
PREFERRED OPTION REPORT TO DISTRICT PLAN COMMITTEE

DATE: July 2018

TOPIC NAME: Business Zone Environments (BS203)

SCOPE DESCRIPTION: Preferred Option Report for Interfaces with Non-Business Zones and Achievement of Urban Design Best Practice in Town Centres

TOPIC LEAD: Jessica Tuilaepa

PREPARED BY: Andrew Cumberpatch, Stantec New Zealand

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<i>Issue(s)</i>	<p><i>Key issues for this topic are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Commercial and industrial activities can potentially generate a range of effects at the zone interface that affect residential amenity;</i>• <i>The existing provisions of the Operative District Plan:</i><ul style="list-style-type: none">- <i>Lack a clear definition of ‘public space’;</i>- <i>Have led to active frontages being located behind car parking areas and sites being dominated by car parks;</i>- <i>Lack principles and guidance on how the style of buildings fit into the Selwyn District context; and</i>- <i>Don’t adequately address the interface with other zones in terms of visual integration.</i>
<i>Preferred Option</i>	<p><i>While there are a number of existing provisions of the Operative District Plan that have been effective in the management of the Business Zone Environments (both interface with non-business zones and urban design in town centres), the Project Team recommend for both scopes Option 2; which involves minor amendments to these existing provisions.</i></p>
<i>DPC Decision</i>	<p><i>“That the preferred option for the ‘Interfaces with Non-Business Zones and Achievement of Urban Design Best Practice in Town centres’ is endorsed for further engagement (targeted stakeholder engagement, Section 32 and Drafting Phase), except that the retention of the recession plane rule requirement for industrial sites adjoining rural sites and the proposed definition for ‘Active Frontage’ are subject to further investigation.”</i></p>

Coversheet for Selwyn District Plan Committee decision on:

Preferred Option Report: BS203 – Interfaces with Non-Business Zones and Achievement of Urban Design Best Practice in Town centres

On the 25th of July 2018 a Preferred Option Report was taken to the District Plan Committee Meeting for endorsement.

The Preferred Option Report recommended the following:

“That the Committee endorses the Preferred Options for ‘Interfaces with Non-Business Zones and Achievement of Urban Design Best Practice in Town Centres’ for further development and engagement.”

As a result of the discussions during this committee meeting, the recommendations made in the Preferred Option Report were subject to amendments, which were subsequently endorsed.

The amendments to the recommended preferred option are as follows:

“That the preferred option for the ‘Interfaces with Non-Business Zones and Achievement of Urban Design Best Practice in Town centres’ is endorsed for further engagement (targeted stakeholder engagement, Section 32 and Drafting Phase), except that the retention of the recession plane rule requirement for industrial sites adjoining rural sites and the proposed definition for ‘Active Frontage’ are subject to further investigation.”

1.0 Introduction

The Business Interface Baseline Report (Scope BS002) sought to establish the most appropriate planning mechanisms to achieve acceptable levels of amenity where business zones (B1 and B2) adjoin more sensitive residential or rural zones within Selwyn District. Baseline Report BS002 recommended a number of options in terms of amendments to the Operative District Plan provisions to manage the interface issues from the existing business zones. Baseline Report BS002 is attached as **Appendix 1**.

The Urban Design Best Practice Baseline Report (Scope BS003) sought to establish the most appropriate planning mechanisms to achieve positive urban form and built environment outcomes within Selwyn District's main commercial centres (B1 zone). Baseline Report BS003 recommended a number of options in terms of amendments to the Operative District Plan's B1 zone provisions for managing activities and the built form. Baseline Report BS003 is attached as **Appendix 2**.

In addition to Baseline Report BS003, Gabi Wolfer, the Council's Senior Urban Designer, has prepared an assessment table of built development and implementation processes relating to the current B1 Zone under the Operative District Plan. The document, entitled DPR B1 Zones Review, is attached as **Appendix 3**.

The purpose of this Preferred Option Report is to provide summaries of these documents and to identify respective issues and options for addressing the management of the business zone environments within Selwyn District.

Preferred options have been identified and outlined. If endorsed by the Council, the preferred options will form the basis of further engagement with targeted stakeholders as part of the District Plan Review project.

The findings of this Preferred Option Report should be considered alongside that of the Preferred Option Report for the Business Zone Framework (Scope BS202); which identifies issues and options for the development of an overarching Business Zone Framework for Selwyn District.

2.0 Summary of Issues

2.1 Interfaces with Non-Business Zones

Baseline Report BS002 identifies the types of potential effects from B1 zoned commercial activities (such as retailing, offices, food and beverage outlets) in town centres that can impact on the amenity of surrounding residential areas. These effects include noise, odour, lighting and glare, loss of privacy/outlook/sunlight and traffic and parking generation.

Baseline Report BS002 also identifies that industrial activities within the B2, B2A and B2B zones also generate a similar range of effects that affect residential amenity; albeit the character of these effects can differ from commercial activities and may for example include potential risks from the use and storage of hazardous goods or involve heavy vehicle movements.

Buildings used for commercial and/or industrial purposes can also be of much a larger scale and therefore visually dominant.

From discussions with the Council’s monitoring and enforcement officers it was determined that there does not appear to be a pattern of effects that generate complaints or systemic issues along Business Zone interfaces with more sensitive activities. The general feedback was that in-zone business activities appear to be well run and do not generate unacceptable effects beyond their site boundaries, and that this operational practice is combined with resident expectations that a degree of non-residential levels of amenity are anticipated if you own a house next door to a long-established business zone.

Complaints from residents were more commonly generated by business activities taking place within residential areas, or non-rural activities occurring on rural properties, especially where these are located in close proximity to existing lifestyle blocks.¹ We note that these matters are to be addressed within the following separate scopes:

- Home-based Businesses (RE008);
- Business activities in Rural Zone (RU002); and
- Noise (DW005).

2.2 Urban Design in Town Centres

Baseline Report BS003

Baseline Report BS003 included an assessment of some of Selwyn District’s town centres and recent development projects that obtained resource consent under the Operative District Plan rule framework. This noted it is challenging to draw definitive conclusions as to the efficiency and effectiveness of the Plan’s regulatory framework in terms of delivering positive urban form and built environment outcomes; especially given that the majority of this framework has only been in place for a relatively short period of time.

The review concluded that while there could be some improvements, recent projects did not identify any systemic problems or shortcomings with the Operative District Plan framework in terms of activity and built form standards, and that the qualitative urban design assessment matters also appear to provide adequate scope for considering a range of urban design matters.

DPR B1 Zones Review

Within the DPR B1 Zones Review, Ms Wolfer identified the following issues:

- The lack of a clear definition of ‘public space’ within the Operative District Plan;
- The Operative District Plan definition of ‘active frontage’ doesn’t extend far enough and has led to active frontages sitting behind car parking areas;
- Principles/guidance on how the style of buildings fits into the Selwyn District context are required;

¹ It is understood complaints have arisen from residents of Armack Drive, Rolleston, regarding noise levels from some operations within the nearby B2A Zone.

- Provisions are required to address the interface with other zones to visually integrate new development and avoid large blank walls etc.; and
- The Operative District Plan requirements can lead to sites being dominated by car parks.

Further to the points raised above, Ms Wolfer has also provided feedback that she considers the existing policy framework to generally be appropriate, but that tighter links to the rules and definitions are required to achieve better urban design outcomes and that where possible the Council's existing Design Guide for Commercial Development should be integrated into the Proposed Plan.

3.0 Statement of Operative District Plan approach

Sections 3.1 and 3.2 below summarise the specific rules/regulatory framework within the current Operative District Plan for how both the interfaces with non-business zones and urban design within the B1 Zone town centres are managed. In addition, listed below are a number of key over-arching objectives and policies of the Operative District Plan which relate to amenity values and are considered to be relevant to these topics.

Township Volume

Objective B3.4.1 – The District's townships are pleasant places to live and work in.

Objective B3.4.2 – A variety of activities are provided for in townships, while maintaining the character and amenity values of each zone.

Objective B3.4.3 – "Reverse sensitivity" effects between activities are avoided.

Policy B3.4.5 – To provide Business 1 Zones which enable a range of business activities to operate while maintaining environmental quality and aesthetic and amenity values which make the zone(s) attractive to people.

Policy B3.4.6 – (a) To provide Business 2 and 2B Zones with few requirements for aesthetic or amenity values, but which have sufficient provisions: to safeguard people's health and well-being and to avoid pollution of natural resources or potential 'reverse sensitivity' effects. (b) To provide a Business 2A Zone which can cater for business activities requiring large footprint buildings and/or sites but which have sufficient provisions to safeguard people's health and well-being and avoid pollution of natural resources or potential 'reverse sensitivity' effects.

Policy B3.4.23 - Allow people freedom in their choice of the design of buildings or structures except where building design needs to be managed to:...Maintain and establish pleasant and attractive streets and public areas in the Business 1 zone.

Policy B3.4.24(a) – Ensure that Business 1 zoned town centres are walkable and well integrated, and that development in those town centres contributes to the economic and social vibrancy of the District's towns...

Objective B4.3.1 - The expansion of townships does not adversely affect: ...Amenity values of the township.

Policy B4.3.108 - Promote the comprehensive development or redevelopment of sites in Key Activity Centres, where these contribute to the function, amenity and vitality of the centre, and provide for quality urban design.

Policy B4.3.109 - Promote the development of vibrant, integrated and coordinated Key Activity Centres by ensuring that appropriate activities are located within predefined precincts that enhance the overall form and functionality of the centre.

Rural Volume

Objective B3.4.1 – The District’s rural area is a pleasant place to live and work in.

Objective B3.4.2 – A variety of activities are provided for in the rural area, while maintaining rural character and avoiding reverse sensitivity effects.

3.1 Interfaces with Non-Business Zones

Regulatory framework for Business 1 Zone Interface

Baseline Report BS002 identifies that the B1 zone rule package is designed to where possible provide residential neighbours to commercial activities with a level of amenity commensurate with a Residential zone (i.e. the onus is generally on adjacent business activities to manage their effects down to a residential level). This approach is consistently applied through both building bulk and location performance standards, and activity-focused controls.² The key provisions are as follows:

- Recession planes: Buildings to comply with residential recession planes along internal boundaries with Living or Rural zones (rule 16.7.1);
- Maximum height: Height generally limited to 10m (compared to 8m in residential zones) (Table C16.1);
- Site coverage and boundary setback requirements (West Melton, Rolleston and Castle Hill only – rules 16.5.1, 16.5.2 and 16.7.2);
 - In Rolleston Precinct 2, building setbacks from internal boundaries with a Living Zone of 12m;
 - In Rolleston, building setbacks from Rolleston Drive of 3m in Precincts 2 and 4 and 10m in Precinct 3;
 - In West Melton, building setback from an internal boundary with a Living Zone of 3m;
 - In Castle Hill, building setback of 6m from both road and internal boundaries and site coverage does not exceed 50%;
 - Outside of the above, there are no site coverage and boundary setback requirements;
- Qualitative urban design assessments:

² The existing provisions sit alongside other potentially relevant district-wide controls relating to noise, glare, transport, parking and signage

- Outside of the Key Activity Centre (KACs) new buildings of less than 450m² are permitted, provided they are built to the road boundary with active frontages, verandas, and parking (if any) to the rear.
- Outside of the KACs, developments of more than 450m² are subject to a restricted discretionary urban design assessment.
- In the KACs of Rolleston and Lincoln all new buildings are subject to an urban design assessment as a controlled activity, with one of the assessment matters being “whether the site layout and location of storage and waste areas minimizes the potential for disturbance and a loss of amenity for residential neighbours” (rule 16.12.1 and assessment matter 16.12.2.13).
- Activity controls:
 - Any industrial activity, transport depot, manufacture or disposal of any hazardous substance, and any activity that requires an offensive trade license issued under the Health Act 1956 is non-complying. Likewise there are controls on residential activities establishing within the Rolleston and West Melton B1 zones;
 - A specific activity Table 13.1 that controls the range of activities that can establish in the Rolleston and Lincoln B1 Zones (KACs);
 - Noise assessed within a Living Zone or within the notional boundary of any dwelling in a Rural Zone is subject to limits set out in rule 22.4.1.2. The L10 limits are 5dBA higher than those that apply within the residential zones under rule 10.6.1;
 - Rule 22.4.2 control hours of operation, the location of outdoor areas and noise levels within West Melton B1 zones;
 - Light spill is to be less than 3 lux on to any part of any adjoining Living Zone or within the notional boundary of any dwelling in a Rural Zone (rule 22.5.1.2). This is the same limit as applies within Living Zones under rule 10.7.1; and
 - Outdoor storage areas are to be screened from both roads and internal boundaries by a fence, wall, or vegetation of at least 1.8m in height (rule 22.6.1).

Regulatory framework for Business 2, 2A and 2B Zone Interfaces

Baseline Report BS002 notes that while the B2 zoned areas are generally on the periphery, rather than the centre of townships, the B2 Zone rule package reflects the functional requirements of industry. The rule package therefore takes an approach of screening and separation, along with restricting the establishment of sensitive activities within these areas. Newer B2A and B2B Zones are also subject to Outline Development Plans and bespoke rules controlling the interface and boundary treatment of these areas.

In summary the key interface-related provisions are as follows:

- Landscaping: The area between any principal building and the road boundary is to be landscaped (rule 16.1.1), with additional landscaping requirements in Rolleston and Lincoln;
- Heights: Limited to 15m for buildings and 25m for structures (rule 16.6 and Tables C16.1 and 16.2);

- Recession Planes: Buildings to comply with residential recession planes along internal boundaries with Living or Rural Zones (rule 16.7.1);
- Setback: Buildings are to be setback 2m from both road and internal boundaries (where adjoining a Living Zone) in the B2 Zone; 10m for road and Rural Zone boundaries in the B2A Zone, and 5m for road, 3m for Rural, and 50m for Living Zone boundaries in the B2B Zone (rules 16.7.2.6-8);
- Noise, glare, and screening of outdoor storage rules are the same as for the B1 Zones set out above; and
- Activity controls:
 - Controls on any activity that requires an offensive trade license issued under the Health Act 1956. Within the B2A Zone there are additional controls on a specified list of industrial processes/activities that have the potential to generate amenity-related effects, either as a controlled or fully discretionary activity (rule 13.1 and associated sub-clauses).
 - Activity controls in the B2 and B2A Zones manage the establishment of sensitive activities within these zones, including non-custodial residential units, visitor accommodation, and hospitality.

3.2 Urban Design in Town Centres

Baseline Report BS003 identifies that the Operative District Plan manages urban design within the B1 Zone through the combination of performance standards (quantitative controls on built form), controls on activities and qualitative urban design assessments.

Rule 16.9.1 permits buildings (or additions) of less than 450m² within all townships outside of the KAC precincts as identified in Appendices 29A and 29B without the need for an urban design assessment, provided that they generally comply with the following:

- No car parking is provided between the frontage of any building and the road;
- At least 50% (by length) of each building frontage which directly faces on-site public space or a road or other area where the public has legal right of access, shall be installed and maintained as active commercial frontage³ (i.e. windows);
- The maximum height of any fence between the building façade and the road boundary shall be 1m; and
- Every building adjoining or within 3m of a road boundary is to have a verandah. The verandah is to extend to within 0.5m of the formed road edge, be a minimum of 3m deep (except where this would conflict with the 0.5m road setback), and shall extend along the entire frontage of the building and adjoin verandahs on adjacent buildings.

Buildings over 450m² are addressed through rule 16.10 whereby a non-notified resource consent is required for a restricted discretionary activity. The Council's discretion is limited to a range of design and context matters (16.10.2.1-16.10.2.7). The main issue being the wording of each assessment matter ending with 'where practicable', which significantly reduces the weight that

³ It is noted that the Operative District Plan currently does not have a definition for 'active commercial frontage' (or 'active frontage')

the assessment matter can be given. A reference is made to the Council's Commercial Design Guide at the end of rule 16.10.

Buildings located within the KAC Precincts 1-4, 7, and 8 (Rolleston and Lincoln town centres) are not subject to the above two rules. New development instead requires a non-notified resource consent as a controlled activity for all new buildings, regardless of size. The assessment matters are broadly similar to those that apply for large buildings outside the KACs, along with specific direction as to the outcomes sought in various precincts. The rule package also includes the identification of streets where an 'active frontage' and 'building line' are required.

Rule 16.12 of the Operative District Plan (Buildings and Urban Design) currently includes a note highlighting that the Council has developed a Design Guide for Commercial Development which applicants are encouraged to consider.

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

4.1 Canterbury Regional Policy Statement

The Canterbury Regional Policy Statement⁴ (CRPS) contains a number of amenity related provisions which are considered to be relevant to the topics of the interface of business zones with adjoining non-business zones and urban design within town centres and business zoned land. These include:

- Development is located and designed so that it functions in a way that avoids conflicts between incompatible activities (Objective 5.2.1.1(l));
- Encourage high quality urban design, including the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values (Policy 5.3.1.5);
- Ensure substantial developments are of a high-quality, and amenity values, the quality of the environment and the character of an area are maintained, or appropriately enhanced (Policy 5.3.3.2);
- The land use and infrastructure framework for Greater Christchurch is to enable KACs which provide a focus for high quality development that incorporates the principles of good urban design (Objectives 6.2.1.2 and 6.2.3.1);
- Business development is to give effect to the principles of good urban design and those of the NZ Urban Design Protocol 2005 to the extent appropriate to the context (Policy 6.3.2);
- Ensure reverse sensitivity effects and conflicts between incompatible activities are identified and avoided or mitigated against within business land in Greater Christchurch (Policy 6.3.6.8);

⁴ Operative 2013 (Revised February 2017)

- Ensure business land in Greater Christchurch provides for healthy working environments and appropriately manages the reverse sensitivity issues of mixed use development within Key Activity Centres (Policy 6.3.6.11); and
- Ensure business land in Greater Christchurch provides for healthy working environments in a manner which incorporates good urban design principles appropriate to the context (Policy 6.3.6.12).

The CRPS requires that territorial authorities *will*:

- Include objectives, policies and rules (if any) in district plans to give effect to Policies 6.3.2 and 6.3.6; and
- Identify trigger thresholds for office and retail commercial activities in industrial areas where these activities are likely to give rise to distributional effects, particularly on larger commercial centres, or result in reverse sensitivity effects.

Further, the CRPS states that territorial authorities *should*:

- Develop urban design guidelines to assist developers with addressing the matters set out in Policy 6.3.2;
- Consider the principles of good urban design as reflected in the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol (2005) in urban design processes;
- Consider appropriate administrative and financial arrangements to enable and encourage business land provision to occur; and
- Identify neighbourhood centres in district plans.

4.2 Action 27 of the Land Use Recovery Plan

Under Section 24(1)(c) of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011 (the CER Act), the Council was directed to change or vary any objectives, policies, or methods of the Operative District Plan to give effect to Action 27 of the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP).

The LURP was a strategic planning document developed under the CER Act for Greater Christchurch area following the Canterbury Earthquakes which identified a series of actions to enable the successful recovery of the area and to guide a coordinated approach to urban growth over the area; including the towns of Lincoln, Prebbleton and Rolleston. The LURP was approved by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery and was gazetted on 6 December 2013.

Action 27 of the LURP required the identification of the extent of KACs in Selwyn District and the rule package associated with those centres. Given the geographic extent of the LURP was limited to Greater Christchurch and Action 27 was limited to the KACs, the resulting amendments to the Operative District Plan were limited to the Business zones in Rolleston and Lincoln only.

Action 27 of the LURP has therefore resulted in a number of the B1 rules summarised in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of this report.

It is noted that Selwyn 2031 incorporates the actions required by the LURP as part of the strategic planning work programme for the whole of Selwyn District.

4.3 Selwyn 2031: District Development Strategy

Of potential relevance to the topic of the interface of business zones with adjoining non-business zones, the Selwyn 2031: District Development Strategy includes the action⁵ of: 'Identify trigger thresholds for office and retail activities in industrial areas where these activities are likely to give rise to traffic/transport effects, particularly on larger commercial centres, or result in reverse sensitivity effects' in order to achieve the strategic policy of ensuring an appropriate scale and distribution of rural, retail and industrial activities.

Selwyn 2031 also states that the Council anticipates that new development will be of a high standard, noting good urban design is fundamental to the creation of successful towns. Key actions⁶ of Selwyn 2031 to achieve higher quality living and business environments and the protection of existing character are:

- Achieve safe, functional and attractive living and business 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.
- 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.

4.4 Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013

The Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan (IMP) does not contain any policy guidance or outcomes in respect of managing effects between business zones and non-business zones.

In addition, while the IMP contains a number of different provisions relating to urban design, these relate directly to business zoned land in Christchurch only.

Baseline Report BS002 notes that Mahaanui Kurataio Ltd has confirmed that to date they do not have any specific feedback on interface issues beyond their feedback provided as part of the District-wide work stream relating to matters such as noise, lighting, and signage.

4.5 Selwyn District Council Design Guide for Commercial Development In Urban Areas, Rolleston Town Centre Masterplan and Lincoln Town Centre Plan

The key urban design and context outcomes that are sought through the Operative District Plan's various assessment matters (set out in Section 3.2 above) are generally consistent with those identified in the Council's Design Guide for Commercial Development (the Design Guide) and the Council's Rolleston and Lincoln Town Centre plans. Plans. The Rolleston Town Centre Masterplan and the Lincoln Town Centre Plan, while adopted by Council, have limited weight in the consenting process. As non-statutory framework documents they are only to be considered as an 'other matter'.

⁵ Action 26

⁶ Page 9

The Design Guide is a voluntary tool that provides developers with guide best practise examples in the form that should be considered when integrating new development into the District's town centres. The Design Guide includes a list of principles under the following headings:

- Fit in with the surroundings;
- Activate the edges;
- Provide space for public life;
- Favour the pedestrian;
- Car parking;
- Landscaping;
- Servicing;
- Signage;
- Design to prevent crime; and
- Respect residential neighbours.

4.6 New Zealand Urban Design Protocol

The New Zealand Urban Design Protocol (2005) is a voluntary commitment by central and local government, as well as property developers, investors, design professionals, educational institutes and other groups, to undertake specific urban design initiatives in order to make New Zealand towns and cities more successful through quality urban design.

The Protocol identifies seven essential design qualities (the seven C's) that together create quality urban design; being Context, Character, Choice, Connections, Creativity, Custodianship and Collaboration.

The Council signed the Protocol in September 2008.

5.0 Summary of alternative management responses – Other Districts

5.1 Interfaces with Non-Business Zones

Baseline Report BS002 reviewed the District Plans of the nearby Canterbury territorial authorities of Christchurch City Council, Waimakariri District Council and Ashburton District Council to identify if there are common approaches to managing interface issues. Tables 7.1 and 7.2 in Baseline Report BS002 compare a range of relevant activity-focused controls and performance standards within the Operative District Plan to those of the other territorial authorities, with the key findings summarised in the sections below.

This review has determined that the current approach of the Council's Operative District Plan in terms of managing the residential interface with commercial and industrial zoned land is not significantly out of step with that of the other Councils.

Commercial/Residential Interface

All District Plans require compliance with the recession plane performance standard of the adjoining Residential Zone. The requirements for screening of outdoor storage areas and treatment of the road boundary in terms of setback and glazing are almost identical. While the Council's Operative District Plan does not have a building setback requirement from a Residential Zone boundary like the other territorial authorities (except in Rolleston Precinct 2 and West Melton), the Baseline Report BS002 notes that the existing recession plane control forces a setback for larger buildings.

Unlike other District Plans, the Operative District Plan also does not have requirements for landscaping of the internal boundaries adjoining a Residential Zone. The inclusion of such a rule has been recommended given the observations around the use of rear yards for outdoor storage in multiple locations within the District.

Industrial/Residential Interface

All District Plans require compliance with the recession plane performance standard of the adjoining Residential Zone and have 15m building height limits.

Unlike the other District Plans, the Operative District Plan does not have requirements for landscaping of the internal boundaries adjoining a Residential Zone or on the road boundary. The inclusion of such a rule has been recommended to manage this interface with industrial land uses.

5.2 Urban Design in Town Centres

Similar to Section 5.1 above, Baseline Report BS003 reviewed the District Plans of the nearby Canterbury territorial authorities along with four other rural-based districts that are signatories to the Urban Design Protocol⁷ to identify if there are common approaches to achieving positive urban design outcomes in town centres. The tables in Appendix 3 of Baseline Report BS003 compares the Operative District Plan to those of the other territorial authorities in terms of relevant performance standards and approaches to qualitative urban design assessments. The key findings are summarised in the sections below.

While this review has determined that the Council's current approach is not generally out of step with that of the other councils, the inclusion of qualitative urban design controls (as is the case with the Operative District Plan) is not as common.

Performance standards (quantitative controls on built form)

There is a lot of commonality across the District Plans in terms of the matters that are controlled and the specific content of the rules; including building height (~12m), recession planes (compliance required where adjoin residential zone boundaries) and requiring buildings to have veranda cover and be built to the road boundary so as to create a uniform building line.

Activity-focused controls

⁷ Timaru, Kaikoura, Masterton and Western Bay of Plenty District Councils

Baseline Report BS003 notes that all these District Plans contain activities-based controls that set out the types of activities that are permitted in commercial areas; with all permitting a wide range of retail, food and beverage, commercial service, travellers' accommodation and community facilities.

Qualitative urban design assessments

The only District Plans to require a qualitative urban design assessment were the Christchurch, Waimakariri, and Timaru District Plans.

In Timaru, an urban design assessment is required for discrete parts of the Timaru and Temuka town centres that have a heritage precinct. In Christchurch there are different trigger thresholds for urban design matters when a resource consent is required in certain commercial areas.⁸ In Waimakariri, any building over 450m² in the KACs and Oxford town centre requires consideration of urban design.

6.0 Summary of Options to address Issues – Interfaces with Non-Business Zones

6.1 OPTION 1 – STATUS QUO

The approach of the Operative District Plan for interfaces with non-business zones, in terms of both building bulk and location performance standards and activity-focused controls, is summarised in Section 3.1 above.

The option of retaining the status quo approach would mean retaining these existing provisions alongside other district-wide controls relating to noise, glare, transport, parking and signage.

Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:

As noted in Baseline Report BS002, the approach of the Operative District Plan has generally been effective for managing interfaces with non-business zones.

However, on the basis that amendments are recommended within Baseline Report BS002 to improve interface amenity, the existing provisions could potentially be more effective in addressing this issue.

Risks:

That the Operative District Plan does not follow best practice or give full effect to the CRPS in relation to avoiding conflicts between incompatible activities and maintaining and enhancing amenity values.

⁸ The activity status is controlled (where the design is certified by a Council-approved urban design expert), or is otherwise restricted discretionary. Any consents are to be processed on a non-notified basis

Budget or Time Implications:

None as no work would be required. However, it may be that issues are raised through submissions, including that the Operative District Plan is not giving full effect to the CRPS.

Stakeholder and Community Interests:

Landowners and occupiers (including residential) interfacing with business zones.

Existing and prospective business land and business owners/operators in the District.

The Regional Council, in terms of the requirements of the CRPS.

Recommendation:

Retaining the status quo is not recommended, however those provisions of the Operative District Plan that have been effective should be carried forward into the Proposed District Plan. This is addressed in Option 2 below.

6.2 OPTION 2 – AMENDED PROVISIONS

This option involves minor amendments to the current provisions of the Operative District Plan to improve the management of interfaces with non-business zones as summarised below.⁹

Recommendation ¹⁰	Reasons for the recommendation
<i>Business 1/Commercial performance standards</i>	
Expand the geographic scope of the current KAC urban design assessment matters relating to interface treatment so they can be considered for all development that triggers an urban design assessment. ¹¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures interface treatment is given specific consideration as part of the design and assessment process. <p>Please note there are further recommendations specifically relating to urban design assessment in Section 7 below.</p>
Subject to the findings of the transport review, consideration is given to removing the requirement to provide on-site parking for smaller developments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assists in improving street scene amenity. On-street parking is often adequate (especially in smaller townships). <p>Please note that Baseline Report DW009 (Transport) recommends that a district-wide strategy for parking is prepared to help determine which options for parking (particularly in town centres) are progressed. As such this recommendation will need to be reconsidered in light of these findings.</p>
<i>Business 2/Industrial interface management framework</i>	

⁹ Refer to Section 8 of the Baseline Report BS002 for full details

¹⁰ For brevity, the full list of Operative District Plan provisions recommended to be retained are not listed

¹¹ 16.12.2.12: "the extent to which the design and location of landscaping and fencing will mitigate any adverse visual and amenity effects of development to adjoining sites containing residential activities" and 16.12.2.13:

"Whether the site layout and location of storage and waste areas minimises the potential for disturbance and a loss of amenity for residential neighbours"

<p>Consider three different interface management frameworks for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B2/industrial zones in all towns except Rolleston and Lincoln; • B2/industrial (Jones Road) in Rolleston which is located well away from residential areas and functionally forms part of the wider Izone and Iport developments; and • B2A and B2B/industrial zones in Rolleston and Lincoln which have a more recent greenfield history and have associated Outline Development Plans and tailored boundary interface provisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures the differences between these areas are appropriately recognised within the provisions.
<p>Careful consideration of the range of activities that can occur within Business 2/Industrial zones where they have either internal boundaries with residential zones or are over the road from a residential or Business 1/Commercial zone.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The spatial distribution of the business zones is important in avoiding conflicts between incompatible activities; a requirement of the CRPS. • Please note this matter, of the general types of activities to be provided for in each zone, has been considered as part of the concurrent BS202 scope.
<i>Business 2/Industrial road boundary interface</i>	
<p>Require a minimum 3m building setback when opposite residential zones.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures space is available to enable landscaping along the road boundary to assist in improving street scene amenity. • Limits the costs to businesses through the loss of productive business land. • Aligns with Christchurch District Plan.
<p>Require the space between the building and the road to be landscaped with a minimum of 1 tree per 10m of frontage when opposite residential zones.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assists in improving street scene amenity. • Aligns with the approach undertaken in the Ashburton, Christchurch and Waimakariri District Plans.
<p>Require, when opposite residential zones, offices and ancillary or trade-based retail activity to be located at the front of the site, with the road-facing façade required to include windows/active frontage.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assists in locating higher amenity uses in the locations where they are most visible. • Aligns with B1 Zone rules. • Consistent with both the market and functional preferences of industrial developers. • Reflects the requirements often found in private developer covenants for industrial areas.
<i>Business 2/Industrial internal boundary interface – Residential zones</i>	
<p>Require buildings to be set back at least 3m from internal boundaries adjoining residential zones.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures space is available to enable landscaping along boundary to assist in improving amenity. • Limits the costs to businesses through the loss of productive business land. • Aligns with Christchurch District Plan.

Require a minimum 2m deep landscape strip along internal boundaries adjoining residential zones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Screening from landscape strips will assist in improving amenity along the zone boundary. Aligns with the approach undertaken in the Ashburton District Plan. <p>It is noted that further investigations will be undertaken into developing a landscaping approach for the wider Proposed District Plan, which does not just specifically relate to business zone interfaces. It is therefore recommended that any future landscaping requirements for the business zones take into consideration these other provisions.</p>
Business 2/Industrial internal boundary interface – Rural zones	
Remove the recession plane requirement along Rural Outer Plains Zone boundaries. ¹²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little benefit to be provided in avoiding shading of largely vacant paddocks.
Require a minimum 2m deep landscape strip along internal boundaries adjoining rural zones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Screening from landscape strips will assist in improving amenity along the zone boundary.
General	
Consider amending and rationalising the existing building bulk and location performance standards ¹³ applying to the business zones to ensure consistency, where appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simplifies the rules framework by reducing a large number of area-specific requirements. Assists plan users in understanding rules.
Objectives and Policies¹⁴	
No additional objectives and policies within the Proposed District Plan are considered to be required for the management of interfaces with non-business zones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As set out in Section 3 of this Report, there are currently a range of objectives and policies within the Operative District Plan (relating to townships being pleasant places, maintaining the character and amenity values of each zone and avoiding reverse sensitivity effects for example) which indirectly cover the management of interfaces with non-business zones. The proposed amendments to the provisions set out in Options 2A and 2B would not significantly change the current approach of the Operative District Plan.
Definitions	
No additional definitions for the Proposed District Plan are considered to be required for the management of interfaces with non-business zones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None of the general issues relating to the interface with non-business zones identified within the Baseline Report BS002, for example a detractor in residential amenity due to the presence of adjoining buildings or car parking areas, would appear to be attributed to

¹² Recommends retaining recession plane requirement for Rural inner plains zone boundaries

¹³ Site coverage, building height, recession planes and setbacks from boundaries

¹⁴ Please note this table comments on the potential for objectives, policies and definitions given the requirements of Scope BS203

	<p>a lack of definitions or clarity of existing definitions within the Operative District Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We note Baseline Report BS002 does not recommend any amendments or additions to the definitions within the Proposed Plan.
--	---

Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:

As outlined in Baseline Report BS002, no significant or systemic issues regarding the management of the interface with non-business zones have been identified within the District. Accordingly, the retention of the existing rules framework is recommended within Option 2 alongside the additional amendments described in the table above.

Option 2 is expected to increase the effectiveness of managing the interface with non-business zones through the amended performance standards that are focused on improving amenity along the zone boundaries.

When compared to Option 1 (the Status Quo) the recommended amendments will result in some minor changes to the potential layout of new developments within the business zones when there is an interface with a non-business zone; for example industrial buildings being set back 3m from internal boundaries, rather than 2m. It is noted that many of the recommended requirements already apply to certain locations within the District under the current rules of the Operative District Plan.

Option 2 is also expected to better respond to the requirement within the CRPS to locate and design development so that it functions in a way that maintains amenity values and avoids conflicts between incompatible activities.

Option 2 also is intended to simplify the existing rules where possible to assist plan users in understanding the rules. Option 2, alongside the current provisions of the Operative District Plan, is expected to help increase the effectiveness of managing the interface with non-business zones.

Risks:

Option 2 would involve changes and could mean that resource consents are required for more business activities. Consequently, existing and prospective business owners/operators in the District may oppose the provisions. However, this risk could to some extent be mitigated through engagement.

To manage potential risks, it is also necessary to ensure the business zone framework of the Proposed District Plan (scope BS202) appropriately distributes and categorises business activities to minimise the potential for reverse sensitivity issues.

Budget or Time Implications:

Redrafting of provisions, alongside any other wider amendments to the business zone chapter recommended in other scopes such as BS202, would need to be undertaken.

Need to engage with landowners and business owners/operators to ensure an understanding of the process, statutory drivers and the implications of the provisions.

Stakeholder and Community Interests:

Landowners and occupiers (including residential) interfacing with business zones.

Existing and prospective business landowners and business owners/operators in the District.

The Regional Council, in terms of the requirements of the CRPS.

Recommendation:

For the reasons outlined above, Option 2 is recommended.

7.0 Summary of Options to address Issues – Urban Design in Town Centres

7.1 OPTION 1– STATUS QUO

The approach of the Operative District Plan for urban design within the B1 Zone, in terms of performance standards, controls on activities and qualitative urban design assessments, is summarised in Section 3.2 above.

The option of retaining the status quo approach would mean retaining these existing provisions alongside other relevant district-wide controls such as noise, parking and signage.

Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:

As noted in Baseline Report BS003, while there is no evidence of structural problems or loopholes with the Operative District Plan framework, the current framework has resulted in some unsatisfactory outcomes that could potentially be avoided if amendments are made. The recommendations made within Baseline Report BS003 to improve urban design within town centres/B1 Zone (refer to Option 2 below).

Furthermore, a number of urban design issues have been highlighted within the DPR B1 Zones Review prepared by the Council's Senior Urban Designer whereby it is considered the existing provisions could potentially be more effective in addressing Urban Design in Town Centres (refer to Option 2 below).

Risks:

That the Operative District Plan does not follow best practice or give full effect to the CRPS in relation to providing high quality development that incorporates the principles of good urban design.

Budget or Time Implications:

None as no work would be required. However, it may be that issues are raised through submissions, including that the Operative District Plan is not giving full effect to the CRPS.

Stakeholder and Community Interests:

Existing and prospective business landowners and business owners/operators in the District.

The wider district community, in particular landowners and occupiers interfacing with town centres.

The Regional Council, in terms of the requirements of the CRPS.

Recommendation:

Retaining the status quo is not recommended, however those provisions of the Operative District Plan that have been effective should be carried forward into the Proposed District Plan. This is addressed in Option 2 below.

7.2 OPTION 2 – AMENDED PROVISIONS

This option involves amendments to the current provisions of the Operative District Plan to help achieve good urban design outcomes within town centres/B1 Zone as summarised below.¹⁵

Recommendation ¹⁶	Reasons for the recommendation
Activity-based recommendations	
Consider whether trade and yard-based retailers (or at least certain forms of them) should still be permitted in the B1 Zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The associated built form (bulky and different from more fine-grained comparison retailing) and functional needs of trade and yard-based retailers mean that a Business 2 zone location is likely to be more appropriate. Would assist in avoiding conflicts between potentially incompatible activities which is a requirement of the CRPS.
Consider amending the current rule package and include alternative car parking options within town centres, such as: communal car parking, shared solutions, car park provisions off-site, car parking in-lieu; take into account assessment matters such as proximity to park and ride facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assists in improving street scene amenity by reducing car parking. <p>Please note that Baseline Report DW009 (Transport) recommends that a district-wide strategy for parking is prepared to help determine which options for parking (particularly in town centres) are progressed. As such these recommendations will need to be reconsidered in light of these findings.</p>
Performance standards recommendations	
Re-draft rules so that the active frontage requirement is applied as a minimum ground	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improves the rules framework and assists plan users by providing greater

¹⁵ Refer to Section 10 of the Baseline Report BS003 and DPR B1 Zones Review for full details

¹⁶ For brevity, the full list of Operative District Plan provisions recommended to be retained are not listed

Recommendation ¹⁶	Reasons for the recommendation
<p>floor glazing percentage, with 60% a common threshold.</p> <p>The rule could also be expanded to require the provision of verandas and the main pedestrian entrance in the road-facing façade.</p>	<p>certainty, rather than just relying on the definition of 'active frontage'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aligns with the approach undertaken in other district plans reviewed. • Could replace the current reference in Rule 16.9.1.2 to the 'active commercial frontage', which is undefined. • Assists in providing higher quality development that incorporates the principles of good urban design; a requirement of the CRPS.
<p>Where the term 'active frontage' is used as an urban design assessment matter, the assessment matter itself could be expanded.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better communicates the active frontage outcomes being sought, rather than cross-referencing to the definition. • Assists in providing higher quality development that incorporates the principles of good urban design; a requirement of the CRPS. • Please note further recommendations in relation to active frontages below.
<p>Consider combining current active frontage and building lines requirements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures the placement of buildings from the active frontage (ODP maps 29C for KAC areas) is not split out. The current approach has led to active frontage displayed behind car parking areas. • Reference to placement on site will help achieve desired outcomes. • Will provide benefits in a town centre context as it will require active frontages in areas where pedestrians are expected and would subsequently direct car parking to the back of the site.
<p>Consider revising the rules of the Business Zone chapter to retain the controlled activity status for new developments within the KACs, but impose a selection of performance standards to ensure minimum urban design aspects are all addressed (such as the current permitted activity performance standards under rule 16.9.1).</p> <p>Where these performance standards are not met, the activity would become a restricted discretionary activity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If minimum urban design aspects are addressed, the Council would still retain matters of control. • Ensures the active frontage of a development is facing the public realm and not provided behind areas of car parking (an adverse outcome identified within KACs by Ms Wolfer). • Would enable developments with significant urban design outcome shortcomings to be declined. • Retains the controlled activity status which assists in directing development into the KACs. • Assists in providing higher quality development that incorporates the principles of good urban design; a requirement of the CRPS. • Provides certainty and potentially reduces costs.

Recommendation ¹⁶	Reasons for the recommendation
Qualitative urban design recommendations	
Consider adopting the 'headline' short list approach to assessment matters that were confirmed through the Christchurch District Plan process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Operative District Plan's assessment matters are comparatively quite lengthy. • The Christchurch District Plan assessment matters for suburban centres are generally considered to be appropriate for Selwyn as they address the relevant urban design matters. • Amendments can be made to reflect Council's existing Commercial Design Guide.
Incorporate context as an assessment matter in order to be able to take into account the surrounding environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would help ensure consideration as to whether new developments integrate appropriately into the setting and the Selwyn context.
Include interface treatment as an assessment matter in order to be able to address effects between adjoining boundaries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures interface treatment is given specific consideration as part of the design and assessment process. • Assists in improving amenity along the zone boundary.
Feedback is sought from Mahaanui on behalf of local runanga as to whether such an assessment matter relating to cultural values is appropriate in the context of Selwyn's smaller rural townships.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is noted that consideration of Ngai Tahu values is an assessment matter for development in the Christchurch CBD; but not in the suburban centres (and not currently in the Operative District Plan).
Retain the current references to the Council's existing Commercial Design Guide within the rule notes of the Business Zone chapter of the Proposed District Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures this existing guidance document is highlighted as a relevant consideration. • This recommendation for including reference only as a note, as opposed to a rule itself, acknowledges that it is problematic to require compliance with a guidance document. <p>It is noted that other documents will likely need be referenced elsewhere within the Proposed District Plan in a similar manner. As such, the approach to how references to the Commercial Design Guide and other documents are incorporated in a consistent manner will be confirmed by the Council once drafting commences.</p>
Objectives and policies¹⁷	
No additional objectives and policies within the Proposed District Plan are considered to be required for the management of urban design in town centres.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As set out in Section 3 of this Report, there are currently a range of objectives and policies within the Operative District Plan (relating to townships being pleasant places, maintaining amenity values which make the zone(s) attractive

¹⁷ Please note this table comments on the potential for objectives, policies and definitions given the requirements of Scope BS203

Recommendation ¹⁶	Reasons for the recommendation
	<p>to people and ensuring that B1 zoned town centres are walkable, well integrated and contribute to the vibrancy of the town for example) which sufficiently address this topic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed amendments to the provisions set out in Option 4 would not significantly change to current approach of the Operative District Plan. • Ms Wolfer has noted the existing policy framework of the Operative District Plan is appropriate.
Definitions	
<p>Consider revising the 'active frontage' definition from Operative District Plan</p> <p><i>means buildings where the ground floor level features glazing, windows or doors which allow views into the premises. It refers to that part of the building with glazing occupying the entire area between 1m and 2m in height, as a minimum.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simplifies the definition by reducing two components. • Reference to 'between 1m and 2m in height' is considered to be better expressed as a performance standard/rule, alongside other requirements such as minimum percentage of façade to be glazed and location on site, rather than within the definition. <p>It is noted that none of the other district plans reviewed within Baseline Report 003 include a definition for 'active frontage'.</p>
<p>Consider if 'public space' needs to be included within the definition chapter.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No clear definition has led to unsatisfactory outcomes (for example private car parks identified in development as 'public space') • Public space needs to remain publicly owned and managed. <p>A definition, which would need to be considered in the context of the wider Proposed District Plan, could potentially assist in implementing provisions; for example Policy B3.4.24(a) of the Operative District Plan: 'ensuring the provision of high quality public space'. It is noted that 'On-site public space' is currently included within definition chapter but there are not clear links to existing provisions.</p>

Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:

As outlined in Baseline Report BS003, no significant issues were identified in respect to the current Operative District Plan provisions for managing urban design within town centres. Accordingly, the retention of the current framework is recommended within Option 2 alongside the additional amendments in the table above.

When compared to the status quo Option 2 is expected to increase the effectiveness of the Proposed Plan in achieving positive urban design outcomes within town centres through providing greater clarity and certainty.

Option 2 is also expected to better respond to the requirements of the CRPS to encourage high quality urban design and enable the KACs to incorporate the principles of good urban design.

Risks:

Option 2 would involve changes to the way proposed developments within town centres are assessed in terms of urban design, which would result in reduced uncertainty.

Consequently, existing and prospective business owners/operators in the District may oppose the provisions. However, this risk could to some extent be mitigated through engagement.

Budget or Time Implications:

Redrafting of provisions, alongside any other wider amendments to the business zone chapter recommended in other scopes such as BS202, would need to be undertaken.

Need to engage with landowners and business owners/operators to ensure an understanding of the process, statutory drivers and the implications of the provisions.

Stakeholder and Community Interests:

Existing and prospective business land and business owners/operators in the District.

The wider district community, in particular landowners and occupiers interfacing with town centres.

The Regional Council, in terms of the requirements of the CRPS.

Recommendation:

Option 2 is recommended for the reasons set out above.

8.0 Summary of stakeholder engagement

Stakeholder engagement has not yet been undertaken by the Council in respect to the proposed options for the management of the business zone environments within Selwyn District (Scope BS203).

It is therefore recommended that an engagement strategy for Scope BS203, in conjunction with any other relevant scopes such as BS202, is prepared by the Council to ensure stakeholder feedback informs the development of the preferred options.

9.0 Preferred Option for further engagement

9.1 Interfaces with Non-Business Zones

While there are a number of existing provisions of the Operative District Plan that have been effective in the management of interfaces with non-business zones and should therefore be carried forward into the Proposed District Plan, Option 2 is the preferred option recommended by the Project Team which involves relatively minor amendments to the provisions of the Operative District Plan.

The development of a revised set of provisions within the Proposed District Plan for the management of interfaces with non-business zones will also need to take into consideration the development of other scopes such as BS202 (Business Zone Framework) and DW209 (Transport).

9.2 Urban Design in Town Centres

While there are not considered to be significant structural problems or loopholes with the Operative District Plan's current provisions relating to the management of urban design in town centres, and most should therefore be carried forward into the Proposed District Plan, Option 2 is the preferred option recommended by the Project Team which involves relatively minor amendments to the provisions of the Operative District Plan.

The development of a revised set of provisions within the Proposed District Plan for the management of urban design in town centres will also need to take into consideration the development of other scopes such as BS202 (Business Zone Framework) and DW209 (Transport).

Appendix 1 – Business Interface (BS002) Baseline Report

Link to Baseline report below:

[Business Interface \[PDF, 4353 KB\]](#) July 2017

Appendix 2 – Urban Design Best Practice (BS003) Baseline Report

Link to Baseline report below:

[Urban Design Best Practice \[PDF, 1512 KB\]](#) September 2017

Appendix 3 – DPR B1 Zones Review

B1 zones- main findings reviewing built development and implementation process

Issue	Category	Resource Consent number(s)	Example	Key findings	Relevance/ Justification	Response/ Recommendation
Public space	Implementation Process and delivery	RC 175476 (not yet consented) RC 115059/115310 RC075485 RC105271/105372	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Darfield 4 square • Masfield Drive • NW supermarket Lincoln • Countdown supermarket • Rolleston Square 	No clear definition of public space leads to false interpretation and unsatisfactory outcomes for example reference in reports where private car parks are identified as 'public space'	Public space need to remain areas that are publicly owned, managed and locally defined. They require to be independent from branding and (private) control	Include public space in definition chapter
Active frontage	Implementation	RC 115059/115310 RC 125467	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masfield Drive • RD 1 Leeston • KACS in general 	Current District Plan definition doesn't extend far enough and splits the placement of buildings from the active frontage part (see ODP maps for KAC areas). This approach has led to active frontage displayed behind car parking areas. In order to have successful outcomes placement on site is essential part to achieve desired outcomes.	Active frontage has multiple benefits particularly in a town centre context; it applies to areas where pedestrians are expected; it also subsequently directs car parking to the back of the site	Amend current definition and combine active frontage and building lines
Architecture and site context	Process	RC 115059/115310 RC 155561	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masfield Drive • Southpoint, Faringdon 	Issue with architecture and style of building and its visual integration with its residential sub-urban surrounds; Architecture has very clean lines, almost sterile look, no colour or material to soften and break up the stark appearance; building looks more like an institution or	We need to include principles/guidelines in terms of design, material and colour for new developments to fit within a Selwyn 'theme' and sub-chapters for our main townships (design guide?)	Incorporate context as an assessment matter in order to be able to take into account the surrounding environment

				better placed in an urban environment;		
Interface treatment		RC 115059/115310 RC 175476 (not yet consented)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masfield Drive • Darfield four square 	There are currently no provisions for any requirements to visually integrate new development in a Business 1 zone with adjacent landuses. Effects are limited to physical effects managed via height and recession plane provisions. This is particular an issue on the interface with public reserves (Darfield), where as the result of a r/c the western elevation of a supermarket is developed as a blank wall that is directly opposite a high amenity reserve. Other examples include large big box development with lack of visual interest along long walls with no active frontage opposite established residential neighbourhoods (Rolleston).	Interface treatment along boundaries between Business 1 and reserves as well as Living Zones need to be managed to protect existing landuses and their character and amenity while integrating new developments.	Include interface treatment as an assessment matter in order to be able to address effects between adjoining boundaries
Car Parks	Implementation Process and delivery	Developments in business zones/ KACs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town centres: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Countdown, ○ Rolleston square ○ Masfield Drive ○ RD1, Leeston 	Current DP requirements leads site layouts where car parks being dominating feature when viewed from public space; buildings are set back from street; large number of individual car parks (car parking provisions linked to single operator); empty car parks after hours; requirements for large number of car parks on site stifles development	Car parks do not positively contribute to attractive streetscenes in town centres, buildings and people do. Perception that car parks are draw card for people to shop and stay is outdated; Selwyn's commitment to walkable, well-connected town centres needs to be reflected in parking provisions	Amend current rule package and include alternative car parking options within town centres, such as: communal car parking, shared solutions, car park provisions off-side, car parking in-lieu;

						take into account assessment matters such as proximity to park and ride
DISTRICT PLAN PROCESSING						
	Artistic illustrations	115059 (entire site) 115310 (portion of site)	Masefield Drive, Rolleston	Artistic illustrations used to 'sell' proposal does not match architectural drawings and what's built on the ground	3D visualisation is an important tool to envisage built form and see development in context	Include 3D renders as part of consent via condition
	Weight of ODPS		Rolleston (KACs)			
	Planting		IZONE and Inland port - Inland port Plant list in Appendix 2	Planting for industrial zone is copied and applied to Inland port, which has more of a business character; plants in IZone have created maintenance issue.	Having appropriate landscaping that provides amenity to a place positively contributes to the overall character of the area.	
	Pre-application meetings	RC 175476 (not yet consented) RC 175510	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Darfield Four square Raewood Fresh, Prebbleton 	Lack of uptake of option to have pre-application meetings result in lengthy, time consuming, RFIs, issues to change concept later in the process always harder than at initial concept stage	Having a pre-application meeting prior to lodgement for business development over 450m2 would help reduce staff resources and avoid time issues	?
	Scale of development	RC 13558 & 165169	West Melton Business area	As part of a variation of consent the height of a commercial development was reduced from two storey to one storey. The height reduction was considered a reduced 'scale' of development and was granted subsequently	A reduction in scale is difficult to interpret and can have different implications; reduction in height in this case meant losing character and variation within the façade; it also meant that the development is not able to	Processors need to be made aware- upskilling might be required Requirement for UD assessment

				without any further UD assessment.	increase in density in the future, which ultimately is underutilising valuable land	needs to be also for a variation of consent where scale is reduced
	Extension of Resource Consents	RC 115120 (original consent) RC 155389 (extension)	Pak'n Save Rolleston (NW at the moment)	Pak'n' Save has applied for another extension to their consent, which seeks to replace the current New World supermarket with a larger Pak'n Save supermarket in varied location.	Plans get fixed in the past' as 'place holders' that don't need to adhere to newer/updated regulations; Multiple/ Unlimited extensions of a consent for a significant development within the town centre creates difficulty in terms of achieving good planning outcomes; when built these areas follow outdated principles and can be contrary to the rest of the town centre	Limit time and/or amount a consent can be extended after which it should become a variation which would have to take into account latest provisions
	Plan interpretation/ Conditions of consent	RC 155561	Southpoint Faringdon	Air conditioning plant is mounted on roof top in a way that is visually affecting the streetscene ; plant is part of the assessment matters under 16.10 (restricted discretionary); provided plans showed plant in site and elevation plan but not in text- from the provided plans it is hard to determine if panel in front of plant or not; no condition to that effect; Colour in architectural drawings don't match colour in the flesh, although description states the correct colour	If plans and conditions don't work together monitoring a non-compliance becomes unachievable; monitoring couldn't use plans for enforcing non-compliance; If plan and text don't have the same outcome	Introduce note on consent that text and plans need to match and that either or can be used for enforcement.