
POST ENGAGEMENT PREFERRED OPTION UPDATE REPORT TO DISTRICT PLAN COMMITTEE

DATE:	12 February 2019
TOPIC NAME:	Business
SCOPE DESCRIPTION:	Residential Areas in KACs
TOPIC LEAD:	Jessica Tuilaepa
PREPARED BY:	Jessica Tuilaepa (Senior Strategy and Policy Planner)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<i>Summary of Preferred Options Endorsed by DPC for Further Engagement:</i>	<i>That consultation and engagement be undertaken relating to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• existing residential properties located on Markham Way, Peel Close, Wilbur Close and Landor Common becoming part of the Transitional Living Policy Overlay area (Option 1c); and• existing residential properties with the Transitional Living Precincts within Rolleston and Lincoln's KACs being rezoned to Town Centre Zone (Option 2b).
<i>Summary of Feedback Received:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Feedback received in relation to Option 1C was mainly in opposition. In addition to phone calls and emails, a 62 signature petition was received. Residents main concerns were the affect a rule change could have on the amenity and character of the area.• A low amount of feedback was received for in relation to Option 2b, with none in support. For those parties opposed, their main concerns related to there not being a shortage of commercial land in Rolleston and the potential impact the rezoning could have on land values and rates.
<i>Recommended Option Post Engagement:</i>	<i>That the preferred approach to how Residential Areas in KACs are addressed be decided by DPC.</i> <i>That the Committee's Preferred Options be progressed to the 'Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase'</i>
<i>DPC Decision:</i>	<i>"That the:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Committee notes the reportb) Committee confirms Options 1C (Transitional Living Overlay) and 2B (Town Centre zoning) as the Preferred Options for Residential Areas in Key Activity Centres.c) Committee's Preferred Options be progressed to the 'Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase.d) Committee notes the updated summary plan."



Introduction

- 1.1 The District Plan Review affords Council the opportunity to consider rezoning the existing residential land within the existing Rolleston and Lincoln Key Activity Centres (KAC) to meet future business demand following the recent increase in population and business growth of the Selwyn District.
- 1.2 Over the last five years the growth of Rolleston and Lincoln have accelerated considerably, at least in part, because it has become the recipient of the movement of populations from those parts of Christchurch affected by earthquake damage. In anticipation of and response to the growth in population, Council produced Town Centre Master Plans for both Townships, which envisage Key Activity Centres (KAC) incorporating the existing Business 1 zoned land and expanding significantly into existing residential areas.
- 1.3 A report was taken to Council recommending that land currently zoned Residential with the KACs of Rolleston and Lincoln remain unchanged and their future zoning be considered as part of a Town Centre Master Planning review exercise following the confirmation of the Future Development Strategy (FDS), or 'Our Space', being developed as part of Council's response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC). A decision was made by the DPC that the future of these areas should be considered now as part of the District Plan Review Process.
- 1.4 Prior to Christmas a consultation exercise was undertaken to gather residents feedback in relation to Options 1c and 2b (**Appendix 1.**) Letters were sent to the land owners in both Lincoln and Rolleston's Precinct 5 asking for their feedback about potentially having their properties rezoned to become 'Town Centre Zone' (Option 2B). A similar letter was sent to the landowners (and occupiers) of Markham Way, Peel Close, Wilbur Close and Landor Common asking for their feedback regarding a potential rule change if their properties were to become part of the existing 'Transitional Living Precinct Overlay' (Option 1C). Throughout the 6 week consultation period (18th December 2018 – 30th January 2019) Council staff received a number of phone calls and emails requesting additional information to make a more informed decision. A petition was also received at Council in relation to Option 1c which most residents have signed to demonstrate their opposition to the proposal.
- 1.5 The purpose of this report is to consider the responses received in relation to rule changes and rezoning in these Residential Areas (within KACs) and receive direction as to how to proceed.

1.0 Strategic Context

National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity

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

- 1.2 However, in response to the requirements of the NPS-UDC, the Greater Christchurch partnership, which Selwyn District Council is part of, together with other local councils, government agencies and iwi, has recently released for public consultation a draft FDS *Our Space 2018-2048, Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update*, which sets actions to address the residential and business capacity needs of the Greater Christchurch portion of the Selwyn district for the next 30 years. Public consultation on this document closed on 30 November 2018, with a hearing anticipated to occur in the coming months.
- 1.3 While Council's response to the NPS-UDC is the subject of a separate workstream, the outcomes of this work will have an impact on the future urban growth of the Greater Christchurch part of the District.

Rolleston Structure Plan and Rolleston Town Centre Master Plan

- 2.4 In order to plan for growth and guide future initiatives for Rolleston, the Council developed the Rolleston Structure Plan (adopted in September 2009). As part of this, a series of options to improve the existing town centre were developed. A preferred town centre location was outlined and a master planning exercise was undertaken. The Rolleston Town Centre Masterplan presents a future vision and provides direction for the transformation of the centre over time.
- 2.5 The Rolleston Town Centre Master Plan envisaged that in the first five years (2014-2018) that commercial developments would start to occur on Kidman Street, which has occurred with establishments like McDonalds and KFC; that Rolleston Primary School playground would be relocated to allow for Moore Street extension (this is still in the planning process) and that transitional redevelopment of residential properties to retail/commercial would occur along Tennyson Street.
- 2.6 The Master Plan, much like the Structure Plan, made no attempt to rezone the existing residential area in the middle of the KAC to commercial, however, the Master Plan notes, that if or when demand requires, retail and commercial services may spread into the residential area by 2031.

Lincoln Town Centre Plan

- 2.7 The Lincoln Town Centre Plan was developed as a framework for future development opportunities in the Lincoln Town Centre. It was initially based on the outcomes of the Lincoln Opportunity Study, which drew on 82 responses to a questionnaire sent to all Lincoln households in July 2011. The Lincoln Town Centre Plan was designed to work alongside the Selwyn District Plan and sets a vision for how the town centre may develop as time progresses.

LURP Action 27

- 2.8 The Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP), which took effect in 2013, was released to assist with the rebuild of earthquake damaged communities in Canterbury. In the Rolleston and Lincoln context, Action 27 directed the Council to change or vary the objectives, policies and methods of its District Plan to the extent necessary to provide for:

- (ii) zoning that defines the extent of the Key Activity Centre
- (iii) implementation of the Rolleston Town Centre Masterplan

2.9 In response the Council defined the KAC with a Business 1 Zoning in both Rolleston and Lincoln, with the exception of:

- the Living 1 Zone being proposed for Rolleston Reserve;
- some properties west and east of Tennyson Street (Precinct 5 Rolleston);
- the Markham Way residential enclave and;
- The residential properties along Gerald Street (Precinct 5 Lincoln)

2.0 Overview of Preferred Options Endorsed by DPC

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

Business

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

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

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

3.0 Summary of Feedback Received

4.1 During the public consultation period, Council staff received phone calls, emails and a petition signed by 62 people, with most people in opposition of the proposal as it relates to the potential extension of the Transitional Living Precinct. The feedback received is summarised below.

Option 1C: Residential zone with Transitional Living Overlay.

Rolleston

In Rolleston, the majority of feedback was in the form of a petition, which was signed by 62 parties. Some of those parties also request additional information on the proposal before provided additional feedback. The method by which parties provided feedback is recorded below.

Landowner	Address	Feedback Provided	Position	Method
Jason & Jennifer Hardy	2 Landor Common	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Email, Phone & Petition
Dekui Jia	14 Peel Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Email & Petition
Linda & Jim Kendall	18 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Email & Petition
Lyn & Murray Dunlop	21 Markham Way	Concerned about the type of activities that could occur if area was subject to overlay. Wish to remain residential. Opposed to Inclusion in overlay area.	Oppose	Email & Petition
Joe & Leanne Taipari	6 Markham Way	Asked impact rule change would have on rates and property valuation and what was to happen to Markham Reserve. Wish to remain residential. Opposed to Inclusion in overlay area.	Oppose	Email & Petition
Justin McErlane	26A Markham Way	Does not support any change in zoning. Unhappy about Markham Way extension. Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Opposed	Email & Petition
Helen Hayes	12 Peel Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Email & Petition
N & V Bool	28 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Email & Petition
Ryan Roche & Jacinda McCarthy	10 Peel Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Email & Petition
Troy McGillicuddy	Unspecified	Owns, but rents property, had questions about rating value and what types of business could establish under overlay rules.	Unclear	Phone
Lloyd Bathurst	14 Wilbur Close	Supportive of inclusion in transitional precinct as this is logical position for future commercial growth. Overlay provides some protection for residents.	Support	Email
Dan Colegate	Unspecified	Disappointed zone change may happen. Asked what effect rule change would have on the Reserve, what timeframes change might occur within.	Oppose	Email
Ron Clark	Unspecified	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Email
Rebecca Moreton	5 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Courtney & Craig Oliver	25 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Sarah & Daniel Ingram	23 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential.	Oppose	Petition

		Opposed to inclusion on overlay area		
Bryan McCormack	6 Peel Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Alex Mundy	6a Peel Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Geof Pannett	8 Peel Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Rowan Traue	10 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Bryan McQueen	7 Wilbur Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Linda McIvor	16 Wilbur Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Bernard Kilbride	9 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Belinda & Brent Margetts	11 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Marama Lynch	17 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Ronald Harding	13 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Eddie Keelan	8 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
R & T Liddicoat	4 Landor Common	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Greg Skuloney	5 Landor Common	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
R Barnes	6 Landor Common	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Chris & Jo Jones	9 Wilbur Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
J & L Mann	20 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Shelley Dickson	22 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Annabelle & James Reid	26 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
S Wootton	8 Landor Common	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Neville Hunter	20 Wilbur Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Ron Koole	20a Wilbur Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
D & H Miller	18 Wilbur Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
C Gouws	12 Wilbur Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Maggie Clark	8 Wilbur Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Michelle Leath	6 Wilbur Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Julie Westland	12 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Barry Munro	15 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition

Sharon & Ken Scott	3 Peel Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Fiona Liley & Michael Bamber	5 Peel Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
K & R Adams	7 Peel Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Jenny Ranson	9 Peel Close	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Leah Munro	7 Landor Common	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition
Shavaun Masterton	24 Markham Way	Wish to remain residential. Opposed to inclusion on overlay area	Oppose	Petition

**petition was also signed by B McKeage of 41 Duncans Road, unsure if they own/reside property in the area.*

Figure 1: Visual representation of location of those in Opposition (o) and Support (s) to Option 1c. (c) denotes property owned by Council.



- 4.2 The major theme of the feedback received was that residents wish to remain residentially zoned, which would be the case if the area was to be included in the 'Transitional Living Precinct', and that the character and amenity of the area be retained. It should be noted that given the majority of this feedback was in the form of a petition, we are unable to gauge the level of understanding each signatory has of the proposal (Option 1c).
- 4.3 A recently granted resource consent is for a retail and hospitality development (RC185298) on the corner of Tennyson Street and Markham Way (land currently within the Transitional Living

Precinct). The consent sought the removal of three existing dwellings, to be replaced with a two-storey commercial development. The application defaulted to 'Non-complying' because of the breach of site coverage (had the development remained within the 40% residential limit the application would have been discretionary), site coverage breach aside, the proposal would have required a resource consent due to the overall scale of the development. The application proceeded to a hearing and several submissions were received in opposition from the landowners within the Markham Way residential enclave. Concerns were raised over car parking, traffic generation, noise, lighting and the potential detrimental effects on the residential amenity of the area.

- 4.4 This consented development could have had an impact on resident's views with regard to Option 1c, as this may be the type of development they anticipate could easily occur in the transitional area. It is important to note that this type of development was not entirely anticipated and its location directly across the road from Rolleston Reserve and the fact it presently adjoins the existing B1 zone played an integral part in the consent being granted following a hearing.
- 4.5 Developments, such as the one discussed above, are not anticipated in the "transitional living precinct' as of right. The relaxation of the rules has been done in a manner that is anticipated to still protect the existing resident's amenity. Any business wishing to establish in this, or any other residential area within the District is expected to comply with rules relating to noise, lighting, signage, hours of operation and even the types of activities are managed. Where a resource consent is applied for and granted conditions are placed on the consent to help mitigate potential impacts on the surrounding area. In the case of the development on the corner of Markham Way and Tennyson Street, the Commissioner granted consent subject to specific conditions to address the concerns of the submitters. Conditions related to: the maximum of number of tenancies; limitations on the types of tenancies; restricted hours of operation; noise restrictions and other conditions relating to landscaping, urban design, lighting, waste and traffic. The consent was granted because of the sites proximity to the town centre and the Master Plan indicates that this type of development would eventually occur in this area. However, the conditions imposed aimed to better protect the residential character and amenity of the area in recognition that the underlying zoning is still residential, albeit with a transitional precinct overlay.
- 4.6 Another common theme of the feedback related to the concerns from residents related to the impact the proposed rule changes would have on their rates. Review of rating database shows there is no noticeable variation in rates between properties in the transitional living precinct and those residential properties within the KACs. Only when a property has been fully developed into a commercial use (which impacts on its value) has the rates increased and then the increase was marginal.

Option 2B: Rezone to Town Centre Zone

Rolleston

Landowner	Address	Feedback Provided	Position	Method
Lloyd Bathurst	14 Wilbur Close	Does not support the rezoning of Precinct 5 to Town Centre Zone, no shortage of commercial land and potential negative effects on adjoining land owners.	Oppose	Email
Unidentified	5A Moore Street	Concern over impact on rates	Unclear	Phone

Lincoln

Landowner	Address	Feedback Provided	Position	Method
Roy & Margaret Cole	33 Gerald Street	Wish to remain residential. Concerned about property values and increase in rates as a result of the changes.	Oppose	Email

- 4.7 As mentioned in the Preferred Option report, there are currently 18 properties located in Precinct 5 at Rolleston and 23 in Lincoln. Feedback was received from 1 of these property owners. Additional feedback was received from a residential landowner within the KAC, who demonstrated concern over increasing the amount of commercial land in the KAC when there was no shortage in supply in Rolleston within the next 10 years.
- 4.8 The table below outlines the available land supply in each KAC and the demand that is projected from the Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model. It's important to note that the available capacity includes both vacant land areas and those areas that have land available for potential for develop, or rather ability to be used more efficiently in line with the Selwyn District Plan provisions.

Township	Capacity (ha)	Demand to 2028 (ha)	Total Capacity remaining at 2028
Rolleston B1 (Incl Vacant Potential)	18	7	11
Lincoln B1 (Incl Vacant Potential)	4	4	0

Table: B1 land availability in Rolleston and Lincoln

- 4.9 Rolleston has capacity for commercial development in its current zoned land beyond 2028, even if vacant potential land is not considered. The fact that Rolleston's KAC capacity is sufficient aligns with the Activity Centre Network that promotes Rolleston as the District Centre, capable of absorbing short falls in other areas.

- 4.10 Lincoln township has sufficient B1 capacity until 2028 but it runs out at that point. Again it's important to note that most of that capacity is reliant on the vacant potential areas. If they do not come on board then Lincoln's remaining capacity (vacant land) will run out well before 2028.
- 4.11 The Town Centre Master Plans anticipated that the residential areas within the centres these areas would eventually be absorbed into the adjoining Town Centres (Business 1 zones). The Transitional Living Precinct Overlay was developed as a way to enable these areas to develop over time, anticipating that when the time presented itself they would eventually be rezoned. Precinct 5 in Lincoln presently contains a dentist, optometrist, lawyer and other commercial service activities in converted dwellings. In Rolleston, Precinct 5 contains a dentist, preschool and a two-storey commercial building is presently under construction, it's anticipated future use will be a mixture of food and beverage, retail and commercial service activities. This could be done now as part of the DPR, or potentially as part of the Town Centre Master Plan review which will begin following the adoption of the Future Development Strategy for Greater Christchurch. A benefit of determining the future zoning outside of the DPR is the process will likely provide more opportunity for landowner involvement.
- 4.12 Concerns from residents related to the impact the proposed rule changes would have on their rates. As discussed above a review of the rating database appears to show there is no noticeable variation in rates between properties in the transitional living precinct and those other properties within the KACs. Only when a property has been fully developed into a commercial use (which impacts on its value) has the rates increased and then the increase was marginal.

4.0 Conclusion

- 5.1 Feedback received from landowners in relation to Option 1c shows the residents are not supportive of the proposal. Less feedback was provided in relation to Option 2b, this perhaps indicates that landowners in the area are less resistant to the proposed change.
- 5.2 If the decision is to retain status quo as the DPR progresses, there are other avenues by which the future of these residential areas within KACs could be determined. The review of the Rolleston and Lincoln Town Centre Masterplans will ensure that whatever the future zone is, the activities anticipated in these areas are complimentary to the surrounding land use. However the views of these affected may remain the same regardless of the process and level of engagement that may be utilised.

5.0 Recommendation/Direction Sought

1. The Project Team recommends that the feedback received during the consultation process, discussed above, be noted and incorporated into other related work streams, as appropriate.

2. The Project Team seeks a decision from the DPC re Option 1c given the strong opposition from the land owners/occupiers of Markham Way, Peel Close, Wilbur Close and Landor Common. If the decision is to retain the status quo (as requested by residents), there would be another opportunity to consider the future of this area as part of the upcoming review of the Rolleston Town Centre Master Plan.
3. Having received little feedback on Option 2b and taking into consideration that there is not currently a shortage of commercial land available in either township that the 'Transitional Living Precinct Overlay' is currently enabling land development, and given the costs/time involved with the rezoning itself, the Project Team seeks direction from the DPC as how to proceed in the case of the Transitional Precincts. If the direction was to maintain status quo (Option 2a), there is the additional option of further relaxing the provisions for properties located within the Transitional Living Precincts, which enables their ongoing development, whilst aligning with the SCGM.

Appendix 1 – Summary of endorsed preferred options

Option 1C – Extend Transitional Living Policy Overlay

This approach would extend the Transitional Living policy overlay (planning map notation) over the subject area, whilst retaining a Residential/ Living 1 zone. This approach is currently applied to Precinct 5 of the KAC's in Lincoln and Rolleston which are still zoned Living 1 but some of the rules have been relaxed to encourage business development.

Effectiveness in Addressing the Issue:

This approach is neither consistent nor inconsistent with the SCGM as the land would continue to be zoned residentially and would have no impact on Rolleston's business land capacity. The Rolleston Town Centre Master Plan recognised the ongoing residential zoning of this residential enclave with retail activities filtering into the area in 15+ years, by applying the Transitional Zoning other commercial activities could filter into the area earlier. This approach has already been undertaken in the Town Centre (Precinct 5), whereby rules have been relaxed to allow some types of commercial development to occur. However, given the location of Precinct 5 on Rolleston's future 'High Street', instead of development occurring within the existing residential dwellings, land owners are opting to completely redevelop sites which results in a more complex process than the transitional precinct current allows.

With this option, amenity is managed to a degree, specifically on adjoining residential properties through retention of those rules relating to built-form and nuisance, but relaxing provisions relating to business activities and scale. This approach still allows landowners to determine the future use of the site and if a house is to be removed and replaced with a commercial building it would be a controlled activity. The use of any site would also be restricted by the permitted activity standards.

Risk:

Further to the above if any proactive zoning is promoted by Council then this is likely to generate submissions on the notified District Plan from other landowners not identified as having preferred sites for the policy overlay to apply. The evaluation of these alternative submission sites (which are inevitable and which may also be potentially suitable for development) comes with substantial further costs in reviewing technical assessments and reporting on submissions. It is recognised that evaluating and responding to submissions will also be required in Options 1A and 1C. However in Option 1A Council will not have already undertaken the cost and time of promoting new business sites, as well as assessing others.

Budget and Time Implications:

If Council decides to proceed with the overlay approach consideration will then be required around whether it continues to fund the progression of the proposal and defend its inclusion in the Proposed District Plan through the submission, hearing and appeal stages of the DPR.

As well taking on the evaluation costs and the costs of progressing through the DPR process Council will also be financing the development/upgrade of servicing infrastructure, if required.

Option 2B – Rezoning to Town Centre

This approach involves Council undertaking the work to potentially rezone sites currently located in the Transitional Living Precincts in Rolleston and Lincoln to Town Centre and to notify this rezoning proposal through the DPR process.

Effectiveness in Addressing the Issue:

Option 2B is somewhat inconsistent with the SGCM figures as discussed in Section 2.0. in relation to Rolleston, however, there is a potential future shortfall in Lincoln by 2028. Although the Transitional Precinct is a logical location to rezone to meet business capacity, additional work is required to determine suitable sites. This work should be undertaken as part of a strategic planning process, whereby the existing Town Centre Master Plans for both Rolleston and Lincoln are reviewed to ensure that the zone expansions occur in the right places (as briefly mentioned in Option 2A).

Risk:

As discussed in Option 1B, Section 32 requires significant information, in addition to taking on the evaluation costs and the costs of progressing through the DPR process Council will also be financing the development/upgrade of servicing infrastructure. Council may also find themselves at the receiving end of submissions on the notified District Plan from other landowners not identified as having preferred sites for rezoning. The evaluation of these alternative submission sites (which are inevitable and which may also be potentially suitable for development) comes with substantial further costs in reviewing technical assessments and reporting on submissions.

Budget or Time Implications:

As noted previously, given the evaluative nature of the s32 process that is required to determine the costs and benefits (and overall merit) of a rezoning proposal there is a risk that even after completing the site specific investigations, the s32 evaluations may not support rezoning (e.g. the costs outweigh the benefits). If Council decides to proceed with zoning, after identifying potential sites, consideration will then be required around whether it continues to fund the progression of any rezoning proposal and defend its inclusion in the notified plan through the submission, hearing and appeal stages of the DPR.