engagement:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>That any additional capacity for residential and business land within the Greater Christchurch Area be considered in response to the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity;</i>• <i>That Council will not proactively rezone any 'greenfield' areas within the Ellesmere and Malvern Wards. This will be left to land owners by way of submissions on the Proposed District Plan.</i>
<i>Summary of Feedback Received:</i>	<i>Numerous requests were received to rezone land, in order to increase the urban development potential of such land, both within the Greater Christchurch Area and the Ellesmere and Malvern Wards.</i>
<i>Recommended Option Post Engagement:</i>	<i>That the preferred approach to rezoning land for urban development, both within the Greater Christchurch Area and the Ellesmere and Malvern Wards, previously endorsed by the Committee remain unchanged.</i>
<i>DPC Decision:</i>	<i>That the preferred approach to rezoning land for urban development, both within the Greater Christchurch Area and the Ellesmere and Malvern Wards, previously endorsed by the Committee remain unchanged.</i>



1.0 Introduction

During the course of the District Plan Review process, DPC has endorsed a number of preferred option reports dealing with the topic of rezoning land, particularly in relating to the Malvern and Ellesmere Areas. Concurrently, Council is working with its Greater Christchurch partners to respond to the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development Capacity which include the preparation of a Future Development Strategy (FDS) for the geographic area.

During the initial public consultation on the District Plan Review process, feedback was sought on a variety of issues and preferred options. In response to this consultation, 22 responses were received from landowners seeking that their land be rezoned. Rezoning of land was not a topic specifically promoted for discussion during the consultation period.

The purpose of this report is to consider the responses received in relation to rezoning and make recommendations as to how to proceed.

2.0 Strategic Context

Greater Christchurch Area

For the Springs and Selwyn Central Wards, which form part of the Greater Christchurch Area, addressing growth is an issue that needs to be initially covered by other national and regional processes before any additional township growth and 'greenfield' zoning can be considered.

At the national level, the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) directs local councils to provide enough land which can be developed for business and housing to meet community needs. At a regional level, the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) has to give effect to the national policy statement and in doing so, determine the extent of urban land required. The current settlement pattern in the CRPS was established after the Canterbury earthquakes of 2010-2011 and was not scheduled to be comprehensively reviewed until 2022, as part of the wider review of the CRPS.

However, in response to the requirements of the NPS-UDC, the Greater Christchurch partnership, which Selwyn District Council is part of, together with other local councils, government agencies and iwi, has recently released for public consultation a draft FDS *Our Space 2018-2048, Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update*, which sets actions to address the residential and business capacity needs of the Greater Christchurch portion of the Selwyn district for the next 30 years. Public consultation on this document closed on 30 November 2018.

While Council's response to the NPS-UDC is the subject of a separate workstream, the outcomes of this work will have an impact on the future urban growth of the Greater Christchurch part of the District.

Malvern and Ellesmere Wards

Urban growth within the balance of the district, in the Ellesmere and Malvern Wards, has been considered through the Selwyn 2031: District Development Strategy and the Malvern and Ellesmere Area Plans. These

planning documents established that there is sufficient land to support business and residential growth through to the year 2031 without Council zoning additional land through the District Plan Review. This direction was confirmed by the District Plan Committee, with the exception of investigating the provision of additional industrial land in Leeston.

However, the Area Plans do signal implementation steps and processes where the location of additional land supply should be considered as well as indicating where future growth should most appropriately locate.

3.0 Overview of Preferred Options Endorsed by DPC

To date, DPC have endorsed several preferred options which, to some degree, relate to the zoning of land. These are summarised below.

Business

BS202 – Business Zone Framework ([Business Zone Framework \[PDF, 503 KB\]](#))

Council has opted to proceed with a business zone framework that aligns both with the Township Network developed in Selwyn 2031 and the proposed National Planning Standards, which provide a suite of zones for Councils to choose from when developing their District Plan. The zones are likely to include:

- Town Centre Zone (applying to Rolleston, Lincoln, Darfield and Leeston B1/KAC zones)
- Local Commercial Zone (applying to all other towns with an existing B1/B1A/B1B zone)
- Neighbourhood Commercial Zone (applying to existing neighbourhood centres e.g. South Point Faringdon)
- Industrial Zone(s) (*Option available to have Light Industrial, Industrial and Heavy Industrial Zones*) (replacing the current B2, B2A and B2B zones across the District)
- Special Purpose Port Zone (applying to Midland and Metroport in the current B2A zone Rolleston)
- Special Purpose Research, Education and Technology Zone (replacing Lincoln's B3 zone)
- Special Purpose Large Format Retail Zone (*to be used in the event the National Planning Standards do not provide a Large Format Retail Zone*).

BS201 – Business in Small Settlements ([Business in Small Settlements \[PDF, 368 KB\]](#))

Instead of rezoning sites in townships that do not currently have a business zone, but are being utilised for business purposes, DPC endorsed the preferred approach to develop a small business overlay which would protect the commercial use of sites, reducing the reliance on existing use rights and providing for certainty for the business owners and adjoining land owners.

BS005 – Business land capacity in Malvern and Ellesmere ([Capacity of existing business zones in Malvern and Ellesmere \[PDF, 2053 KB\]](#))

Given there being no shortfall in commercial and industrial land available in the Malvern and Ellesmere townships with business zones, with the exception of Leeston, the decision was made not to actively rezone any additional business land in these townships. Further investigation is underway in relation to determining the most appropriate place in Leeston for additional industrial land to be located and to

confirm actual land requirements. In Darfield, Castle Hill, Dunsandel and Southbridge no additional land will be actively rezoned for business purposes by Council.

Preferred Option Report relating to Transitional Living Zones in KACs

(<https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/property-and-building/planning/strategies-and-plans/selwyn-district-plan/selwyn-district-plan-review/supporting-information>)

Whilst this preferred option has not yet been endorsed by DPC (it is on the same agenda as this report), the approach recommended is not to actively rezone land in the KACs of Rolleston and Lincoln. Instead, it is recommended that a commitment be made to undertake further strategic planning work to determine what the requirements are and the best locations to service demand following the adoption of the FDS.

Residential

RE207 – Residential Character, Amenity, Density and Housing Typologies ([Residential Character, Amenity, Density and Housing Typologies \[PDF, 408 KB\]](#))

This preferred option endorsed a range of approaches for managing residential development in the Proposed District Plan that will result in the rationalisation of the large number of existing residential zones in line with the proposed National Planning Standards. In place of the 72 Living Zones, the four zones endorsed were:

- General Residential Zone (applying to the Living 1 zones)
- Medium Density Residential Zone (applying to the Living Z zones)
- Large Lot Residential Zone (replacing the current L2 and L3 zones)
- Settlement Zone (applying to smaller townships without a business zone)

Specific objectives and policies will be drafted for each zone that will clearly describe the outcomes sought for each zone and will also enable a range of appropriate housing typologies. Zones will generally be distributed spatially to locate more intensive residential development around key activity centres, flowing out to lower densities on the boundaries of townships. Development standards for each zone will be developed and within these, rules will also be developed for different housing typologies, to manage character and amenity.

4.0 Summary of Feedback Received

During the public consultation period, 22 responses were received seeking the rezoning of land for urban purposes within the district. These submissions are summarised below.

Requests for rezoning of land within the Greater Christchurch Area

Business

Township	Landowner	Inside or outside of town boundary	Current Zone	Requested Zone
Rolleston	Lilley Family Trust	Inside	Living 1	Business 1/Neighbourhood Centre
Rolleston	Gulf Central Properties Ltd	Outside	Rural (Inner Plains)	Rural Business

Residential

Township	Landowner	Inside or outside of town boundary	Current Zone	Requested Zone	Requested Density
Lincoln	Lincoln Developments Ltd	Outside	Rural (Inner Plains)	Living Z	600m ²
Prebbleton	D. Shanks	Inside	Living 1	Living Z	500m ²
Prebbleton	N. Terpstra	Inside	Living 2A (Blakes Road)	Living 2	5000m ² – variation to ODP
Prebbleton	J Stafford	Outside	Rural (Inner Plains)	Living 2	5000m ²
Prebbleton	M Springer	Outside	Rural (Inner Plains)	Living X	800m ²
Prebbleton	K & B Williams	Outside	Rural (Inner Plains)	Living or Industrial	Not identified
Prebbleton	GR Rhodes Estate	Outside	Rural (Inner Plains)	Living Z	700m ²
Rolleston	A. Holton	Outside	Rural (Inner Plains)	Living	5000m ²
Rolleston	Ellis Darussette Ltd	Outside	Rural (Inner Plains)	Living Z	650m ²

Requests for rezoning of land within the Ellesmere Ward

Business

Township	Landowner	Preferred Development Area as identified in Area Plan	Current Zone	Requested Zone
Leeston	Peter Bayliss	LEE3	Rural (Outer Plains)	Business

Residential

Township	Landowner	Preferred Development Area as identified in Area Plan	Current Zone	Requested Zone	Requested Density
----------	-----------	---	--------------	----------------	-------------------

Leeston	L Render	LEE 2	Rural (Outer Plains)	Living	Not less than 1500m ² , otherwise avg 5000m ²
Southbridge	L & B Doubleday	N/A – land already inside township boundary	Business 2	Living	N/A

Requests for rezoning of land within the Malvern Ward

Business

Township	Landowner	Preferred Development Area as identified in Area Plan	Current Zone	Requested Zone	Comment
Hororata	Prime Smoke Salmon Factory	N/A	Rural (Outer Plains)	Business or Small Business Overlay	

Residential

Township	Landowner	Preferred Development Area as identified in Area Plan	Current Zone	Requested Zone	Requested Density
Darfield	C Buttle	N/A – land already inside township boundary	Living 2A (Def). (1 ha avg)	Living 2	Average 5000m ²
Darfield	M Todd & M Reed	DAR 7	Rural (Outer Plains)	Living X	650m ² , with opportunity for small lot medium density (400m ²) and opportunity for retirement village
Hororata	A Rhodes	HOR 3	Rural (Outer Plains)	Living X	800m ²
Hororata	H Studholme	HOR 2	Rural (Outer Plains)	Living 2	3000m ²
Kirwee	P Thomas	KIR 2	Living 1 Living 2A Rural (Outer Plains)	Retain Living 1 Living X	650m ² 650m ² 650m ²
Sheffield / Waddington	K Jenkins	WAD 1	Rural (Outer Plains)	Living 2	1-2 hectares

5.0 Analysis of Feedback Received

There are significant information and costs involved in rezoning a site, as outlined in **Appendix 1**. Substantial programming is also required ahead of time to determine if infrastructure is available as and when required and has been suitably budgeted for, as detailed in **Appendix 2**. These matters must be taken into consideration when analysing requests for the rezoning of land.

Rezoning Requests within Greater Christchurch Area

Business

Rolleston (Neighbourhood Centre)

The SCGM demonstrates that there is no shortfall of commercial land in Rolleston in the next 10 years. For this reason, and that Council is waiting on the outcomes of the FDS, DPC has not yet made any decisions relating to actively rezoning commercial or industrial land in the Greater Christchurch Area. Whilst the Rolleston Structure Plan does indicate that a 'Neighbourhood Centre' was potentially anticipated north of the Rolleston Key Activity Centre (KAC), this work is almost 10 years old and requires updating to determine on going suitability. It should be noted that this land is presently being used for commercial purposes, operating under resource consents/existing use rights, therefore there is some recognition of this area as a 'neighbourhood centre'.

Once the outcomes of the FDS are known, Council will undertake appropriate strategic planning work to update structure plans and town centre master plans. One of the priorities of Council is to ensure that developments outside of the KAC do not create negative retail distribution effects and for this reason additional economic analysis would also be required before the development of future neighbourhood centres.

Prebbleton (Industrial)

Prebbleton does not currently have an industrial zone and research indicates there is not presently a shortage of industrial land in the area. Following the adoption of the FDS, additional strategic planning work will be undertaken by Council that will consider what types of land townships need and where the best location for this is. This work will likely involve the updating of the existing Prebbleton Structure Plan and is a process that will involve the wider community.

Residential

All bar two requests received in relation to the Greater Christchurch Area were for the rezoning of land currently zoned Rural (Inner Plains) to Living, at varying densities. The areas to which these requests relate are all located outside of existing urban areas, or greenfield priority area, as identified in Map A of Chapter 6 of the CRPS.

CRPS Chapter 6 seeks to provide certainty to the community around how recovery and growth will be enabled within the Greater Christchurch Area, to enable and support earthquake recovery and rebuilding

through to 2028. Objectives establish a framework for recovery that identifies the priority areas for urban development and seek to manage the urban form and settlement pattern to provide sufficient land for urban uses that achieves consolidation and intensification, alongside the development of greenfield areas, in a way that enables the efficient provision and use of infrastructure. Map A identifies the location and extent of urban development, be that intensification or existing area or new urban activities within identified greenfield priority areas.

Given the strong direction of growth set out in the CRPS through the objectives and policies of Chapter 6, it is considered that there is little ability at this time for land outside of the areas shown on Map A to be rezoned for urban development, be that through private plan changes or the DPR process.

However, as outlined in Section 2.1 above, the Greater Christchurch partnership has prepared a draft FDS, which outlines the Greater Christchurch Partnership's proposed settlement pattern and strategic planning framework to meet the land use and infrastructure needs over the medium (next 10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years) periods. It focuses on the critical role of how urban areas will accommodate growth and how efficient infrastructure planning can support and guide development decisions and seeks to balance the projected future demands of housing and business markets with an urban form that will best enable sustainable growth.

The draft FDS concludes that *“Rolleston will continue to grow as the principal centre in Selwyn, with a range of new developments supporting a vibrant town centre and the choice of housing broadening to reflect the changing demand profile of the growing town. Industrial and large format retail expand around the I-Zone Southern Business Hub, benefitting from improved connections across State Highway 1. Lincoln will develop while retaining its village and university character, with opportunities emerging from new academic and business partnerships through the Lincoln Hub initiative”*¹.

Two requests related to land in Prebbleton, within the existing urban area, and are not considered to be constrained in the same way by the direction of Chapter 6. The sites to which the requests relate are small, discrete allotments, one of 2000m² and the other of 1ha, rather than large greenfield areas. The overall spatial allocation of residential growth within the Greater Christchurch Area is still to be determined through the NPS-UDC workstream, which may result in subsequent updates to the Prebbleton Structure Plan that would consider strategically, with community engagement, the need and location of varying residential densities. At this time, the mechanisms of the resource consent process are better suited to determine the appropriateness of further development or subdivision opportunities of individual land parcels.

Rezoning Requests within the Ellesmere and Malvern Wards

Business

Leeston

¹ Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update. November 2018 p. 21

The Ellesmere Area Plan identified Area 'LEE3' as having potential for industrial development. The request to rezone this site for business purposes will be considered as part of the 'Leeston Industrial Zoning' workstream.

Hororata

In addition to deciding against proactively rezoning additional business land in the Malvern Area, the District Plan Committee has also already decided against spot business zoning across the District. The preferred approach for Business in small settlements without existing business zones is for an overlay to be developed to recognise the existing and continued uses of certain sites. Hororata Township, which does not currently have a business zone, will be subject to the business in small settlement overlay. A survey was undertaken of the existing sites being used for commercial purposes within the existing Living 1 zone of the township. To date, the small business overlay has not been expected to manage activities on Rural land which are instead intended to be managed by the rules relating to business activities in the Rural Zone.

The site is presently operating under previously granted resource consents from the early 2000s. As such, it is considered more appropriate for the activity to continue to be authorised via resource consent than attempting to provide an exemption to the 'small business overlay' intended for urban areas or any other type of spot zone that could potentially undermine the underlying zone provisions.

Residential

With the exception of two requests, the majority of rezoning requests received within the Malvern and Ellesmere Wards related to sites identified within the Area Plans as Preferred Development Areas.

The Area Plans were adopted in September 2016. Their primary purpose is to provide high-level planning direction to guide growth and sustainable management of Malvern and Ellesmere townships through to 2031. The Area Plans identified 'preferred development areas', being the location and direction of future urban growth for a number of townships. However, the Area Plans also recognised that the substantive merits of rezoning land need to be considered through a statutory process, including that set out in s32 of the RMA. This could be done through the DPR (including via the submission process), a Council plan change or a privately-initiated request. The Area Plans outline that there are constraints to growth (e.g. infrastructure, reverse sensitivity, landscape or cultural matters) that will require investigation and funding to overcome. The cost and benefits of development may not stack up for some smaller towns.

Both Area Plans concluded that all towns have capacity to meet residential growth projections through existing zoned land (i.e. developable land or 'plan-enabled' land). This existing capacity included zoned but undeveloped land and developed land with further development potential (i.e. infill). As such, they conclude that there was no need to rezone any additional land for residential needs. This conclusion is supported by the results of the Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model (SCGM) (see Appendix 3), which has concluded that all townships, other than Rakaia Huts (at capacity at 2028), are projected to have capacity to meet residential demand out to 2033 and beyond. As such, there is over 10 years of residential capacity in the Ellesmere and Malvern townships.

The District Plan Committee has previously resolved not to investigate rezoning of any of the residential preferred development areas through the DPR process and this decision has been communicated to landowners, along with information on the processes they could avail themselves of should they wish to promote the rezoning of their land. This information is attached in **Appendix 4**.

Two rezoning requests received related to land within township boundaries – one in Darfield and the other in Southbridge.

The request in Darfield relates to land that is currently identified as deferred. An approach for responding to all remaining deferred land within the district is the subject of a separate workstream and, as such, this feedback will be taken into account as part of this topic area.

The request for rezoning a parcel of land in Southbridge is more complex. This land is currently zoned Business 2, but is, and has historically always been, a residential property. However, it is largely surrounded by Business 2 zoned land which support a range of commercial and industrial activities. The rezoning of this land to Living would result in spot zoning and has the potential to lead to an increase in reverse sensitivity issues.

6.0 Conclusion

Numerous requests for rezoning of land within the district were received during the initial public consultation period and the level of information attached to each request varied considerably, however none could be considered to be sufficient detail to meet the requirements of the RMA, as set out in Section 32.

Given the existing direction of Chapter 6 of the CRPS in relation to urban development, as well as work currently being done within the NPS-UDC workstream, it is considered that there is little ability for Council to promote the rezoning of land within the Greater Christchurch Area at this time.

The District Plan Committee has also previously made a number of decisions not to actively rezone additional land for living or business within the townships within Ellesmere and Malvern Wards through the District Plan Review process, other than for Leeston industrial areas.

These decisions do not prevent landowners within these areas from requesting a rezoning either by a private plan change now (prior to the notification of the Proposed District Plan) or via a submission on the notified Proposed District Plan in 2020.

7.0 Recommendation

The Project Team recommends that:

1. The requests for the rezoning of land received during the initial public consultation process, discussed above, be noted and incorporated into other related workstreams, as appropriate.
2. These requests not be progressed by Council through the DPR process (except where relevant to other workstreams) on the basis that:
 - a. There is little mandate to rezone land within the Greater Christchurch Area given the strong direction of Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement and that any rezoning of land in this area needs to be considered through the National Policy Statement for Urban Development Capacity workstream.
 - b. Within the Malvern and Ellesmere wards, the District Plan Committee has previously resolved that Council will not actively rezone land through the DPR process, with the exception of

industrial land in Leeston, as it is considered that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate growth to beyond 2033.

3. Following the outcomes of the NPSUDC work stream the Council considers reviewing its growth management strategies where required, to provide direction, with input from the community, on the location and nature of residential and business land in the future.

These decisions be conveyed to all parties who provided feedback on possible rezonings and that they be provided with clear advice regarding the level of information required to support a submission on the Proposed District Plan, at the time it is notified.

Appendix 1:

Overview of Section 32 information requirements for rezoning

District Plans that are developed using sound evidence and rigorous policy analysis lead to more robust, enduring provisions, and can mean issues are resolved early on in plan-making, reducing opposition during hearings or at appeal. As outlined in the Area Plans and mentioned above the substantive merit of zoning any site, including any 'preferred development area' ('PFD Area') must be determined through the statutory process set out in the Act. To determine the substantive merits of these areas investigations will be required which will include the commissioning of detailed technical reports. The purpose and requirement to do this work is to help inform section 322 evaluation reports to demonstrate that the zoning has been well tested against the purpose of the Act and that the anticipated benefits outweigh costs and risks. In short, the evaluation must examine whether the objectives of the proposal (new zoning) are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.

To evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposal it is necessary to identify, quantify and assess the benefits and costs and to assess the risk of acting or not acting. To inform this evaluation key technical assessments are likely to be required to support any rezoning request, including:

- Geotech
- Contamination
- Transport
- Infrastructure
- Landscape
- Economic
- Planning
- Urban design – ODP design

The approximate cost to undertake the above investigations for one site development is estimated to be between \$80,000 and \$120,000³. The level of information or the number of technical reports required would have some impact on this cost but this provides an 'average' indication of cost. All things being equal there is also little in the way of economies of scale in the cost of a plan change⁴.

² Section 32 (s32) is integral to ensuring transparent, robust decision-making in Resource Management Act (RMA) plans, plan changes and policy statements S32 requires new proposals to be examined for their appropriateness in achieving the purpose of the RMA, and the policies and methods of those proposals to be examined for their efficiency, effectiveness and risk.

³ Obtained through discussions with Planz Consultants and Baseline Group

⁴ John Ferguson, Planning Director, Baseline Group.

Appendix 2:

Infrastructure provision, cost and programming

Aside from the initial s32 information and investigation costs any rezoning proposal will also need to consider the costs on, and supply of, infrastructure (e.g. from the 5 waters and roading, community services etc). If Council proactively zones then the cost of meeting the infrastructure needs has to be planned and financed for by Council. The infrastructure needs could be a transparent trigger for a deferred zoning but there will need to be commitment from Council (i.e. Long Term Plan) to provide it at a nominated time in the future.

A significant aspect to the s32 evaluation will be the quantification of benefits and costs. The financial cost of having to provide and service finance on infrastructure will be significant in many cases. The financial benefit to the wider community of any Council-led rezoning may be quite limited in low growth areas (i.e. to the individual landowner, jobs through construction phase, employment in subsequent businesses etc.). There may be social benefits to providing more opportunities for growth but it is important to ensure this is not overridden by a financial burden for a community in servicing infrastructure that is not taken up. In short, the financial costs may outweigh the quantification of benefits.

In financing any new infrastructure or upgrades Council takes on debt and obligations of servicing a loan and/or recouping its own investment. This is normally recouped through Development Contributions (DC). In areas of low growth there is a risk to Council that the amount of DC's recouped each year is not sufficient to service a loan. Alternatively, to reduce this risk, the DC may have to be so high that developments in low growth areas are not commercially feasible. In a scenario where a private developer promotes a zone change (through a submission on the new District Plan or through a private plan change) the infrastructure provision (including any upgrades) and cost of this falls on the developer, not Council.

As well as servicing any financing Council will also need to ensure that infrastructure requirements are programed into the Long Term Plan (LTP) to provide services to zoned land or to uplift any deferrals. This provides some certainty to the community and the developers that the land is developable and when and how it will be available for serviced development as with the finance servicing issue there is a risk that Council's forward programming of infrastructure and community facilities, based on zoned land, and is not required due to continued low growth. This may impinge on budget and planning for other infrastructure that may become more pressing.

Overall there is a cost risk to Council in proactively zoning areas of land and addressing infrastructure constraints. This is particularly the case in towns where there is already land available to meet growth projections and business needs. Going beyond what is needed or feasible in infrastructure capacity puts Council at risk of not being able service funding and/or increases community expectations around the provision of other facilities that is (potentially) inconsistent with the Township Network set out in Selwyn 2031.

Appendix 3:

Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model

As part of the DPR process, a more robust and detailed growth model has been developed to assist in determining the zoned land capacity of each of the District's townships and also the demand on land supply from a population projection perspective. These projections include the demographic information recently provided by Dr Natalie Jackson to build in age considerations to understand not just how many households may be required but to inform what type of housing (and other services) may be needed.

The Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model (SCGM) will assist in reviewing the existing zone framework and assessing whether this meets demand, taking into account the future demographic profile of the district. This may result in changes to zoning patterns and housing types provided for within these zones. This model will also enable more accurate consideration of land supply (e.g. is more greenfield land needed or is effective and efficient use of existing zoned land required?).

At the DPC meeting on 6 December 2017 the development, structure and function of the SCGM was presented. The SCGM received endorsement for use in the DPR with particular control settings being applied. This has enabled staff to progress analysis of township capacity and forecasted demand with some certainty.

To ascertain whether a town has sufficient land capacity to support growth, the SCGM projections were compared to the potential yield of the existing zoned land in each town. It is important to note that the potential yield is 'theoretical' in that it is an amount that is 'plan-enabled', through District Plan provisions and zoning. The yield has not factored in any site specific constraints to development within this existing zoned land.

Appendix 4:

Letter sent to landowners within Preferred Development
Areas within Ellesmere and Malvern Area Plans

<http://dpr/Project/Shared%20Documents/Residential%20and%20Business%20Growth%20-%20Area%20Plan%20targeted%20update%20-%20DRAFT.docx>

<http://dpr/Project/Shared%20Documents/Residential%20and%20Business%20Growth%20-%20Area%20Plan%20targeted%20update%20-%20INFORMATION%20TO%20BE%20SUBMITTED.docx>