
PREFERRED OPTION REPORT TO DISTRICT PLAN COMMITTEE

DATE: 13 June 2018

TOPIC NAME: Residential

SCOPE DESCRIPTION: Comprehensive Medium Density Development

TOPIC LEAD: Jocelyn Lewes

PREPARED BY: Stantec New Zealand (Karen Bell)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<i>Issue(s)</i>	<p><i>The Operative District Plan enables a range of housing typologies, however the attached and semi-detached forms related to comprehensive medium density are not being taken up by developers.</i></p> <p><i>The provisions in the Operative District Plan related to comprehensive medium density development are largely unused and this may possibly be due to inconsistent use of terminology, making the provisions hard to interpret and administer.</i></p> <p><i>A change in market conditions that may result in increased demand for comprehensive medium density development could result in interpretation and administration issues related to the provisions in their current form.</i></p> <p><i>There are potentially implementation issues meaning that related rules need better clarity in terms of drafting and formatting.</i></p>
<i>Preferred Option</i>	<p><i>In summary the recommended options for further development are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Option 2a and Option 2b: realignment of existing provisions;</i><i>Option 3: New rules associated with different approaches to comprehensive residential development</i> <p><i>It is noted that the changes suggested in Options 2a and 2b could be undertaken as part of the preferred option from Preferred Option Report for RE207.</i></p>
<i>DPC Decision</i>	<p><i>That the Committee endorses the Preferred Option for Comprehensive Medium Density Development for further development and engagement.</i></p>



1.0 Introduction

The Comprehensive Medium Density Development (CMDD) Baseline Report (Baseline Report RE018) has been prepared for the residential work stream to inform the identification of issues, options and approaches related to this form of residential development. Baseline Report RE018 looked at the application of the CMDD provisions in the Living Z zone and in ODP areas in that zone as specified in the definition. Baseline Report RE018 is attached as **Appendix 1**.

The purpose of this Preferred Option Report is to provide a summary of Baseline Report RE018 and to identify additional issues, options and approaches for addressing the management of Comprehensive Medium Density residential development. If endorsed by Council, the Preferred Option will form the basis of further engagement with stakeholders as part of the District Plan Review project.

2.0 Summary of Issues

2.1 CMDD provisions within the existing structure of Operative District Plan

Baseline Report RE005 (Bulk and Location) identified a number of issues relating to plan structure, interpretation of rules and clarity of drafting, inconsistent use of terminology and definitions which leads to implementation issues. Some of these issues also apply in the case of CMDD.

Baseline Report RE018 found the CMDD provisions potentially prone to outcomes not anticipated when the provisions were included in the Operative District Plan. This situation arises due to the terminology and rule framework used in the plan. The use of inconsistent terminology confuses the delivery of both medium density and comprehensive residential development. The approach to enabling medium density development is further complicated by the focus in the CMDD definition on the provision of CMDD in the Living Z zone.

Baseline Report RE018 notes that the density anticipated in the ODPs is being delivered not via attached and semidetached development envisaged in the definition of CMDD, but instead by small lot subdivision, as there is a clear preference in the market for standalone sites at this time.

Baseline Report RE018 noted the limited delivery of CMDD by developers. There are a number of factors which could be influencing developers' decisions. Anecdotally developers have commented on the absence of any market demand in the district and given that some of the developers deliver CMDD in other jurisdictions this seems to be a significant factor.

Whilst the existing approach appears to give effect to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (RPS), as the Operative District Plan enables medium density, the attached and semidetached typologies are not being delivered on the ground. Therefore the rules and provisions are not as effective as anticipated.

The future growth in population and changing demographics signalled in Baseline Report RE004 (Density and Typology) indicates that there is the potential for an increased demand for different housing typologies. It is considered that if the price of land increases in the district in conjunction with a change in community experience and perceptions, there could, as seen elsewhere in New Zealand, be demand for comprehensively designed and delivered medium density development.

The review in Baseline Report RE018 also noted that while the Operative District Plan enables comprehensive medium residential development in other zones (although not referred to as CMDD), the assessment matters in the Operative District Plan for such development are not as conducive to good urban design outcomes as their implementation is very reliant on the ability of council staff to influence outcomes and for developers to accept this. Different market or development pressures and changes in Council staff could mean that this is not achieved under the existing approach if it is incorporated into the Proposed District Plan.

3.0 Statement of Operative District Plan approach

Currently the key provision in the Operative District Plan in relation to the provision of CMDD is the definition of *Medium Density* located in Part D of the Operative District Plan, as *Comprehensive Medium Density Development* is a subset of that definition. It is noted that the other subset is *Small-lot Medium Density*.

Provisions directly or indirectly related to the management and delivery of CMDD are located in various sections of the Township volume of the Operative District Plan. The majority of the relevant objectives and policies are located in Section B4 Growth of Townships with rules and other methods split across Sections C1 Living Zone Activities, C4 Living Zone Buildings and C12 Living Zone Subdivision. The key issue is that the term CMDD is not used in the various sections of the Operative District Plan; instead there is reference to comprehensive residential development in a number of the provisions. Due to the drafting it is potentially not clear to users if they are applicable to CMDD. This was confirmed by council staff who advise that they often have to guide plan users around the plan and at times use provisions not directly applicable to get good outcomes.

Comprehensive residential development has its own definition and due to the wording of the definition is restricted to the Living L15 zone in Prebbleton.

The CMDD definition means that CMDD can only occur in the Living Z Zone, on land identified in an ODP for medium density housing, or in a Business 1 Zone. These specific circumstances only apply in greenfield situations as these areas are predominately located on the periphery (towards the urban boundaries) of the larger townships (for example Rolleston and Lincoln). As these provisions have not been applied to other zones it theoretically means that CMDD or comprehensive residential development is expected to occur only in these locations. However, it is noted in Baseline Report RE018 that the Operative District Plan provisions can allow applications for comprehensive residential under rules such as 4.6.1 as non-complying activities.

All relevant objectives and policies have been set out in Baseline Report RE018 (Appendix 1).

4.0 Summary of relevant statutory and/or policy context and other background information

4.1 National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016

While the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (NPS-UDC) is subject to another work stream it is important to note that the Proposed District Plan must:

- provide sufficient opportunities for the development of housing land to meet demand, and provide housing choices to meet the needs of people, communities and future generations for a range of dwelling types and locations (Objective OA2);
- provide urban environments that, over time, develop and change in response to the changing needs of people, communities and future generations (Objective OA3); and
- promote the efficient use of urban land and infrastructure (Policy PA3).

The Preamble to the NPS-UDC also sets out that the NPS-UDC has a particular focus on ensuring that local authorities, through their planning, provide enough space for their populations to happily live and work. This can be both through allowing development to go “up” by intensifying existing urban areas and “out” by releasing land in greenfield areas.

4.2 National Planning Standards

As part of the 2018 amendments to the Resource Management Act (RMA) the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) is developing national planning standards to make council plans under the RMA faster to prepare and easier for plan users to understand, compare and comply with. The first set of draft standards was released for consultation on 6 June 2018. There is a submission period open until 17 August 2018 and the recently notified standards (amended potentially by submissions) are likely to be confirmed by April 2019.

While the draft standards released in June 2018 include a zone framework, standardising the range, names and purpose of zones with reference to low, medium or high density residential zones, it does not contain a guidance on the level of development anticipated by these densities. In addition there is no direct reference to CMDD. It is noted however that the standards include definitions for site, net site area that could influence the delivery of CMDD.

Once approved by the Minister for the Environment, the Council will be required to give effect to the national planning standards in its district plan. It is noted that under the draft standards, Selwyn District Council must amend its plan within 5 years of gazettal of the planning standard.

As such, the development of a new zoning framework within the Proposed District Plan will need to have regard to the national planning standards. However, at this time, as the national standards are out for consultation, the final form of the standards are unknown and it is unclear whether the standardised zones or definitions will be mandatory or able to be adapted to local circumstances.

4.3 Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013

The RPS recognises that changing demographic patterns, including the aging population and smaller households, along with providing housing choice for future generations are expected to increase the desirability of higher density development. The RPS sets out that territorial authorities will adopt a comprehensive approach to the management of the location of urban and rural-residential development to ensure that good urban design and amenity outcomes are achieved.

4.3.1 Chapter 5 Land Use and Infrastructure

The key themes evident from an analysis of the policy framework of Chapter 5 of the RPS that are relevant to this Preferred Option Report are:

- encouraging within urban areas housing choice of a character and form that supports urban consolidation (wider region) (Policy 5.3.1);
- encouraging high quality urban design, including the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values (Policy 5.3.1); and
- ensuring that substantial developments are designed and built to be of a high-quality, and are robust and resilient where amenity values, the quality of the environment, and the character of an area are maintained, or appropriately enhanced (wider region) (Policy 5.3.3).

The methods identified in Chapter 5 for implementing the policies provide clear direction to territorial authorities as to what is required of them. This includes that councils will include provisions in their district plans that:

- establish an approach for the integrated management of urban development with the primary focus of ensuring consolidated, well-designed and more sustainable urban patterns; and
- consider methods which promote good planning, building design and urban design that give effect to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol (2005).

4.3.2 Chapter 6 Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch

Chapter 6 provides a resource management framework for the recovery of Greater Christchurch. The key themes evident from an analysis of the policy framework of Chapter 6 that are relevant to this Preferred Options Report are:

- ensuring residential developments provide choice and diversity in their layout, built form, housing type and density in order to adapt to the changing needs and circumstances of the population (Policy 6.3.2);
- focusing intensification in urban areas of Greater Christchurch around the Key Activity Centres and neighbourhood centres commensurate with their scale and function, core public transport routes, mixed-use areas, and on suitable brownfield land (Policy 6.3.7); and
- providing in district plans for urban growth and limited rural residential development in comprehensive development across multiple or amalgamated sites achieving a minimum net density of 10 households per hectare in greenfield priority areas (Policy 6.3.7).

The methods identified in Chapter 6 for implementing the policies generally relate to requiring territorial authorities to give effect to specific policies through their district plans. The methods include:

- district plans objectives, policies and rules (if any) to give effect to policies;
- development of urban design guidelines to assist developers with addressing the matters set out in Policy 6.3.2;
- consideration of the principles of good urban design as reflected in the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol (2005) in urban design processes; and
- identify areas in Proposed District Plan that are suitable for urban intensification, including brownfields redevelopment and around the Key Activity Centres.

4.4 Selwyn 2031: District Development Strategy

The key outcomes anticipated by the Strategy's actions that are relevant to this Preferred Option Report are:

Protection of our existing character:

- Retain the District's sense of rural identity by adopting a consolidated approach to urban growth;
- Reinforce and enhance the character of each township by requiring outline development plans and the use of good urban design principles within new development areas.

Higher quality living environments:

- Achieve safe, functional and attractive living environments by requiring new development to occur in accordance with outline development plans, design guidelines and to give effect to higher level strategic planning documents.

There are a number of actions identified in the Strategy that require implementation through the District Plan Review that relate to the residential zone framework. These are as follows:

- review District Plan residential density provisions, including the number of Living Zones and minimum allotment sizes, to create a cohesive Living Zone framework;
- ensure that subdivision design is based on good urban design principles, including opportunities for enhancing tāngata whenua values, and integrates into the existing township as much as possible;
- monitor and review the effectiveness of ODPs through an assessment of the urban design merit of subsequent subdivision consents and the quality of built development; and
- monitor and review the effectiveness of the Council's Subdivision Design Guide, Medium Density Housing Design Guide and Commercial Design Guide in achieving high quality living and business environments.

4.5 Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan

The Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan (IMP) provides a policy framework for the "protection and enhancement of Ngāi Tahu values, and for achieving outcomes that provide for the relationship of Ngāi Tahu with natural resources across Ngā Pākihi Whakatekateka o Waitaha and Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū."

Although no specific policies relating to CMDD are specified in the IMP, there is some discussion on urban design outcomes in relation to subdivision and development, and policies around ensuring that new development plans and strategies recognise and provide for the relationship of Ngāi Tahu and their culture and traditions with ancestral land, water and sites.

5.0 Summary of alternative management responses – Other Districts

5.1 Approaches to medium density development

The second generation district plans of Christchurch, Auckland, Hamilton and Waimakariri were reviewed in Baseline Report RE018 to identify a range of methods related to delivering CMDD (or similar typology/definition). A summary of approaches used in each district plan is set out in Table 1. A description of each approach is set out in Table 2.

Table 1: Summary of approaches

	Permissive approach to multiple dwellings on the same site	No density standard in residential zones	Definition of CMDD	Definition for comprehensive residential development/ comprehensive development plan
Auckland Unitary Plan 2016 (Operative in part);	X	X		
Hamilton District Plan 2017	X	X		X
Christchurch District Plan 2017	X	X		X
Waimakariri District plan 2005				X

Table 2: Description of Approaches

Approach	Description
Permissive approach to multiple dwellings on the same site	Either a permitted activity, or the same activity status of the principal dwelling. Incentivises the development of more than one dwelling on the site, this could range from multiple detached dwelling through to units and apartments. This results in an increase in site coverage and subsequent higher density in preferred locations.
No density standard	No minimum density is set out, therefore a number of dwellings can be developed subject to other standards such as height, height to boundary and yard standards. Negative effects from this could be that land is underutilised.
Comprehensive residential development	Generally specifies at least 3 dwellings designed as a group and located on a physically contiguous site or sites. This approach is similar to the current Comprehensive Medium Density Development definition in the Operative District Plan but generally (but not always) available in a number of zones.
Comprehensive medium density development	No definition but there are medium density zones.

5.2 Plan structure

A review of the structure of the four District Plans found that these plans were intuitive in their structure; it was generally easy to find the relevant residential rules as the provisions were separated into their respective zones and all the relevant rules were in one location. Unlike the Operative District Plan's structure which requires a very good understanding of the rules and the plan related to the type of proposal, there is more certainty for users of the other plans with their structure that all relevant rules for the zone have been identified.

The review identified that a number of residential rules in the Operative District Plan could be considered to relate to CMDD due to the use of the word 'comprehensive' in the rule. It is good practice to limit the use of words that are also defined terms, unless the intention is that the defined term is to be captured by the rule.

6.0 Summary of stakeholder engagement prior to or during the drafting of the Baseline Report

Stakeholder engagement was undertaken with developers and housing providers who were identified by staff as being providers of comprehensive residential development. Discussions were held during the preparation of Baseline Report RE018.

Feedback was also sought from internal stakeholders from Selwyn District Council's Compliance and Consenting Team with regard to the administration of the Operative District Plan.

It is expected that further stakeholder engagement in relation to this topic will occur as the District Plan Review project progresses.

7.0 Summary of options to address issues

There are a range of approaches to managing CMDD in the Proposed District Plan: to retain the status quo (Option 1); to make changes through modifications and additions to the existing provisions (Options 2a and 2b); or to draft new provisions (Options 3). These options are discussed in more detail below.

7.1 Option 1 Status Quo

No changes would be made to the existing residential objectives, policies and rules, or to the structure of the Operative District Plan. The definition of CMDD (applying only to Living Z zoned land in ODP areas and Business 1 land) would be maintained along with the policy framework without modification.

Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:

This approach would not effectively address the issues identified with the Operative District Plan provisions. While the existing provisions are not achieving a diversity of housing typologies and both the meaning and structure of the plan's provisions are confusing from a plan user's perspective, the absence of market demand means that currently there is no pressure on the Council or challenges to these provisions due to the absence of market demand for CMDD.

Risks:

There would be a lost opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of management of residential activities across the District if the existing provisions were rolled over. The Operative District Plan provisions may not be best suited to respond to the projected growth in population and change in demographics and any corresponding increase in market demand for CMDD.

Budget or Time Implications:

None as no work would be required.

Stakeholder and Community Interests:

All District residents, development industry and other housing providers.

Recommendation:

That Option 1 Status Quo should not be carried forward for further consideration.

7.2 Option 2: Changes to existing provisions

This option comprises a suite of suggested modifications and amendments to the existing provisions (the status quo) that can be adopted separately or as a package.

7.2.1 Option 2a – Widen the provision for comprehensive residential development by utilising existing criteria

This sub option looks to take the opportunity already present in the existing rules in the Operative District Plan (Rule 4.6.6) that makes the erection of more than one building (other than an accessory building) which does not comply with Rule 4.6.1 a non-complying activity in Living zones. It proposes:

- changing the activity status for such applications;
- amending the definition of comprehensive residential development;
- utilising existing criteria (Rule 4.12. – Comprehensive Residential Development in Medium Density Areas covered by an Outline Development Plan); and

applying the rules potentially to existing townships such as but not necessarily limited to the Key Activity Centres (Rolleston and Lincoln) identified in the RPS. This would provide the opportunity for comprehensive residential development in all townships, in all residential zones, where relevant criteria can be met. Potential methods are set out in further detail in Table 3.

Table 3: Widen provision for multiple dwellings

Widen provision	Comment	Recommendation
Introduce explicit provision for comprehensive 'multiple' residential development on the same site in all residential zones	<p>This options involves providing for multiple principal dwellings on a large site as a restricted discretionary activity in all residential zones.</p> <p>This option is effective on larger sites (existing or through site amalgamation) able to accommodate multiple principal dwellings either by adding to existing dwellings or involving removal of the</p>	This option be carried forward for further consideration

Widen provision	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>existing dwelling/dwellings and adding new dwellings on one or more sites.</p> <p>Further investigation is required in terms of where this option is applied. A starting point could be the existing Key Activity Centres (Rolleston and Lincoln). Alignment with the subdivision provisions is required to ensure that site amalgamation and subsequent subdivision around existing development is provided for.</p>	
Utilise criteria in Rule 4.12.1 for assessing comprehensive 'multiple' residential development in residential zones	<p>This option involves using the existing criteria and applying them to applications for multiple dwellings in all residential zones.</p> <p>Further investigation is required in terms of what additional matters are included in 4.12.1 to ensure that urban design standards manage the effects of various forms of multiple dwellings development. The criteria could be broadened to include locational criteria to access to key facilities that reduces reliance of motor vehicles.</p>	This option be carried forward for further consideration
Amend the comprehensive residential development definition	<p>Amend the existing definition of 'comprehensive residential development' to remove the limitation that it applies only to the Living L15 zone in Prebbleton and if needed create a separate definition for Prebbleton.</p> <p>Bring the definition in line with the Ministry for the Environment definition for medium density housing to provide for a more comprehensive approach and enable both small lot medium density and comprehensive medium density. (It is noted that a new definition may be proposed in future National Planning Standards).</p> <p>Further investigation is required in terms of what additional criteria should apply and whether the definition should include a provision for multiple (four or more) dwellings.</p>	This option be carried forward for further consideration
Non-notification rule	<p>In 2017 amendments were made to the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) which now precludes public notification in certain circumstances.</p> <p>Section 95A(5)(b) states that public notification is precluded <i>the application is for a resource consent for 1 or more of the following, but no other, activities:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(i) a controlled activity;</i> <i>(ii) a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity, but only if the activity is a subdivision of land or a residential activity;</i> <i>(iii) a restricted discretionary, discretionary, or non-complying activity, but only if the activity is a boundary activity;</i> <i>(iv) a prescribed activity (see section 360H(1)(a)(i)).</i> <p>It is not recommended that a provision be included in the Proposed District Plan that duplicates what is addressed in the RMA.</p>	This option not be carried forward for further consideration

Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:

This sub option potentially incentivises increases in density in existing townships. This could encourage the provision of a range of housing typologies and may facilitate the uptake by property owners, housing providers and developers of development potential.

This option will support the policies in the RPS seeking consolidated, well-designed and more sustainable urban patterns in existing urban areas.

Risks:

Residents may raise concerns about the scale of development potentially encouraged by these incentives and the perceived impact it could have on the amenity of existing residential neighbourhoods. Given the perception of medium density development as outlined in the Baseline Report RE018 it is recommended that stakeholder engagement is undertaken to explicitly discuss the potential changes to the Proposed District Plan if this option is pursued. The potential impact of such a change to some neighbourhoods needs to be outlined along with the benefits such as utilising locational assessment criteria that support enhanced access to key facilities. This is potentially a change given the existing plan's approach that could be subject of challenges if included in the Proposed District Plan.

Budget or Time Implications:

This option will require the drafting of amended provisions, stakeholder engagement, testing of provisions, and further investigation and evaluation to determine the new criteria and specific townships to be subject to the proposed provisions. To protect this sub option from a successful challenge, a full assessment of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects, supporting research, investigations and information and an analysis of the costs and benefits including qualitative and quantitative and, where appropriate, an identification of the recipients of the costs and benefits, as required by s32 of the RMA should be undertaken.

Stakeholder and Community Interests:

All District residents, development industry and other housing providers.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that Option 2a be carried forward for further investigation.

7.2.2 Option 2b: Redraft District Plan provisions

This sub option involves amending the existing provisions (definition and rules) that are related to comprehensive residential development and CMDD, within specified zones and areas where medium density development is specifically encouraged. This option is considered necessary and stands on its own merits, whether Option 2a is pursued or not.

Table 4: Amend existing provisions

Amend existing provision	Comment	Recommendation
Deleting the definition of Medium Density	The existing definition refers to small lot and CMDD. There is no need for a medium density definition particularly if a medium density zone is drafted and applied. The existing definition is also not needed if the definition of comprehensive residential development is amended as suggested above. Further investigation is required in terms of what additional changes may be needed to other definitions.	This option is recommended
Amending existing provisions to ensure that use of term 'comprehensive' is appropriate to the rule and its application	Given the use of 'comprehensive' throughout the plan, reviewing its application is essential.	This option is recommended

Amend existing provision	Comment	Recommendation
Revisiting the subdivision section of the plan to make subdivision related to semi-detached and attached housing typologies clear and as simple as possible	Review the subdivision rules to determine how effective they are for different forms of housing typologies.	This option is recommended

Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:

This option essentially involves realigning existing provisions to ‘tighten’ up the drafting and implementation issues identified with the Operative District Plan.

Risks:

By making only the changes outlined, the opportunity to reinforce consolidation of the existing townships, and improve the potential for implementation of growth as envisaged in the RPS and the existing objectives (such as B4.3.3) of the Operative District Plan is not achieved. However it also means that, if there are changes in the factors that currently influence market trends in the district that result in increased pressure to deliver more dense development, there is the potential that unforeseen or perverse outcomes are avoided.

Budget or Time Implications:

This option will require restructuring and minor amendments to the rules and standards. Therefore less time and budget will be required to undertake this option as opposed to the drafting new provisions.

Stakeholder and Community Interests:

All District residents, housing providers and developers.

Recommendation:

Option 2b should be carried forward for further consideration.

7.3 Option 3: New rules associated with different approaches to comprehensive residential development

This approach assumes that, as part of the review of other residential provisions in the Operative District Plan, it is considered appropriate to provide for residential development through a different approach such as proposed in the draft National Standards (low, medium and high density zones with some amendments to address the local setting). This option was outlined in the Preferred Option Report for RE207.

Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:

Adopting the National Planning Standard option, or a similar approach, would be an effective method to address the issue of simplifying the residential zone framework and it may not be necessary to specifically provide for comprehensive residential development as the zones would provide for a diversity in housing typologies and give effect to the RPS.

Risks:

The provisions of each National Planning Standard zone have yet to be confirmed as they are open for submissions until 17 August 2018 and are not likely to be confirmed until April 2019.

The National Planning Standard zones in the current draft form includes a zone category that does not reflect local circumstances.

The Selwyn community may not be aware of the implications of the National Planning Standards and could challenge the application of the standards through the Proposed District Plan process.

Budget or Time Implications:

This option could result in /require limited drafting. Stakeholder engagement on the National Planning Standards is being carried out by MfE following notification in June 2018.

Stakeholder and Community Interests:

All District residents, housing providers and developers. The community may raise concerns with regard to the types and scale of development which could occur under these standard zones. Stakeholder engagement should be undertaken in relation to the National Planning Standards as the Selwyn community may not understand that the standards could apply to the district. Feedback received should be used to refine the application of the zones and the provisions

Recommendation:

Option 3 Preparation of an approach with a range of zones that includes a 'medium density' zone (such as proposed with the National Planning Standards zones) should be considered as Selwyn District Council must give effect to the National Standards potentially by 2024.

8.0 Conclusion

The key conclusions of this Preferred Option Report is that the current provisions in the Operative District Plan related to CMDD require review. The options (particularly Options 2a and 2b) involve amendments that would address most of the issues raised in Section 2 of this report.

It is noted that a wider review of the residential provisions is recommended in the Preferred Option Report for RE207. The amendments recommended in option 2a and 2b could be included in that review.

9.0 Preferred Option for further engagement

In summary the recommended options for further consideration and engagement are:

- Option 2a and 2b: Realignment of existing provisions
- Option 3: new rules – such as National Planning Standards adapted to local circumstances.

Appendix 1: Baseline Report RE018 – CMDD