
POST ENGAGEMENT PREFERRED OPTION UPDATE REPORT TO DISTRICT PLAN COMMITTEE

DATE:	16 October 2018
TOPIC NAME:	Residential
SCOPE DESCRIPTION:	Housing development in residential zones (RE207, RE016 and RE018)
TOPIC LEAD:	Jocelyn Lewes
PREPARED BY:	Jocelyn Lewes (Strategy and Policy Planner)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<i>Summary of Preferred Option Endorsed by DPC for Further Engagement:</i>	<p>That the Proposed District Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• rationalise the large number of living zones down to four zones, as proposed by the draft National Planning Standards and that specific objective and policies be drafted for each zone;• encourage medium density residential development not only within specific zones but also in appropriate areas within townships where relevant criteria can be met; and• provide for alternative forms of housing, such as retirement villages, supported accommodation and boarding houses, including the incorporation of appropriate definitions, policies and rules.
<i>Summary of Feedback Received:</i>	Feedback from Environment Canterbury, Canterbury District Health Board, Ministry of Social Development, Retirement Villages Association, various infrastructure and industry bodies, Public feedback received via Engagement HQ and email
<i>Recommended Option Post Engagement:</i>	That the preferred options previously endorsed by DPC be progressed to the drafting and Section 32 evaluation phase.
<i>DPC Decision:</i>	That the preferred options previously endorsed by DPC be progressed to the drafting and Section 32 evaluation phase.



1.0 Introduction

1.1 Overview of Preferred Options Endorsed by DPC

Engagement on this topic combined three preferred option reports endorsed by DPC in respect of residential character, amenity, density and housing typologies. A summary of the endorsed option for each report is provided below.

Alternative Housing (RE016)

This report discussed providing for alternative forms of housing, such as retirement villages, supported accommodation and boarding houses and recognised that, while these are essentially residential activities, they are generally of a greater intensity than that of a detached dwelling and, in the case of retirement villages, offer a range of other complementary activities (such as recreation, social, community and health) in an integrated manner. The endorsed approach was to amend the District Plan, through the development of objectives, policies and definitions, to provide a context for the consideration of issues associated with the provision of alternative housing and provide specific guidance (rules) in relation to the form that this housing may take. Recognition that there are particular considerations related to alternative housing will help to improve the process for assessing applications.

Comprehensive Medium Density Development (RE018)

While the Operative District Plan enables a range of housing typologies, the comprehensive medium density provisions are not being taken up by developers, in part due to issues with the current structure and clarity of terminology and definitions. This has led to medium density development being delivered as stand-alone dwellings on small lots rather than as attached and semi-detached dwellings as envisioned. The endorsed approach to addressing these issues included amending the existing provisions (definition and rules) and providing an opportunity for comprehensive residential development not only within specified zones and areas where medium density development is specifically encouraged but in all townships where relevant criteria can be met. This could encourage the provision of a range of housing typologies and may facilitate the uptake of the development potential by property owners, housing providers and developers.

Residential Character, Amenity, Density and Housing Typologies (RE207)

This report 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, four zones were endorsed being General Residential Zone, Medium Density Residential Zone, Large Lot Residential Zone and Settlement 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 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.

2.0 Summary of Feedback Received

2.1 Partner/Stakeholder Feedback

Environment Canterbury

Environment Canterbury advised that they:

- support the simplification of the residential zone framework;
- support the encouragement of diverse housing stock and more comprehensive medium density housing; and
- support the encouragement of choice, consolidation, and sustainable urban design in town centres.

Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB)

The CDHB advised that they consider that housing is a key determinant of health and that having a range of diverse, safe, dry and affordable housing close to where people work and play is important for promoting physical health and mental wellbeing. However, their position is that residential development should be carefully planned to ensure utility infrastructure can effectively service growing townships. The CDHB supports having a wide range of different density housing options for affordability and to meet different household sizes and advised that they see merit in reducing the number of residential zones.

The CDHB recommended that housing developments:

- be linked to utility infrastructure. The CDHB noted that the zoning of land needs to be linked with Council's Long Term Plan funding for key infrastructure to prevent issues like the current wastewater infrastructure in Darfield/Kirwee.
- should include Life Mark design principles and high Energy Standards. These result in housing designed to be usable, safe and sustainable for people of all ages, abilities and stages.

The CDHB also recommended that a rule be considered around requiring greenway/walkway connections at the end of new cul-de-sacs to improve walkability, encourage active transport and improve connectivity between housing developments and other zones.

Ministry of Social Development

While the Ministry does not currently have landholdings within the district, it expressed an interest in any district plan provisions that might have an impact on its ability to perform its core functions. The Ministry supports the inclusion of enabling provisions for alternative forms of housing in the Proposed District Plan, but has requested a more permissive activity status than that indicated in the preferred options report, with specific built form standards appropriate to that activity.

Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand (RVA)

The RVA is a voluntary, nationally-based membership association representing the interest of operators, developers and managers of retirement villages throughout New Zealand. The feedback provided by RVA is generally supportive of the approach taken to acknowledge retirement villages and the role that they can play in providing essential, affordable and purpose-built accommodation for older people, as one of the solutions to the housing challenges the District faces.

The RVA requested that:

- the Proposed District Plan makes explicit provision for “registered retirement villages” in each of the residential zones and that it also provides for aged residential care facilities, where a day-to-day care and assistance is provided, to be part of a retirement village development in all residential zones;
- that residential zone objectives and policies acknowledge that retirement villages are a residential use, and that their development is actively supported in all residential zones; and
- that built form standards applicable to residential zones be suspended for retirement villages in favour of a more practical set of standards that meet operators’ and residents’ needs while fitting into the residential environment.

Where there are existing registered villages, the RVA also submitted that these developments be provided with an overlay which would permit a greater degree of development and redevelopment either without the need for consent, or alternatively for a more certain activity status such as a controlled activity.

Infrastructure Providers

KiwiRail, Christchurch International Airport Company (CIAL), Transpower and IPort/Rolleston Industrial Holdings Ltd/Rolleston Industrial Development Ltd provided feedback on noise sensitive uses and/or reverse sensitivity activities such as residential development.

KiwiRail and CIAL both sought the imposition of acoustic attenuation matters, such as setbacks and building design requirements, where development would be located in proximity to a noise source. These bodies also suggested a proposed definition of activities sensitive to noise in their feedback.

Transpower noted that the National Grid traverses the existing settlements of West Melton, Darfield and Arthurs Pass and that restrictions would be sought relating to sensitive activities, such as housing developments, within the National Grid Yard, which is the area beneath and immediately next to national grid lines.

2.2 Public Feedback

Engagement HQ

During the public consultation period, 226 people visited the page on housing development in residential zones (aware participants). Of these, 120 people took some form of action, being downloading a document or visiting the FAQ page (informed participants). Of these, 24 people completed the survey (engaged participants).

Demographic analysis of the survey participants indicated that:

- 22 respondents live in Selwyn, with 19 living in towns and 3 living in rural areas. 2 respondents did not live in Selwyn.
- The majority of respondents live in the Selwyn Central ward.

The majority of respondents agreed that the district needs to provide for alternative types of housing such as housing for the elderly and people with special needs, and for boarding houses and that there is a need for more medium density development. There were three responses which were not supportive of boarding houses.

The survey asked participants what they thought would make it easier to build a more diverse housing stock within the district. Comments received in response to the question included allowing for greater diversity through a variety of section sizes, including smaller sections, as well as smaller houses, like semi-detached dwellings and apartments.

The majority of respondents supported the preferred option of reducing the number of zones as well as the four zones proposed. Feedback indicated that this option could make the planning process easier to follow and less time consuming but indicated that the District Plan needed to be clear about the form and character of residential development desired in each zone and where the zone boundaries might be drawn.

General comments received largely supported the preferred approaches to encouraging a more diverse stock of housing to cater for the changing population within the district, while still maintaining the existing character and amenity of the area.

Emails

In addition to the feedback received through the Engagement HQ website, a number of emails were received from individuals relating to housing development. While the matters raised were varied, there was generally support for the direction of the preferred option reports to make provision in the Proposed District Plan for alternative forms of housing, be that retirement villages, medium density developments or boarding houses.

One individual submission requested alternative forms of housing should also be specifically identified as non-notified and not requiring affected party approvals. This submission also sought to allow for medium density housing throughout the proposed General and Medium Density Residential Zones, rather than concentrated within the one area (zone).

3.0 Analysis of Feedback Received

All of the feedback received is considered to be supportive of the approaches endorsed in the preferred option reports, however there were a number of minor issues raised that could have an impact on the subsequent drafting of provisions in the Proposed District Plan. These are discussed below.

3.1 More permissive approach to housing, including retirement villages and supported accommodation

The Ministry of Social Development, the RVA and an individual submission requested a more permissive activity status to alternative and medium density housing development than that put forward in the Preferred Options Report be considered within the Proposed District Plan.

Currently, the lack of recognition in the Operative District Plan for alternative forms of housing, combined with the lack of specific standards, means that applications for alternative forms of housing are most likely to be determined to be non-complying. This gives rise to uncertainty to developers, given the possible notification requirements and extent of matters able to be considered by Council in making a decision. Despite this, as evidence in the Preferred Options Report, development has still been achieved.

While alternative forms of housing should be facilitated within most residential areas, these forms of housing are likely to give rise to effects on surrounding communities and for this reason it is considered appropriate that the Proposed District Plan incorporate appropriate standards and retain a measure of discretion over these developments. Overall, no change to the endorsed approach is recommended.

3.2 Boarding Houses

A number of survey respondents objected to boarding houses in residential areas. These responses appear to be related to issues associated with an existing dwelling currently being occupied by students in Lincoln.

The Operative District Plan does not recognise boarding houses as a specific residential activity and therefore it is harder to manage this activity or the possible effects such as increased traffic generation and a greater need for on-site car parking. Hence it is considered appropriate that the Proposed District Plan recognise boarding houses as an activity in its own right, which is the direction of the Alternative Housing preferred options report.

3.3 Reverse Sensitivity and Noise

The large infrastructure providers within the District, being KiwiRail, CIAL, Transpower and IPort all provided feedback in relation to reverse sensitivity issues, mainly associated with the noise of their activities and sought that the Proposed District Plan recognise these activities, either through the application of or exemption from regulations.

Presently land which is of concern or control to both the CIAL and IPort is located outside of residential township boundaries. However, there are a number of townships where the activities of KiwiRail and Transpower need to be considered in relation to residential activities.

The matters raised by these providers are being addressed by other work streams, principally the noise and vibration workstream and the network utilities and infrastructure workstream.

4.0 Recommended Option Post Engagement

The Project Team recommends that:

- The Preferred Option previously endorsed by DPC progresses to the 'Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase'.