

Waikirikiri Ki Tua

Future Selwyn

**Hearing Summary Report
on the draft of Waikirikiri Ki
Tua Future Selwyn**

6 September 2024



Introduction

The Officers' Report¹ on submissions received on the draft of Waikirikiri Ki Tua Future Selwyn (WKTFS) was circulated to the Hearing Panel and submitters and made publicly available on 23 October 2024. The Officers' Report was prepared to:

- briefly outline the purpose of the draft of Waikirikiri Ki Tua Future Selwyn;
- describe the consultation and engagement process and results;
- provide an overview of the submissions received on the draft of Waikirikiri Ki Tua Future Selwyn;
- provide an officer's response to points made in the submissions received on the draft of Waikirikiri Ki Tua Future Selwyn; and
- provide recommendations on proposed changes to the draft of Waikirikiri Ki Tua Future Selwyn.

Those who wish to be heard, presented on their submission at a public hearing held on the 31st of August 2024.

This Hearing Summary Report provides a response to the information presented by submitters at that hearing. It also identifies and corrects errors in the Hearing Report and highlights additional changes to the draft of WKTFS as a result of the hearing presentation.

Report Layout

The report briefly responds to each submitter in the order in which they presented at the hearing. The final section of the report identifies and corrects errors in the Officers Report.

Appendix 1 includes an updated version of the reporting officer's recommendation table from the Officers Report.

Submitter Response

Submission No. 25 – Warren Pettigrew

I acknowledge Mr Pettigrew's position presented at the hearing. Selwyn needs to remain vigilant of emerging trends, pressures, and disruptions, particularly around climate change. The draft of WKTFS has acknowledged this through the Strategic Framework section, under 'A Healthy and Restored Environment' and 'Living within Environmental Limits' outcomes. The development of the 'Strategic Foresight' section, which outlines several potential scenarios for the district, also highlights the importance of adaptability to emerging pressures, challenges and opportunities. The purpose of this section is to 'stress test' the strategy to ensure that we can adapt the strategy as different future scenarios become more or less likely. The 'living' nature of WKTFS will allow us to make these changes quickly as they emerge.

¹ [WKTFS-Draft-Officers-Report.pdf \(selwyn.govt.nz\)](#)

Submission No. 54 – Mark Alexander

I acknowledge Mr Alexander's position presented at the hearing. I acknowledge that the dictionary definition may not explicitly present affordability as part of somewhere that is 'liveable'. I consider that the dictionary definition for 'liveable' as an adjective is decoupled from the subject (noun) and therefore is not helpful for understanding 'liveable' in the context of the draft of Waikirikiri Ki Tua Future Selwyn. Much of the research on liveable places and liveability contend that the context is of the utmost importance. Liveable is the adjective of the noun liveability which is a broader more holistic concept. Liveability is also a closely related concept with quality of life.

Liveable in the draft of Waikirikiri Ki Tua Future Selwyn is included in the Vision in respect to the entirety of Waikirikiri Selwyn as well as in the context of 'Liveable Low Carbon Towns' and 'Quality Infrastructure'. Each instance of liveable is in relation to large geographic areas, and that is the context for interpretation. Liveable as a broad and subjective concept in this context sufficiently encompasses affordability. I am therefore still of the position that affordability is sufficiently integrated into the vision through the use of the term 'liveable'.

As a point of clarification, the Mass Rapid Transit system (or Turn Up and Go), is not intended to be rail based, as suggested by Mr Alexander. Work is ongoing as to whether it should be via light rail (road based) or an advanced bus system, however using a heavy rail system has been discounted, in part due to the matters Mr Alexander raised in the hearing. A separate piece of work is being undertaken by Environment Canterbury (ECan) to explore the possibility of regional commuter rail.

Mr Alexander's hearing statement has been attached as Appendix 2.

Submission No. 109 – Sonya Olykan

I acknowledge Ms Olykan's position presented at the hearing. The submitter sought amendments to the direction 'protect highly productive land for land-based primary production'. As other submitters acknowledged, the language in this direction is lifted directly from the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022. The submitter stated that soils were not included anywhere in the draft of Waikirikiri Ki Tua Future Selwyn. In Part 1: Our Opportunities under the Natural Environment Topic is a section titled 'Land and Soil' which includes a map of key spatial data. The content in Part 1: Our Opportunities is a summary of background work that informed the draft of Waikirikiri Ki Tua Future Selwyn. Although soil is not explicitly mentioned in the Strategic Framework, other terms such as 'finite resources' and 'the life supporting capacity of the natural environment' sufficiently includes soil. The language in these directions reference 'natural and physical resources' as defined by the Resource Management Act 1991 which states that natural and physical resources includes land, water, air, soil, minerals, and energy, all forms of plants and animals (whether native to New Zealand or introduced), and all structures. Our current understanding of the natural and physical resources within the district will inform the development of the Area Plans, which will include exploring opportunities to support the ongoing use of high value soils as suggested by Ms Olykan.

Submission No. 88 – Keith Morrison

I acknowledge Mr Morrison's position presented at the hearing. Housing is an important aspect of WKTFs and has been identified as one of the Strategic Priorities. Work is continuing on developing

approaches to ensuring housing is accessible, diverse, sustainable and affordable. These approaches will be realised through next stages of WKTFS, which includes the Area Plans and the Action Plans, and will be consulted on with the public in the near future.

Submission No. 96 – Linda Klok & Submission No. 49 – Mary O’Brien – CCS Disability Action

I acknowledge Ms Klok’s and CCS Disability Action’s (CCSDA) positions presented at the hearing. Ensuring that all aspects of the district are accessible to everyone, particularly those with mobility issues, is important. This has been reflected in the draft of WKTFS and my suggested changes outlined in my hearing report. This work will be continued in the Area Plan and Action Plan stages. We welcome CCSDA’s offer to provide support and guidance as we undertake these stages and will contact them at an early stage of the Area Plan development to ensure these concerns are well integrated.

Submission No. 92 – Carey Barnett – Ellesmere Sustainable Agriculture Incorporated

I acknowledge ESAI’s position presented at the hearing. As acknowledged in my hearing report, the vision of the draft of WKTFS should be amended to better acknowledge the values of the small towns and rural areas.

A Key Terms section is included in the draft of WKTFS to aid in the understanding of the language used with the WKTFS, including Māori words and concepts. This section will be expanded and improved for the final version.

Submission No. 70 – Suzanne O’Rourke – Fonterra

I acknowledge Fonterra’s position presented at the hearing. To allay Fonterra’s concerns about the potential for reverse sensitivity effects on its processing plant, I recommended in my officer’s report that an additional direction be included, in part to protect significant industries from inappropriate urban growth.

It should be noted that the dot which identifies the townships, including Darfield are not intended to identify their precise geographical extents. The dots are sized to reflect their comparative size and sphere of influence. The size of Darfield’s dot in the District Picture represents its identity as the de facto capital of the Malvern Area. Furthermore, these dots in the District Picture dynamically resize depending on the spatial extent of the map. The extent and direction of its growth will be determined at the Area Plan stage, which will include public engagement.

Submission No. 81 – Jade Arnold – Ellesmere Bus Users and Supporters

I acknowledge Ellesmere Bus Users and Supporters’ (EBUS) position presented at the hearing. Public Transport (PT) within the district continues to be well below what is desired and required by Selwyn residents, especially for the more rural townships. This is reflected in the directions under ‘Sustainable and Accessible Transport’ outcome. While public transport falls under ECan’s function, Council will continue advocating for improved PT in Selwyn. Work will also be undertaken through the Area Plan

and Action Plan stages on addressing rural towns needs and possible solutions. I encourage Ellesmere Bus Users and Supporters to participate in the engagement for these stages.

In relation to the quality of the engagement, I agree that some aspects of the consultation could have been improved. We have taken on board this feedback and it will inform our approach to the next engagement in the phases of implementing WKTFS.

Submission No. 41 – Fiona Aston on behalf of Robbie McIlraith; Submission No. 74 – Fiona Aston on behalf of Grant Duncan; and Submission No. 69 – Fiona Aston on behalf of Lynn Townsend

I acknowledge these submitters positions presented at the hearing. The draft of WKTFS recognises the importance of providing a range of housing choice throughout the district. The strategy focuses on growing up through increase density as opposed to growing out through greenfield development that is currently the predominant form of growth in Selwyn. The direction and scale of growth for all towns, including Lincoln and Prebbleton will occur at the Area Plan phase. During this phase we will be asking for the identification of potential growth areas of township for consideration. This will also consider the need for commercial and industrial land.

The s32 Report General Industrial Zone and Port Zone² for the District Plan Review considered the option of separating current industrial areas into different industrial zones (for example a Light Industrial Zone for areas outside of Lincoln and Rolleston and a Heavy Industrial Zone for Lincoln and Rolleston). This option was not preferred as the option to apply site-specific rules was considered more appropriate than using multiple zones.

It is noted that the town centre zone in the Partially Operative District Plan does currently permit some of the activities identified by Mr Townsend as lacking in Lincoln, such as automotive activities as well as trade retail and trade supply activities.

The submitter did not understand the meaning behind 'Education / Net Zero Town' for Lincoln in the Township Network, particularly the net zero aspect. The draft of WKTFS contains a 'Key Terms' section of which the term net zero is included. Net zero is described as "a target of completely negating the greenhouse gas emissions produced by human activity. This can be done by balancing emissions and removals or by eliminating the production of emissions in the first place." This is the definition provided in the First Emissions Reduction Plan and was used in the draft of WKTFS. When the defined 'net zero' term is read in conjunction with the subject (being the town of Lincoln), I consider that the intention is clear. The submitter did raise some important points around what timeframe applies and is it the case that Lincoln is the first net-zero town of the towns in Waikirikir Selwyn.

The submitter suggested alternative wording, such as "Potential Net Zero Town". As the draft of Waikirikir Ki Tua Future Selwyn is future-focused and aspirational, renaming to a less aspirational term, especially given the long-term timeframe for Waikirikir Ki Tua Future Selwyn is not recommended. On balance, submitters raised that Lincoln is a town focused on 'knowledge' as well as 'education'. This also brings in alignment with the Partially Operative District Plan regarding the

² https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/354760/29-and-35-General-Industrial-and-Port-Zones.pdf

Knowledge Zone for part of the town. I recommend changing the title of Lincoln in the Township Network to '**Knowledge and** Net Zero Town'.

The submitter stated that the direction to 'enable sufficient development capacity for housing' should be amended to 'enable sufficient development capacity for housing **and business land**' to align with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020. A Productive, Low-Carbon and Diverse Economy contains a direction to 'enable sufficient development capacity for business land'. I consider that the amendment to the direction is unnecessary given that there is a separate direction for business land.

Submission No. 11 – Pauls Davis

I acknowledge Mr Davis's positions presented at the hearing. Attracting the appropriate talent to the district will be essential to ensure a thriving and robust economy. This is incorporated into the draft of WKTFS through the Direction "Attract and retain talent and skills". Further work on this will be undertaken at the action plan stage.

Submission No. 52 – Nicholas Kirk

I acknowledge Mr Kirk's positions presented at the hearing. Achieving positive environmental outcomes requires a whole of system approach. The draft of WKTFS highlights this through many of the supporting outcomes and directions under 'A Healthy and Restored Environment'. These outcomes and directions will ensure that the impacts on water will be consider and managed in all aspects of land use decisions.

Linked below is the report referenced by Mr Kirk in his presentation:

[Report: Wider than freshwater. How non-freshwater related activity can indirectly influence and have impact on freshwater outcomes. \(screen resolution\) \(landcareresearch.co.nz\)](https://landcareresearch.co.nz/report/wider-than-freshwater-how-non-freshwater-related-activity-can-indirectly-influence-and-have-impact-on-freshwater-outcomes-screen-resolution)

Submission No. 86 – Waihora Ellesmere Trust

I acknowledge Waihora Ellesmere Trust's positions presented at the hearing. It is acknowledged that the restoration of Te Waihora will take many years to achieve with many parties working together. Further development of opportunities to work towards this goal will be identified in future stages of WKTFS, and Council welcomes the opportunity to benefit from Waihora Ellesmere Trust's knowledge and support.

Submission No. 90 – Mark Brown – Hughes Development Ltd

I acknowledge Hughes Development Ltd's positions presented at the hearing. WKTFS is designed to be a high-level strategy, and does not outline implementation approaches, as further work is required to determine the best approach for achieving the Outcomes. The implementation will occur through the Area Plan and Action Plan stages. To inform these stages further discussion will be had with the development sector to identify opportunities and barriers to achieving improved urban outcomes.

Submission No. 47 – Hannah Ritchie – NZ Pork

I acknowledge NZ Pork's positions presented at the hearing. The continued viability of food production within the district is an important aspect achieving a strong and healthy economy. As noted by the submitter, the pork industry can differ from other food production in the district, particularly regarding indoor farms, which don't rely on the productive capacity of the land on which they are situated. I believe that the draft of WKTFS does address these concerns through the direction 'Support a high performance and sustainable rural economy'.

The submitter sought the consolidation of rural outcomes. The rural environment includes a wide range of aspects and is very diverse. As these aspects cover nearly every outcome and direction within the draft of WKTFS, there would be little achieved by doing this.

Submission No. 99 – Anne Scott – Spokes

I acknowledge Spokes's positions presented at the hearing. I agree with Spokes position on the importance of active travel. Enabling and encouraging active modes of transportation will contribute towards achieve many of the objectives of WKTFS. Work will continue on developing active transport networks as part of the Area Plans and Action Plan stages. This will include engaging with surrounding districts and Ecan to ensure that our networks are both inward and outward looking. It is noted that Council is currently working alongside its Greater Christchurch partners to develop the Greater Christchurch Transport Plan, to ensure alignment of our work in this area. The submitter considered that the direction 'support and develop connected public transport and active transport networks' should become two directions to distinguish between PT and active transport. I consider that there is an interrelationship between PT and active transport. Their inclusion in one direction does not diminish the importance of both PT and active transport nor does it prevent them being considered separately in future work.

Submission No. 105 – Peter Scott – Environment Canterbury

I acknowledge ECan's positions presented at the hearing. We welcome the continued support and collaboration offered by ECan, particularly regarding public transport and environmental outcomes. In the next phases of the Area Plan and Action Plans we look forward to continuing our strong relationship with Ecan to ensure positive outcomes for Selwyn in these areas.

Errors in the Officers Report

Recommendation 10 in the table in Appendix 1 of the Officers Report reads:

Amend Direction 1 under "Sustainable and Accessible Transport" as follows

2. Conserve **and manage** Finite Resources

This change relates to Direction 2 under "Living within Environmental Limits" and should read:

Amend Direction 2 under "Living within Environmental Limits" as follows

2. Conserve **and manage** Finite Resources

In the first paragraph on page 20, within Section 5.1.1 of the Officers Report, I recommended that the visual from the Consultation Document be amended and included in the Strategic Framework

section of WKTFS with an introductory explanation of the Strategic Framework explaining the interrelationship. This what not included in the table within Appendix 1 of the Officers Report.

These errors have been corrected in the updated recommendation table in Appendix 1 of this report.

Appendix 1

Ref.	Strategy Section	Recommended change	Report Section ref.
1.	Whole of WKTFS	Amend all instances of the wording “Outcomes and Directions” within the draft of WKTFS as follows “Outcomes, <u>Supporting Outcomes</u> and Directions”	5.1.1
2.	Strategic Context	Insert below ‘How Does Waikirikiri Ki Tua Future Selwyn Fit Within Our Strategic Context’ as follows <u>“Implementation</u> <u>Waikirikiri Ki Kua will shape and inform all decisions and investment that Council makes. This includes guiding plans, policies, bylaws, direction and guidance. The next step is to develop Area Plans, which will provide more detailed information and direction on future growth and development of the district. The projects contained within the Area Plans will be implemented through subsequent Long-Term Plans. As Area Plans are spatial plans, non-spatial actions will be identified and implemented through other instruments, including changes to the District Plan and/or non-statutory LGA plans and policies. The Area Plans and non-spatial actions will be developed with consultation with the community.”</u>	5.1.1
3.	Strategy Framework	Insert directly before ‘A great Place to Call Home’ a title and description as follows <u>“Outcomes, Supporting Outcomes and Directions</u> <u>Below are the four main outcomes that seek to achieve the Vision and Spirit of Selwyn. Each of these main outcomes is supported by various supporting outcomes, which in turn, contain directions that describe what needs to be done in order for that outcome to be achieved.”</u>	5.1.1
4.	Strategy Framework	Develop and incorporate a short code system for the outcomes, supporting outcomes and directions.	5.1.1
5.	Strategy Framework	Amend paragraph 1 on the Vision of Selwyn as follows	5.1.6

		“...Our places are equitable , distinct, liveable, vibrant, resilient and connected; enriching all our lives now and into the future...”	
6.	Strategy Framework	<p>Amend Paragraph 1 of the Spirit of Selwyn Section, in the Strategic framework section, as follows:</p> <p>“... Our sustainable and connected urban form sees improved connections between towns, new opportunities and choices for how we live, work and get around. The character of our small towns is cherished, and our rural areas are valued for farming and food production. Our growth is in harmony...”</p>	5.3.1
7.	Strategy Framework	<p>Amend paragraph 2 on the Vision of Selwyn as follows:</p> <p>“Our Waikirikiri Ki Tua Future Selwyn is a place where all people feel they belong, are able to connect with one another, share experiences, celebrate our differences and value our heritage...”</p>	5.1.6
8.	Strategy Framework	<p>Amend paragraph 2 on the Vision of Selwyn as follows:</p> <p>“We embrace new technologies and get ahead of the curve, with sustainable infrastructure and investment unlocking the full potential of Waikirikiri Selwyn.”</p>	5.2
9.	Strategy Framework	<p>Add additional direction under “A Productive, Low-Carbon and Diverse Economy”:</p> <p><u>“9. Protect regionally significant industry and agricultural research from reverse sensitivity effects of increased urban growth and inappropriate activities.”</u></p>	5.2
10.	Strategy Framework	<p>Amend Direction 2 under “Living within Environmental Limits” as follows</p> <p>2. Conserve and manage Finite Resources</p>	5.2
11.	Strategy Framework	<p>Amend Direction 1 under “Sustainable and Accessible Transport” as follows:</p> <p>“1. Prioritise and enable sustainable transport options.”</p>	5.2

12.	Urban Form Direction and District Picture.	Amend the pop-up description of the Lincoln township as follows: “...Lincoln has the opportunity to support a broader range of commercial business activity to support population growth...”	5.6.1
13.	Key Terms	Develop and insert definitions of the terms used within WKTFS	5.1.3
14.	Urban Form Direction and District Picture.	Amend the pop-up description of the Lincoln township as follows: Lincoln - Education / Knowledge and Net Zero Town	Submission No. 69 – Fiona Aston on behalf of Lynn Townsend
15.	Strategy Framework	Amend the visual identified as Figure 7 in the Officers Report to remove the ‘Strategic Priorities’ layer and included it in the Strategic Framework section of WKTFS with an introductory explanation of the Strategic Framework explaining the interrelationship.	5.1.1

Appendix 2

Mark Alexander Speaking Notes

Tēnā koutou,

Ko taku ingoa ko Mark Alexander aho

I appear to be both submitter 5839366 in the reporting officer's report and submitter #54 in the submissions.

Firstly I want to challenge something in that report.

Officer's report section 5.1.2 Council Focus Page 21

Submitter 5839366 suggests addition of the word 'affordable' into vision.

I am of the view that affordability is incorporated into the draft 'Vision', within the term 'liveable'

I beg to differ.

From Dictionary.com

Liveable adjective

1. suitable for living in; habitable; comfortable:
2. worth living; enduring:

Synonyms: worthwhile, bearable, tolerable, enjoyable, inhabitable

3. that can be lived with; companionable (often used in combination with *with*):

Affordable adjective

1. that can be afforded; believed to be within one's financial means:

The dictionary definitions of livable and affordable show a distinct difference in the meaning of livable and affordable.

Everyone I have spoken to doesn't think of affordability when thinking of livable.

The definition and understanding of livable doesn't include affordable for most people.

A livable Selwyn is clean, green, pleasant to live in with great spaces and places.

A livable Selwyn may be too expensive for most people to be able to pay rent, rates or purchase properties.

Queenstown, as an example, is livable but not affordable as a place to live for most New Zealanders. Is that what we want for Selwyn.

Future Selwyn should be both liveable and affordable for ratepayers and residents.

I strongly believe affordable should be added to the vision statement to ensure the rest of the strategy has that focus of Selwyn being an affordable place for residents and ratepayers.

The addition of affordable into the vision statement doesn't make that statement any less concise.

It does an additional important element to the vision.

I ask that you support my request and recommend the addition of affordable to the vision statement.

Q8. Do the Strategic Framework and Outcomes represent your values for the district's future? In your answer, think about what parts of the Framework and Outcomes are important to you, and if there is anything you think should not be there or that is missing.

No

Q9. Please explain.

A focus on affordability is missing or downplayed throughout the document. A focus on generating sustainable employment where people are is also missing. Mass rapid transport is an admission that there are not sufficient jobs for Selwyn residents within the Selwyn District. There needs to be greater attention to growing employment in Selwyn across the Selwyn District. Selwyn should not be delivering a dormitory suburb for Christchurch. Selwyn should be a viable stand alone district with employment for its residents within the district.

I further consider that the reporting officer's report has understated or ignored in several places the need to grow employment for Selwyn residents within Selwyn.

In my answer to Questions 8 & 9 I focused on increasing employment opportunities within Selwyn that would reduce the need for transport, private or public, to and from Christchurch city.

Why do people commute? Because they can't find suitable employment within our district. There should be a greater emphasis within the strategy to grow employment opportunities within Selwyn.

In addition the mass rapid transit discussion is frustrating, to me, because of its continued focus on a rail based solution on the heavy rail corridor. While a heavy rail based system may suit those urban areas adjacent to the rail corridor it doesn't and won't suit the rest of the district.

Is anyone going to drive from Lincoln, Prebbleton, West Melton to Rolleston to catch a train into Christchurch? And if they did where would they leave that service? How would they get to their final destination?

Rail services are additionally hard to add to. Currently it is extremely hard to get more buses onto popular Selwyn routes. How much more difficult will it be to get additional rail rolling stock and add to a service?

The strategy is meant to be a visionary document but it does need to be grounded in reality and commuter rail is, in my humble opinion, an unhelpful distraction in the discussion around public transport within Selwyn and for the journey to & from Christchurch city.

Urban Sprawl

There needs to be a greater focus or emphasis within the strategy on achieving a compact urban form to achieve a livable and affordable Selwyn.

Despite the current government's claim that allowed unrestrained development will lower housing costs we can recognise that for what it is – rhetoric not reality.

If urban sprawl is allowed then there will be a Selwyn City with suburbs of Prebbleton, Lincoln and Rolleston. I don't want this and I hope you don't want this.