

Coversheet for Selwyn District Plan Committee decision on:

Preferred Option Report: BS203 URBAN DESIGN AND INTERFACE

On the 21 November 2018 a Post Engagement Report was taken to the District Plan Committee Meeting for endorsement.

The Post Engagement Report recommended the following:

“That the Preferred Option that has been previously endorsed by DPC progress to the ‘Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase.’”

As during this committee meeting, the recommendations made in the Post Engagement Report were endorsed.

POST ENGAGEMENT PREFERRED OPTION UPDATE REPORT TO DISTRICT PLAN COMMITTEE

DATE: 21 November 2018

PURPOSE: Post Engagement Update on Preferred Options for:

- Urban Design and Interfaces – BS203

PREPARED BY: Jessica Tuilaepa, Senior Strategy and Policy Planner

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<i>Summary of Preferred Option Endorsed by DPC for further engagement</i>	<p>Urban Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No proposed changes to existing Objectives and Policies. • Look to amend/include definitions for Active Frontage and Public Space • Activity based recommendations relating to trade based retail in B1 zones and car parking requirements. • Performance standards recommendations relating to active frontage • Qualitative urban design recommendations relating to assessment matters and commercial design guide <p>Interfaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No proposed changes to existing Objectives and Policies. • No requirement for additional definitions • Recommendations relating to the treatment of interfaces between industrial/commercial/rural and residential zones using setbacks and recession planes and management of activities.
<i>Summary of Feedback Received</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback received from 7 parties, via Engagement HQ and email. • Landowners generally supportive, concerns raised over urban design controls discussed and rationalized • Partners supportive of approach • General public supportive of preferred approach
<i>Recommended Option Post Engagement</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the Preferred Option that has been previously endorsed by DPC progress to the 'Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase.
<i>DPC Decision:</i>	<i>"That the Preferred Option that has been previously endorsed by DPC progress to the 'Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase."</i>



1.0 Introduction

1.1 Overview of Preferred Option Endorsed by DPC

This preferred option was broken down into two streams – Urban Design in commercial zones and Business Interfaces, where business zones adjoin rural, residential or other types of business zones. Below is a summary of each option as endorsed by the District Plan Committee earlier in 2018.

Urban Design

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.
- 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.

Performance Standards recommendations

- Re-draft rules so that the active frontage requirement is applied as a minimum ground floor glazing percentage, with 60% a common threshold. The rule could also be expanded to require the provision of verandas and the main pedestrian entrance in the road-facing façade.
- Where the term ‘active frontage’ is used as an urban design assessment matter, the assessment matter itself could be expanded.
- Consider combining current active frontage and building lines requirements.
- 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).

Qualitative urban design recommendations

- Consider adopting the ‘headline’ short list approach to assessment matters that were confirmed through the Christchurch District Plan process.
- Incorporate context as an assessment matter in order to be able to take into account the surrounding environment.
- Include interface treatment as an assessment matter in order to be able to address effects between adjoining boundaries.
- 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.
- 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.

Objectives and Policies

- No additional objectives and policies within the Proposed District Plan are considered to be required for the management of urban design in town centres.

Definitions

- Consider revising the 'active frontage' definition from Operative District Plan
- Consider if 'public space' needs to be included within the definition chapter.

Business Zone Interfaces

Business 1/Commercial performance standards

- 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.
- Subject to the findings of the transport review, consideration is given to removing the requirement to provide on-site parking for smaller developments.

Business 2/Industrial interface management framework

- Consider three different interface management frameworks for:
 - 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.
- 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.

Business 2/Industrial road boundary interface

- Require a minimum 3m building setback when opposite residential zones.
- 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.
- 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.

Business 2/Industrial internal boundary interface – Residential zones

- Require buildings to be set back at least 3m from internal boundaries adjoining residential zones.
- Require a minimum 2m deep landscape strip along internal boundaries adjoining residential zones.

Business 2/Industrial internal boundary interface – Rural zones

- Retain the recession plane requirement along Rural Outer Plains Zone boundaries.

- Require a minimum 2m deep landscape strip along internal boundaries adjoining rural zones.

General

- Consider amending and rationalising the existing building bulk and location performance standards applying to the business zones to ensure consistency, where appropriate.

Objectives and Policies

- No additional objectives and policies within the Proposed District Plan are considered to be required for the management of **interfaces with non-business zones**.

Definitions

- No additional definitions for the Proposed District Plan are considered to be required for the management of **interfaces with non-business zones**.

2.0 Summary of Feedback Received

2.1 Landowner Feedback

- Industrial landowners are eager to be actively involved during the drafting stage to ensure that outcomes are beneficial to all parties involved.
- Feedback was received from both Port Companies, whilst supportive, issues were raised relating to reverse sensitivity, height controls and urban design controls outside of the Town Centre. These are discussed further in section 3.0.

2.2 Partners/Stakeholder Feedback

- Feedback from Partners was fully supportive of the preferred approach.

2.3 Public Feedback

- Public feedback, although limited (5 submissions) was supportive of the preferred approach.
- One submission, although not specifically related to the topics under consultation, suggested the inclusion of rules relating to the number of public toilets to be provided on a site based on building size and or activity type. This is deemed to be a Building Act issue and is not something that other District Plans tend to manage, and subsequently this request has not altered the preferred option for Urban Design and Business zone interfaces.

3.0 Analysis of Feedback Received

Reverse Sensitivity

The Port Companies wish to ensure that the establishment of noise sensitive activities within close proximity to either Port is avoided to ensure that future development of the Ports is not unduly restricted in the future, given their status as 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure'.

Going forward, consideration will be given to this issue during the development of Policies and Rules for both the Port Zone and the adjoining zones (both Industrial and Rural).

Height Controls

Both Port Companies are concerned about the height restrictions for the draft Port Zone. Both companies have suggested the current 15m height limit that applies to buildings in industrial Zones (containers sit within the definition of a building) will be problematic and seek that when determining the future height limits for the Port Zone, height limits more accurately reflect the nature of the activity.

Provisions for the future Port Zone will be drafted with input from both Port Companies. Specific provisions have not been discussed, as at the time the initial preferred option report (and prior baselines) were drafted the inclusion of a Port Zone had not been confirmed. Further discussion is required to determine a suitable height limit for the proposed Port zone given the Port is deemed regionally significant infrastructure and to provide for functional efficiencies. This will include further investigation to determine the visual impact of any height limit increase on the site on neighbouring zones.

It is worth noting that the preferred option sought to review the bulk and location provisions for all Business zones to determine their appropriateness, which includes height controls.

Urban Design Controls

Concern has been raised regarding possible Urban Design Controls in Industrial and Large Format Retail zones. Stakeholders have indicated they believe the current building controls are suitable for managing Urban Design to the degree it is required to be managed in Industrial areas and the preferred approach agrees with this to a large extent. The edges of zones warrant some extra consideration to recognise the amenity of adjoining rural and residential zones. It is recommended that landowners are given an opportunity to provide feedback on draft provisions, as set out in the attached Summary Communications and Engagement Plan.

Overall Conclusion

The issues raised during the public consultation period mainly relate to the development of two new Zones for the District – a Port Zone and a Large Format Retail Zone. At the time the Urban Design and Business Interface Baseline Reports were prepared the inclusion of these separate zones had not yet been considered and as these reports inform the Preferred Option report it stands to reason that additional issues may arise. Given these concerns are raised by Stakeholders, who have already been tipped as being involved in the drafting phase, the issues should be able to be resolved whilst still aligning with the preferred approach adopted by Council.

4.0 Recommended Option Post Engagement

The Project Team recommends that:

- The Preferred Option for the following topic that has been previously endorsed by DPC progress to the 'Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase'