



**PUBLIC AGENDA**

**FOR THE MEETING OF**

**DISTRICT PLAN COMMITTEE**

**TO BE HELD AT THE**

**SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICES,**

**COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**ON WEDNESDAY 04 MARCH 2020**

**COMMENCING AT 1:00PM**

## **Committee Members**

### Chair

Tim Harris

Group Manager – Environmental and Regulatory Services

### Selwyn District Council

Mayor Sam Broughton

Councillor Mark Alexander

Councillor Jeff Bland

Councillor Debra Hasson

Councillor Murray Lemon

Councillor Malcolm Lyall

Councillor Grant Miller

Councillor Bob Mugford

Councillor Nicole Reid

Councillor Jenny Gallagher

Councillor Shane Epiha

Councillor Sophie McInnes

### Te Taumutu Rūnanga

Hirini Matunga

### Environment Canterbury

Councillor Craig Pauling

### Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga

Tania Wati

### Project Sponsor

Jesse Burgess

Phone 347-2773

### Project Lead

Justine Ashley

Phone 027 285 9458

## **Agenda Items**

Item	Page	Type of Briefing	Presenter(s)
<b>Standing Items</b>			
1. Apologies	4	Oral	The Chair
2. Declaration of Interest	4	Oral	
3. Deputations by Appointment	4	Oral	
4. Outstanding Issues Register	4	Written	
5. Confirmation of Minutes	5-12	Written	
<b>Specific Reports</b>			
6. Monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preferred Options Report</li> </ul>	13-41	Written	Craig Friedel
7. Resolution to exclude the public <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Excluded Minutes from 19 February 2020</li> </ul>	42	Written	The Chair

## **Standing Items**

### **1. APOLOGIES**

### **2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Nil.

### **3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

Nil.

### **4. OUTSTANDING ISSUES REGISTER**

Nil.

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Report Date / Action</b>	<b>Item Resolved or Outstanding</b>
Key Changes on Draft Provisions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	<p><b><i>Report back on changes to draft provisions and Biodiversity Working Group.</i></b></p> <p><i>Resolution from ‘Update Report on draft Proposed District Plan programme’ on DPC agenda 19 February 2020:</i></p> <p><i>“That the Committee notes the recommended changes to draft provisions (in Appendix 2) since they were last presented to DPC at the Chapter/Topic Workshop, subject to any further amendments agreed by DPC.”</i></p>	4 March 2020	Outstanding

### **5. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

Minutes from the meeting of the District Plan Committee on 19 February 2020.



**District Plan Committee meeting  
Held on Wednesday 19 February 2020 at 1.00pm  
at Selwyn District Council,  
Rolleston**

**Present:** Mayor S Broughton, Councillors M Alexander, M Lemon, D Hasson, B Mugford, G Miller, M Lyall, J Gallagher, S Epiha, S McInnes, Mr C Pauling (Environment Canterbury), Mr H Matunga (Te Taumutu Rūnanga) and Mr T Harris (Chair – Group Manager Environmental and Regulatory Services).

**In attendance:** Messrs J Burgess (Planning Manager), B Rhodes (Strategy & Policy Team Leader), S Hill (Business Relationship Manager), R Love (Strategy and Policy Planner), A Mactier (Strategy and Policy Planner), Greg White (Consultant, DHI), (Nick Griffiths, Callum Margetts, and Justin Cope of Environment Canterbury), Mesdames J Ashley (Project Lead), J Lewes (Strategy and Policy Planner), J Tuilaepa (Senior Strategy and Policy Planner), R Carruthers (Strategy and Policy Planner), V Barker (Planning Consultant), K Johnston (Communications Consultant) and T Van der Velde (District Plan Administrator).

**Standing Items:**

**1. Apologies**

Apologies received from Tania Wati (Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga) and Councillors Nicole Reid and Jeff Bland for absence.

**Moved – The Mayor / Seconded – Councillor Alexander**

*‘That the apologies from Committee members Tania Wati (Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga), and Councillors Nicole Reid and Jeff Bland for absence are received for information.’*

**CARRIED**

**2. Declaration of Interest**

Nil.

**3. Deputations by Appointment**

Nil.

#### **4. Outstanding Issues Register**

Nil.

#### **5. Confirmation of Minutes**

Nil.

#### **6. Update on draft Proposed District Plan programme**

It is the focus of this year's District Plan Committee (DPC) meetings to address outstanding workstreams, report back on pre notification consultation and preparation for the formal notification process. The update report highlights some of the key changes to provisions since the last DPC workshop, a summary of Rūnanga advisory group feedback and priorities of the project team for the next six weeks.

Discussion was held around key changes particularly those to the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter.

Councillor Lemon discussed the process of the Biodiversity working group which he chaired. This was a collaborative process where decisions were reached. Councillor Lemon indicated changes outside of the Biodiversity Group can put a strain on integrity of group and decisions made by the group.

Mr Mactier advised that after consultation and consideration from stakeholders particularly Rūnanga it was considered that changes were relatively minor.

It was clarified there was some Rūnanga representation during stages of the Biodiversity Working Group.

A Committee member acknowledged the Biodiversity working group's hard work and commented on Council's relationship with Rūnanga and the requirement to address Rūnanga feedback as well as noting the timings of when this feedback was received. There are two processes combined where it is expected there will be some critique.

The Chair questioned if Council could feed changes back to the Biodiversity group.

It was agreed as a first step that Mr Mactier and Councillor Lemon will work together to revisit some of the provisions.

It was agreed that the second recommendation of the report:

*"That the Committee notes the recommended changes to draft provisions (in Appendix 2) since they were last presented to DPC at the Chapter/Topic Workshop, subject to any further amendments agreed by DPC."*

Be included in the District Plan Committee's outstanding issues register.

**Moved (as amended) – The Mayor / Seconded – Councillor Lyall**

## Recommendation

***“That the Committee notes the report.”***

**CARRIED**

### **7. Communication Strategy for formal public consultation - Presentation**

The Project Team is planning communications for the notification stage which is expected to start in May 2020. The consultation will last eight weeks (40 working days) which is the minimum time required under legislation, Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act.

Further communication will go out once submissions are received, summarised and further submissions requested.

The Project Team are expecting the new District Plan to be in place by mid-2022, subject to any Environment Court appeals.

Communication to go out for notification will provide the public with an understanding of key proposed changes, which means we want to proactively highlight changes that based on the engagement to date, will likely be of most interest. Council hope to hear feedback from a cross section audience.

The communications strategy will focus on engaging those that usually do not engage with the Council on planning matters. As a result Councils campaign theme is 'Because it matters' - this will focus on explaining why the District Plan matters and provide concrete examples of what the District Plan does. This will be communicated through various methods.

A Committee member suggested that before the plan is notified Council may look into holding a series of workshops to upskill and educate the public on the Resource Management Act and how to make a submission during a consultation. In addition the same Committee member advised to have targeted consultations with township committees and residents associations.

The Chair advised this is something the Project Team can look into.

Discussion was held over making the proposed plan and submission form easily accessible and an easy process, so more people are likely to hold interest and be engaged.

It was clarified that the team are somewhat restricted by requirements of Schedule 1 of the RMA for questions on submission form but are looking at different platforms to make sure it's user friendly and can be accessed from different devices.

Discussion was held around receiving advice for those Councillors who will be on the Hearings Panel as Commissioners in regards to their level of public engagement during the consultation on the Proposed District Plan.

The Chair will seek formal advice and will bring this back to the Committee. In the meantime it was advised for panel members to take a conservative approach.

**Moved** – Councillor Mugford / **Seconded** – Councillor McInnes

## **Recommendation**

***“That the Committee notes the presentation.”***

**CARRIED**

## **8. West Melton Rifle Range – Update report**

The Council is progressing the option of requiring new noise sensitive activities within an identified outer noise contour to be insulated for noise. This approach was endorsed by District Plan Committee (DPC) in June 2019.

When Council consulted with landowners about this approach last year the outer contour was based on a 2013 noise study provided by New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF). It was made clear that the noise contour was preliminary and that it would be reviewed and NZDF were to commission an updated noise report. An updated noise report was received from NZDF on 14 January this year. This report was expected around September/October last year therefore it has been delayed.

A key change in operations since the 2013 noise report is that NZDF now use a Barrett sniper rifle which has impacted the noise modelling. As a result there has been an extension to the outer noise contour.

To determine the number of additional affected properties, Council's GIS team produced the map in Appendix 2 of the report which shows the preliminary outer noise contour in green and the new contour in yellow. There are 33 additional potentially affected properties shown within the yellow contour.

*‘Cr Lemon out 1.50pm’*

Council has engaged Acoustic Engineering Services (AES) to peer review the updated noise report. AES have requested further information from NZDF's noise consultants to complete their review. This further information has not yet been received and is necessary to determine the noise levels on which the contours are based, and the extent of the contours.



A key preliminary message is that there may be fewer or more properties affected once the peer review is complete as the contour line has not yet been substantiated. Therefore the additional property owners affected has not been confirmed.

Last year in August Council indicated it would communicate with landowners once the updated report had been peer reviewed. As this is not completed the project team are proposing to communicate with select land owners who are well connected to the community and who we have communicated with directly in the past. Communications will advise of this DPC report and the noise report and the fact it is subject to peer review and the overall timing has been delayed. Once peer review is complete all affected landowners will be updated.

If the peer review is not complete by Mid-March, Council will still communicate with affected land owners, but the messaging will be more around the delay and the reasons for it and advising them of the opportunity to participate in the submission process.

A Committee member raised concerns about only contacting a selective group of landowners as there may be perception Council are favouring landowners. The same Committee member suggested the West Melton District Residence Association group be included in the mail out.

It was clarified as an interim step contact will be made with parties that were really involved with the last consultation, these are key landowners who rallied the community and who kept communication open with other landowners.

*‘Cr Lemon in 1.52pm’*

If there are delays with the peer review and the new proposed contours are not substantiated, Council intends to use the preliminary contours and their extent will need to be determined through the submission process.

The Chair suggested Council take a precautionary approach covering a wider area in case contour line increases, tailoring communication to suit.

It was agreed that there be no contact with select parties as an interim step and that instead all identified land owners would be contacted once the peer review is complete or if not complete by mid-March that all identified land owners be contacted in any case and advised about the delay and submission process.

**Moved (as amended) – Councillor Alexander / Seconded – Councillor Lemon**

### **Recommendation**

***“That the Committee notes the report.”***

***“The Committee notes that:***

- i. an updated noise report has been received from NZDF and is currently subject to peer review which is yet to be completed. The extent of the proposed outer noise contour has increased, and the noise contour levels and extent of the outer noise contour may change further subject to peer review; and***
- ii. direct communications with ~~select~~ identified land owners will be initiated to provide an update about the revised noise report being available on the Council’s website and next steps; and***
- iii. the timing of the written communications to all affected landowners will follow the completion of the peer review and the extent of the noise contours being confirmed by Council, assuming this information is available by mid-March ahead of notification of the Proposed Plan. If not available by mid-March, communications will be sent advising of the delay and that participation will need to occur via the submission process following notification.”***

**CARRIED**

## 9. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

**Moved** – Councillor Miller / **Seconded** – Councillor Hasson

### Recommendation

#### Recommended:

1. *'That the public be excluded from the following proceedings of this meeting. The general subject matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason of passing this resolution in relation to the matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:*

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reasons for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution	Date report can be released
1. Natural Hazards - Flooding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preferred Option Report</li> <li>• Communications and Engagement Summary Plan</li> </ul>	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)	Date of commencement of landowner engagement
2. Natural Hazards- Report on Draft Flooding provisions			Date of commencement of landowner engagement
3. Natural Hazards – Coastal Hazards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preferred Option Report</li> <li>• Updated Communications and Engagement Summary Plan</li> </ul>			Date of commencement of landowner engagement
4. Natural Hazards- Report on Draft Coastal Hazards provisions			Date of commencement of landowner engagement

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests

protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act or Section 6 or Section 7 or Section 9 of the Official Information Act 1982, as the case may require, which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

1-4	<p>Maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) the free and frank expression of opinions by or between or to members or offices or employees of any local authority, or any persons to whom section (5) applies, in the course of their duty;</li> <li>(ii) The protection of such members, officers, employees and persons from improper pressure or harassment.</li> </ul>	Section 7(2)(f)
-----	---	-----------------

2. *That appropriate officers remain to provide advice to the Committee.*

*The meeting moved to Public Excluded at 2.05pm*

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2020

The Chair Group Manager Environmental and Regulatory Services  
Tim Harris

Signature:

## **Specific Reports**

### **6. Monitoring – Preferred Options Report**

Author:	Craig Friedel, Planning Consultant (Harrison Grierson)
Contact:	Ben Rhodes (Strategy and Policy Team Leader) (03) 347 2824

### **Purpose**

To brief the Committee on the Preferred Options Report, which is to identify a preferred option for how the provisions contained in the Proposed District Plan are to be monitored to give effect to section 35 of the RMA and how this is integrated with monitoring the state of the environment, and the administration of resource consents and delegated functions.

### **Recommendations**

***“That the Committee:***

- (i) Notes the report; and***
- (ii) Incorporates the Monitoring Statement contained in Appendix 1 into the Proposed Plan and implements a non-statutory monitoring strategy (Option 2); and***
- (iii) That the Environmental Services Department proceeds with the development of a non-statutory monitoring strategy to assist in delivering the integrated outcomes expressed in the proposed Monitoring Statement under Recommendation (ii) above.”***

### **Attachments**

‘Preferred Options Report for Monitoring’

# PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT TO DISTRICT PLAN COMMITTEE

**DATE:** DPC Meeting - 4 March 2020

**TOPIC:** District Wide - Monitoring

**SCOPE DESCRIPTION:** Preferred Issues and Options for Monitoring (PW300/01)

**PREPARED BY:** Craig Friedel, Consultant Planner

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue(s)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clear direction is required on how the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan is monitored that is practical and cost-effective to implement; and</li> <li>2. The outcomes of district plan monitoring need to be recorded, reported and actioned in a practical and cost-effective way.</li> </ol>
Preferred Option	Incorporate a monitoring statement into the Proposed Plan and implement a non-statutory monitoring strategy (Option 2).
Recommendations to DPC	<p>That the Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Notes the report; and</li> <li>(ii) Incorporates the Monitoring Statement contained in Appendix 1 into the Proposed Plan and implements a non-statutory monitoring strategy (Option 2); and</li> <li>(iii) That the Environmental Services Department proceeds with the development of a non-statutory monitoring strategy to assist in delivering the integrated outcomes expressed in the proposed Monitoring Statement under Recommendation (ii) above.</li> </ol>
DPC Decision	



## 1.0 Introduction

This issues and options report relates to how the provisions contained in the Proposed Plan are to be monitored to give effect to section 35 of the RMA and how this is integrated with monitoring the state of the environment, and the administration of resource consents and delegated functions.

Regarding the Proposed Plan:

- There are no specific objectives, policies, rules, definitions or land use zones proposed to monitor the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan or council's wider monitoring duties under the RMA; and
- A statement outlining Council's monitoring obligations for monitoring and reporting, including the efficiency and effectiveness of the Proposed Plan, is proposed as a final sub-section of the 'How Your Plan Works' section in 'Part 1 - Introduction and general provisions of the Proposed Plan' (refer to Appendix 2). This statement highlights the processes that will be relied on to 'give effect' to the relevant clauses of section 35, with reference being made to statutory and non-statutory processes that include a monitoring strategy.

The development and implementation of a non-statutory monitoring strategy, compliance with the NPS-UDC mandatory monitoring requirements, ten-year district plan review and changes to the Plan under the 1st Schedule of the RMA will all assist in ensuring the effectiveness and efficiency of the objectives, policies, rules and other methods are monitored, reported and actioned. A monitoring strategy will also assist in ensuring that the effectiveness of the Proposed Plan is informed by, and integrated with, council's other monitoring duties (state of the environment, delegated functions and exercising resource consents) under the RMA.

### 1.1 Overview and purpose of monitoring and reporting on district plan effectiveness

#### ***Council's duties under the RMA***

The RMA sets out the duties and functions for local authorities to monitor and report on: (i) the state of the environment; (ii) the efficiency and effectiveness of district plan policies, rules or methods; (iii) the exercise of resource consents; and (iv) delegated functions<sup>1</sup>. The contents of district plans may state the significant resource management issues for the district, the environmental results expected from the policies and methods and the procedures for monitoring the effectiveness and efficiency of the policies and methods<sup>2</sup>. There is a duty on councils to ensure information is available to assist in managing natural and physical resources. The requirement to monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of policies, rules, or other methods in policy statements or plans is specifically relevant to the administration of district plans<sup>3</sup>.

The monitoring of the exercise of resource consents and the state of the environment are key indicators of how effectively and efficiently the plan is working to meet the purpose of the RMA.

<sup>1</sup> Section 35

<sup>2</sup> Section 75(2)(a), (d) and (e)

<sup>3</sup> Section 35(2)(b)

Councils are also required to prepare and make available to the public a report on district plan monitoring every five years<sup>4</sup> and there is a duty to take appropriate action when monitoring indicates that a response is needed to give effect to the purpose and principles of the Act<sup>5</sup>.

***Why monitor and report on the effectiveness of the district plan?***

Monitoring is a critical feedback mechanism to close the policy formulation, policy evaluation and policy administration loop through continual refinement and improvement based on qualitative and quantitative information. In a district plan context, monitoring assists in providing:

- An early warning of issues or problems with how the district plan is working so improvements can be made before they become serious, costly or irreversible;
- A better understanding of the key pressures on the environment so that organisations are accountable for poor outcomes and to ensure appropriate responses are implemented to improve the effectiveness of policies and methods; and
- Robust, accurate and accessible information to encourage effective participation in resource management processes.

District plan monitoring forms part of a broader monitoring regime that is carried out by council's to 'give effect' to the broader requirements of section 35. These monitoring functions inform the effectiveness and efficiency of district plans and through the general duty to take appropriate action in response to monitoring outcomes. These include:

- Measuring the state of the environment by monitoring whether the quality of the district's resources are declining, being maintained or improving when considered against baselines and desired outcomes. Examples include protected landscapes, heritage items, cultural sites and values, housing needs, discharges to air, ground and water associated with the establishment, operation and upgrading of public infrastructure to comply with Regional Council permits and consents<sup>6</sup>;
- Measuring how efficiently resource consents are being processed and how effective they are in managing resource management outcomes through participation in the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) National Monitoring System (NMS)<sup>7</sup>;
- Measuring progress towards achieving the community wellbeing's in the Long-Term Plan under the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA); and
- Providing information to the public in a transparent and convenient way to encourage participation in resource management processes that contribute to sustainable outcomes<sup>8</sup>.

***How effective and efficient is the operative district plans monitoring schedules?***

Section 3.0 below establishes that there are several inefficiencies with how the SDP monitors the effectiveness and efficiency of its provisions and its wider monitoring duties. There is a

<sup>4</sup>Section 35(2A), (3), (4) and (5)

<sup>5</sup>Section 35(2)

<sup>6</sup>Section 35(2)(a)

<sup>7</sup>Section 35(2)(c), (ca) and (d)

<sup>8</sup>Section 35(2A), (3), (4), and (5)



disconnect between the Appendix 1 Monitoring Schedules and the balance of the SDP and there are several inconsistencies between the two versions of the monitoring strategy listed in Table E1.1 of each volume of the Plan. The separation of the Rural and Township Volumes results in a significant level of doubling up on some issues and makes the prioritisation of resources difficult.

The lack a dedicated resource to implement the SDP Appendix 1 Monitoring Schedules, coupled with unclear guidance within Tables E1.1, has contributed to there being no coordinated effort to regularly monitor the effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan. As a result, targeted monitoring is required to be developed as part of plan change processes, strategic planning initiatives or to address priorities identified in the Strategy and Policy Team's works program. These investigations ensure there is an appropriate evidence base to inform specific changes that will improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the SDP, but it is often disconnected from other monitoring that is undertaken by Council and its partner agencies<sup>9</sup>. The uncertainty with the monitoring framework within the SDP hinders the ability for suitable state of the environment monitoring to take place and for this to be integrated with the administration of resource consents and determining that desired outcomes are being met.

## 1.2 Preferred Options

The issues and options analysis contained in this report have confirmed that best practice monitoring has evolved since the draft Monitoring Strategy was prepared and that there are opportunities already provided within RMA processes to monitor, action and report on the ongoing effectiveness and efficiency of SDP. The statutory context also provides scope for second generation plans to be less 'hands-on' when it comes to monitoring how well plans are working as it isn't a mandatory requirement under the National Planning Standards. As a result, it is not considered to be necessary or appropriate for the Proposed Plan to identify the significant resource management issues (in addition to the Strategic objectives and objectives), key anticipated environmental outcomes, environmental indicators or to list any specific monitoring actions. It is more efficient and effective to rely on the statutory and non-statutory processes listed in the proposed monitoring statement contained in [Appendix 1](#) of this report. A non-statutory monitoring strategy will enable a more integrated monitoring regime to be developed and applied to meet Council's needs. This will require an ongoing commitment from Council to ensure it is monitoring is resourced and prioritised with other RMA and LGA duties and functions.

Monitoring remains critical in measuring how well the Proposed Plan is working on a day to day basis to inform changes that are necessary to make it more efficient to administer and effective in managing the district's natural and physical resources. Council will fulfill these requirements by:

- Reviewing the operative SDP, which must occur every 10 years<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> This includes agencies such as Statistics NZ, Government Ministries and the Canterbury Regional Council

<sup>10</sup> Section 79(1)(c)

- Undertaking more regular and targeted policy, rules and methods effectiveness and efficiency monitoring<sup>11</sup>;
- Administering private plan change requests and promulgating changes to regularly improve how the Proposed Plan ‘gives effect’ to the Part 2 matters, where evaluations under section 32 of the RMA must assess the efficiency and effectiveness of proposed changes in achieving the objectives of the Proposed Plan<sup>12</sup>;
- Developing and prioritising the implementation of a comprehensive non-statutory monitoring strategy to ensure an integrated approach that covers all components of section 35 of the RMA and monitoring duties under the LGA; and
- Participating in sub-regional and national monitoring forums to implement statutory processes and non-statutory initiatives.

## 2.0 Summary of Issues

The following lists the two priority issues and documents why they have been identified as being relevant. These issues provide the starting point for determining the most appropriate option for monitoring the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan and to ensure this is integrated with Council’s wider monitoring duties under the RMA and LGA.

### ***Issue 1: Practical and cost-effective district plan effectiveness monitoring***

*Clear direction is required on how the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan is monitored that is practical and cost-effective to implement.*

The Proposed Plan needs to provide certainty to plan users that district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring will be managed through statutory and non-statutory processes that are consistent with the statutory context and Council’s resourcing and capabilities. It is critical that this monitoring is undertaken in an efficient and cost-effective manner. This can be achieved by setting clear expectations within the Proposed Plan of what, when and how effectiveness and efficiency monitoring is to be carried out. It is equally important that an integrated approach to monitoring Council’s wider duties and functions under section 35 of the RMA and the LGA informs this monitoring.

An overly ambitious or uncertain district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring system will require ongoing resourcing and budgets to implement that may undermine the delivery of other resource management priorities. Conversely, the uncertainty and complexity associated with the existing SDP monitoring schedules must be addressed to improve implementation and to ensure monitoring isn’t completely overlooked.

---

<sup>11</sup> Section 79(9)

<sup>12</sup> Section 32(1)(b)(ii)

***Issue 2: Recording, reporting and actioning district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring***

*The outcomes of district plan monitoring need to be recorded, reported and actioned in a practical and cost-effective way.*

The Proposed Plan needs to establish what milestones and key district plan administration tasks need to incorporate effectiveness and efficiency monitoring, how this information is shared with the community, stakeholders and interested parties and decision makers and how the results are to be acted upon. The RMA incorporates set procedures that require the results of monitoring to be evaluated when considering the appropriateness of changes to district plans and ideally that these changes are informed by Council's wider monitoring duties under section of the RMA.

Processes to evaluate statutory changes to district plans under the RMA and the development of non-statutory spatial plans and strategies under the LGA also require that information is made available to the public. Public hearings are often held to consider submissions, evaluate the monitoring findings that have influenced the policy development phase and ultimately to decide on how these monitoring findings are actioned. An overly ambitious or uncertain monitoring reporting regime will require ongoing resourcing and budgets to implement. It also may unnecessarily duplicate existing public participatory processes that require monitoring information to be made available to the public and for decision-making processes to determine how the findings of this monitoring is best actioned.

The options to address these identified resource management issues are evaluated in [Section 7.0](#) of this report.

### 3.0 Statement of Operative District Plan approach

This sub-section initially outlines the relevant SDP provisions that apply to district plan monitoring and reporting, before evaluating these against the identified issues to determine what changes are considered appropriate.

***SDP monitoring provisions***

The SDP was made fully operative on 3 May 2016. It was developed as an 'effects'-based planning instrument that sets out Issues, Objectives, Policies and Methods by topic. The district is divided into different zones for the purposes of establishing minimum areas for subdivision and applicable performance standards to manage land use activities. A relatively unique feature of the SDP is the separation of the Rural and Township environments into two volumes. The policy framework for each volume is similar, but there are some notable differences, including the 'Monitoring Strategy' included as Appendix 1 of each Volume.

Part E - Appendix 1 in both the Township and Rural Volumes of the SDP contain an objective and supporting policies relating to district plan monitoring. Objective E1.1 applies to both the Township and Rural Volumes of the SDP. The Township Volume includes nine policies that seek to deliver a range of high-level monitoring actions and outcomes that have been derived from section 35 of the RMA. Appendix 1 of the Rural Volume includes three policies that capture some, but not all, of the matters referred to in the Township Volume policies.

The procedures and information sources required to implement the SDP Monitoring Schedules are stated in Appendix 1 - Table E1.1 of both the Township and Rural Volumes. Table E1.1 sets out the various Issues, Indicators, Information sources and Frequency proposed for monitoring. The Rural Volume Monitoring Schedule is organised to reflect the same structure as the policy framework that includes the identification of 21 key 'Issues' for monitoring. The Schedule lists the Indicators for monitoring the 'Issue', defines the 'Purpose' for monitoring the 'Issue', and provides a monitoring timeframe. The Monitoring Strategy for the Township Volume groups elements in the policy framework under broader 'Issue' headings, resulting in nine key 'Issues' that need to be monitored. For each Issue, the schedule provides information on the 'Resource Management Aspect' to be monitored, defines the 'Indicators', identifies 'Information Sources' for undertaking the monitoring and provides a timeframe for when each 'Issue' is to be monitored by (Frequency Monitoring).

The purpose of the SDP Monitoring Schedules is to enable Council to determine whether the policies, rules and methods are effective and the most efficient way of addressing the identified Issues, Objectives and Environmental Outcomes. They also assist in tracking the state of the district's priority resource management issues that have been identified in the SDP.

#### ***The effectiveness and efficiency of the SDP monitoring schedules***

The SWOT analysis identified that there is a disconnect between Appendix 1 Monitoring Schedules and the balance of the Plan, with several examples illustrating inconsistencies between the two iterations of Table E1.1. The separation of the Rural and Township Volumes results in a significant level of doubling up on some issues that makes the prioritisation of resources difficult. There is evidence that this approach has:

- (a) Failed to monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of the SDP;
- (b) Generated inconsistencies with other components of the Plan; and
- (c) Contributed to poor implementation where the Monitoring Schedules have not formed the basis of district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring or reporting.

The uncertainty in Appendix 1 as to what, when and how the identified priorities need to be monitored has contributed to piecemeal project-based effectiveness and efficiency monitoring being carried out as an alternative to implementing the SDP monitoring schedules. Examples include: (i) the use of vague terminology and the failure to identify the core components of the 'Outstanding natural features and landscapes' Issue in Appendix 1; (ii) the poor link and variability between the 'Issues' in Table E1.1; (iii) uncertainty around achieving the outcomes expressed in the objectives to objectives or policies, and (iv) the disconnect between the 'Indicators', 'Information Sources' and the stated 'Resource Management Issues'. The Appendix 1 schedules follow a traditional policy-based framework with objectives and policies, but there are no commensurate rules, with the only methods being listed in Table E1.1.

The Strategy and Policy Team works program identifies and prioritises the resourcing that is allocated to the administration of the SDP, implementation of statutory instruments and strategic planning initiatives and responding to issues identified through the administration of the Plan and raised by elected representatives, lobby groups and members of the public. The preparation of project-based issues papers for the consideration of Council establishes the level

of resourcing commitment and the processes for resolving the identified issues. This alternative approach has proven to be successful in appropriately managing priority resource management issues, where monitoring can be tailored to the project and resourcing allocated according to the available budget and the capacity and capabilities of the personnel within the planning team.

One threat, or issue, that needs to be considered in this evaluation is meeting the balance between implementing a comprehensive integrated monitoring regime versus the reality that monitoring needs to be consistent with the statutory context, resourcing and ongoing capabilities to implement district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring in a cost effective and efficient manner. This context is evolving through the development of the National Planning Standards and contemporary best practice where councils are choosing not to include significant resource management issues for the district, the environmental results anticipated from the policies and methods or the procedures for monitoring the effectiveness and efficiency of the policies and methods in second generation plans. In addition, Central Government is also starting to provide stronger direction on what resource management issues require targeted monitoring to ensure decision-making is informed by robust monitoring data. These national-level monitoring priorities are discussed in more detail in [Section 4.0](#).

The prioritisation of the monitoring actions identified above have improved how the state of the environment and the effectiveness of the SDP in managing the district's resources, although there continues to be a need for a more integrated approach to monitoring that ensures the necessary information is available to satisfy Council's section 35 duties under the RMA. A non-statutory monitoring strategy is seen as an appropriate tool for realising these outcomes.

## 4.0 Summary of relevant statutory and/or policy context

### ***Part 2 of the RMA***

Section 5 sets out the purpose of the RMA, which is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Sustainable management includes managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources to enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety. In achieving this purpose, authorities need also to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance<sup>13</sup>, have 'particular regard' to other matters<sup>14</sup> and 'take into account' the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi<sup>15</sup>.

Monitoring is a critical mechanism within the policy cycle to ensure that the contents of district plans are reviewed and updated on a regular basis to 'give effect' to the Part 2 matters and to respond to changing resource management priorities. State of the environment monitoring and the monitoring the exercise of resource consents is an important method for determining and measuring whether priority resources are being appropriately managed. This monitoring,

---

<sup>13</sup> Section 6

<sup>14</sup> Section 7

<sup>15</sup> Section 8

coupled with the outcomes of effectiveness and efficiency monitoring, should inform the general duty to amend the content of district plans as a response to address identified resource management issues<sup>16</sup>.

### **National Instruments**

The following national instruments are relevant to district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring and reporting:

#### **1. National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (NPS-UDC)<sup>17</sup>**

The NPS-UDC contains objectives and policies for providing sufficient urban development capacity. The functioning of urban environments to provide for people and communities' wellbeing is recognised as a matter of national significance. A portion of Selwyn District that is contained within the Greater Christchurch area qualifies as a 'High Growth Area' under the NPS-UDC prerequisites, meaning that all the objectives and policies apply to that portion of the district.

An important method for achieving the outcomes expressed in the NPS-UDC is to gather evidence and monitor urban development capacity to support decision making (OB1). A housing and business development capacity assessment must be prepared, and councils are encouraged to publish them every three years (PB1). The capacity assessments must contain information about urban development capacity demand (PB2) and estimate the sufficiency of development capacity provided within other relevant planning instruments and plans (PB3). Councils are required to use information provided on price efficiency indicators in their land and development market to understand how well it is functioning, how planning may affect this, and to assist in determining when additional development capacity might be needed (PB7).

The monitoring required to 'give effect' to the above policies must be used to inform the responsive planning actions to resolve any development capacity shortfalls (PC3). Monitoring should also form the basis of the planning evidence and decision-making to ensure there is sufficient urban development capacity provided across the Greater Christchurch sub-region (PD1(a)).

Council has been working collaboratively as part of the Greater Christchurch Partnership to 'give effect' to the NPS-UDC. This has included publishing market indicator monitoring reports, preparing Housing and Business Capacity Assessments and adopts a Future Development Strategy (Refer to the following discussion on the Our SPACE Strategy in this section). This work is supplemented by targeted 'greenfield' section and housing uptake monitoring and the commissioning of the Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model prepared by Market Economics.

<sup>16</sup> Section 35(2)

<sup>17</sup> Hyperlink to the [NPS-UDC](#)

2. Valuing Highly Productive Land - A Discussion Document on a Proposed National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Soils (pNPS-HPL)<sup>18</sup> and Planning for Successful Cities - A Discussion Document on a Proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development (pNPS-UD)<sup>19</sup>

The government has released discussion documents in mid-2019 on two proposed National Policy Statements. The pNPS-UD is intended to replace the operative NPS-UDC. It is intended to provide clear direction to local government on how to enable opportunities for development in New Zealand's urban areas in a way that delivers quality urban environments for people, now and in the future. The discussion materials continue to emphasise the need for regular and robust monitoring as part of the evidence base to inform decisions on urban development capacity.

The pNPS-HPL seeks to improve the way highly productive land is managed under the RMA. This will require regular monitoring of the available versatile soil resource in the district as a baseline for determining the impacts urban land development and subdivision may have on highly productive soils.

### ***National monitoring initiatives***

The following report is relevant to district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring and reporting:

3. Measuring Up: Environmental Report – Discussion Document (MUEP)<sup>20</sup>

The MUEP confirms there is a lack of statutory direction to require regular and independent state of the environment reporting and there is an inconsistent regional state of the environment monitoring program. This has hindered how effectively state of the environment is undertaken, reported and used to inform resource management effects analysis and decision-making.

The MUEP is more specifically relevant to state of the environment, which is important in determining the effectiveness and efficiency of the district plan in sustainably managing the district's resources.

### ***Regional Policy and Plans***

The following regional planning instruments are relevant to district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring and reporting:

4. Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS)<sup>21</sup>

The CRPS provides a clear framework for managing natural resources throughout the Canterbury region. It includes a prescriptive policy framework that sets out what objectives and policies are to be contained in the Proposed Plan.

<sup>18</sup> Hyperlink to the [pNPS-HPL](#)

<sup>19</sup> Hyperlink to the [pNPS-UD](#)

<sup>20</sup> Hyperlink to the [MUEP](#)

<sup>21</sup> Hyperlink to the [CRPS](#)

Monitoring how effectively and efficiently the objectives and policies that apply to the Greater Christchurch portion of the region is specifically provided for in the CRPS<sup>22</sup>. It requires that the availability of residential and business land is monitored, and that Chapter 6 is reviewed where there is a shortfall identified in the availability of land or changing circumstances. These requirements now form part of the mandatory requirements of the NPS-UDC that is being implemented by the Greater Christchurch Partnership. The supply, uptake and impacts of rural residential land use and development are also required to be monitored. Council is meeting these requirements through the implementation and review of its Rural Residential Strategy (RRS14) and monitoring the subdivision and uptake of housing within the Living 3 zone. Several monitoring forums have been initiated since Chapter 6 of the CRPS was made operative to assist in developing key strategies, changes to the CRPS or to meet legislative requirements.

Chapter 3 of the CRPS identified that the Canterbury Regional Council will develop and implement a non-statutory monitoring strategy to monitor the effectiveness and efficiency of the CRPS. This includes the development of a database to track the implementation of policies and methods through regional and district plans, and work programs set out in long term plans and in annual plans<sup>23</sup>. A further purpose of the monitoring strategy is to identify indicators to enable the regional council to assess the impact that implementation of policies and methods to determine whether they are the most appropriate for achieving the purpose of the RMA.

The monitoring strategy was not available on the regional council's website and it is understood that it had not been drafted at the time this evaluation was undertaken.

The Proposed Plan must 'give effect' to the CRPS.

***Mahaanui: Iwi Management Plan (IMP)***<sup>24</sup>

The IMP is an expression of kaitiakitanga (guardianship and conservation) and rangatiratanga (sovereignty). In the context of the SDP, the IMP provides a tool for local authorities, other agencies and the wider community to meet statutory obligations under the RMA.

The Kaupapa Policy Statements listed in Chapter 3 provide a framework for expressing the expectations and opportunities associated with implementing the IMP. The IMP lists a broad range of policies with accompanying explanations. There are no references to ongoing monitoring, but the State of the Takiwā monitoring approach is an initiative that is documented in the IMP as a best practice state of the environment example.

The Proposed Plan must 'take into account' the IMP.

<sup>22</sup> CRPS: Policy 6.3.11

<sup>23</sup> CRPS: Policy 3.1.2

<sup>24</sup> Hyperlink to [IMP](#)



### ***Regional policies, plans or strategies***

The following regional non-statutory plans and strategies are relevant to district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring and reporting:

5. Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy 2007, Updated Action 2010 and Strategy Update 2016 (UDS)<sup>25</sup>

The UDS was developed through the collaborative Greater Christchurch Partnership forum. It includes several strategic goals and Actions to deliver on the Vision for the Greater Christchurch Area by 2041. These include ensuring an integrated approach between land use planning and the provisions of efficient and cost-effective transport networks. A key step in meeting this Vision has been achieved by the integration of the UDS strategic directions into the sub-regional planning instruments, including through Chapter 6 of the CRPS and the Christchurch City and Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plans.

The UDS outlines the anticipated monitoring and review process (Section 6.3). Many of the UDS outcomes have been formalised in the SDP through the Chapter 6 CRPS and Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP) Actions. Several monitoring initiatives have been advanced through targeted Greater Christchurch Partnerships forums, with Canterbury Regional Council as the lead agency. These have been progressed in response to priorities, such as the UDS Action Plan, UDS Refresh, LURP review and the Our SPACE Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update, rather than regular efficiency and effectiveness monitoring that is primarily managed through statutory processes such as changes to the CRPS and district plan reviews.

6. *Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga*/Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update: Our SPACE 2018-2048 (Our SPACE)<sup>26</sup>

Our SPACE serves the primary purpose of meeting the requirements of the NPS-UDC in respect to the Future Development Strategy to illustrate the relative capacity of feasible housing and commercial development capacity across the Greater Christchurch in the short, medium- and long-term planning horizons. It builds on the UDS Vision, while signaling several actions to assist in determining, and providing for, sufficient urban development capacity.

Our SPACE reports on the monitoring that has been undertaken to determine how efficiently and effectively urban development capacity is provided for across Greater Christchurch, including specifically the market indicator monitoring and housing and business capacity assessments.

A schedule of future work is contained in Section 6.2 of Our SPACE that lists monitoring the tasks to be undertaken to develop key outputs required to manage urban development capacity, including:

- **Action 2:** Work with Government and social and affordable housing providers to better address current and future housing needs across Greater Christchurch and develop an associated Action Plan;
- **Action 3:** Evaluate the appropriateness of existing minimum densities specified in the CRPS for each territorial authority;

<sup>25</sup> Hyperlink to the [UDS](#)

<sup>26</sup> Hyperlink to [Our SPACE](#)

- **Action 4:** Develop and agree a single growth model for Greater Christchurch;
- **Action 5:** Review and recalibrate the Christchurch Transport Model and Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic Model;
- **Action 6:** Prepare a new Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment;
- **Action 9 and 10:** Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to undertake structure planning and to gather evidence to inform changes to the CRPS necessary to 'give effect' to the NPS-UDC;
- **Action 11:** Facilitate the redevelopment of existing urban areas in Christchurch City through several actions; and
- **Action 12:** Review Chapter 6 of the CRPS as part of the scheduled full review in 2020.

Our SPACE includes a specific section on the research and monitoring outputs that are needed to evaluate urban development capacity across Greater Christchurch (Section 6.4 - Research and monitoring).

The Proposed Plan shall 'have regard' to these regional policies, plans and strategies.

#### ***Local policies, plans or strategies***

The following Council non-statutory plans and strategies are relevant to district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring and reporting:

#### **7. Selwyn 2031: District Development Strategy (Selwyn 2031)<sup>27</sup>**

Selwyn 2031 provides an overarching strategic framework for achieving sustainable growth across the district through to the year 2031. The Strategy identifies solutions to the key underlying planning issues that relate to population growth, spatial planning and earthquake recovery. Selwyn 2031 is intended to guide the future development of the district and to inform Council's capital investment decisions.

Selwyn 2031 identifies several monitoring priorities in Chapter 4 - Governance and Monitoring. It states that an annual six-monthly Monitoring Report will be a key assessment tool to summarise progress on implementing initiatives and assessing the extent to which implemented initiatives have achieved desired outcomes<sup>28</sup>. Although Council has yet to prepare or publish a S2031 Monitoring Report, several projects have delivered monitoring outputs that have formed part of the DPR analysis. Examples include the Area Plans, the Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model and the actions required to 'give effect' to the NPS-UDC is effectively targeting monitoring to the priorities listed in S2031.

<sup>27</sup> Hyperlink to [S2031](#)

<sup>28</sup> Including specifically: Housing land availability and uptake; Dwelling consents; Greenfield land development and uptake; Vacant residential land; Business land availability and uptake; Annual business monitoring report; Vacant industrial land; Infrastructure supply and capacity; Water and sewer connections register for each township; and State of the Environment Report.

8. *Mahere ā Rohe and Mahere ā Rohe o Waihora/ Malvern and Ellesmere Area Plans 2016 (Area Plans)*<sup>29</sup>

The Area Plans provide high-level planning direction to guide growth and the sustainable management of townships within the Malvern and Ellesmere Wards of the district through to 2031. The Area Plans identify that implementation and outcomes monitoring is to be undertaken as part of the annual Selwyn 2031 Monitoring Report. They also identify that the Plans are to be reviewed at five yearly intervals and that an initial review in 2021 and a final review in 2026.

9. Draft Selwyn District Council Monitoring Strategy 2013 (dMS13)

The dMS13 was prepared by the Strategy and Policy Team as a non-statutory framework to guide how monitoring and reporting is planned and coordinated in an efficient and effective manner. The dMS13 aimed to provide the methods for monitoring the tasks required under the RMA and to establish connections with the monitoring that is carried out by other teams within Council and external organisations. It aimed to prescribe what, when, how and why resource management monitoring is to be undertaken and reported on to Council staff, elected representatives, stakeholders and the community.

The dMS13 identified the following actions relating the district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring:

- (a) Establish a schedule that lists the components of the SDP that have been reviewed and when the remaining provisions will be reviewed to track progress with, and to inform, the list of priority projects on the Policy and Strategy Team annual works program;
- (b) Establish a reporting template to enable SDP changes to be included in the Annual Monitoring Report to inform customers and stakeholders;
- (c) Liaise with strategic partners to implement monitoring and reporting functions in accordance with the LURP and Chapter 6 of the CRPS; and
- (d) Align SDP reviews with legislative changes, including regulations arising from the RMA reforms.

The dMS13 recommends removing Appendix 1 of the Plan and developing a separate Monitoring Strategy that is linked to the 'Anticipated Environmental Outcomes' expressed for each 'Issue' in the SDP that utilises a cross organisational collaborative approach. A non-statutory monitoring strategy to fulfil Council's s31 (1)(a) and s35 (2)(b) requirements is recommended, consistent with the approach adopted by the Canterbury Regional Council to coordinate the CRPS efficiency and effectiveness monitoring.

Council is committed to finalising a Monitoring Strategy to sit alongside the Proposed Plan to provide an overarching integrated monitoring regime to cover the various monitoring functions under the RMA and LGA.

---

<sup>29</sup> Hyperlink to the [Area Plans](#)

#### 10. Environmental Services Activity Management Plan 2018-2028 (ESAMP)<sup>30</sup>

The ESAMP is a supporting document to the Council's Long-Term Plan 2018 to 2048. It is relevant to the DPR monitoring as it establishes the projects that have been programmed to enable Council to administer and review the Plan and implement mandatory requirements from central government<sup>31</sup>, respond to priority resource management issues, undertake strategic planning initiatives and to participate in collaborative partnerships (such as the Greater Christchurch Partnership). The Strategy and Policy Team are allocated a budget to review, develop and implement changes to the SDP in response to issues and the gathering of evidence and monitoring. This includes providing consent compliance and plan administration information to the Ministry for the Environment on a yearly basis to satisfy the requirements of the National Monitoring System. Other tasks include participating in the Greater Christchurch Partnership urban development capacity monitoring, developing and implementing spatial plans, carrying out housing and subdivision uptake monitoring and commissioning the Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model.

#### 11. Rural Residential Strategy 2014 (RRS14)<sup>32</sup>

The primary purpose of the RRS14 is to provide guidance and policy direction on how best to manage rural residential development within the Greater Christchurch area of the district. The RRS14 was prepared to give effect to Policy 6.3.9 of the CRPS and establishes the optimal form, function and character of rural residential development and where it is best located. The RRS14 summarises the methods for monitoring rural residential development and reviewing the approaches and preferred locations contained in the current strategy (Section 8). Rural residential development capacity now forms part of the NPS-UDC actions and is also captured by the growth modelling and uptake data discussed below. Relative demand will also be determined when the RRS14 is formally reviewed.

#### 12. Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model (SCGM)<sup>33</sup>

The SCGM was commissioned to determine the land supply and capacity of the district's Living and Business zones. It is a spreadsheet-based model that determines demand based on population projections and includes modules that identify development capacity and available land supply. The SCGM is the primary tool used by council to monitor housing and business development capacity, vacant land register and to track housing uptake. It is supported by 'greenfield' section and housing uptake monitoring data that is collected to determine what zoned land has been developed and subdivided. These monitoring tools are essential in enabling council to meet its statutory requirements under the NPS-UDC and to align land development with the community outcomes and capital expenditure managed under the Long-Term Plan.

<sup>30</sup> Hyperlink to the [TAMP](#)

<sup>31</sup> For example, the national monitoring system, participating in the process to develop the draft national Planning Standards and giving effect to national policy statements and national environmental standards

<sup>32</sup> Hyperlink to the [RRS14](#)

<sup>33</sup> Hyperlink to SDC website <https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/property-And-building/planning/population>

## 5.0 Research, best practice review and stakeholder engagement

The following section lists the baseline information that has been gathered to identify the resource management issues and to inform the options analysis that follows.

### **Research**

Table 1 lists the baseline evaluations that form baseline information reports to assist in this issues and options evaluation:

**Table 1: Evidence base for the Monitoring Topic**

Title	Author	Brief synopsis
Draft Monitoring Strategy 2013	SDC	The dMS13 was prepared by the Strategy and Policy Team as a non-statutory framework to guide how monitoring and reporting is planned and coordinated in an efficient and effective manner
Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats analysis (SWOT)	SDC	This report presented the findings of the SWOT analysis that was undertaken on the SDP Monitoring Schedule to the District Plan Committee on 11 May 2016

### **Best practice review**

A review of current best practice district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring has been undertaken against the following district plans:

- Christchurch District Plan (CDP);
- Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Council (pQLDP);
- Proposed Dunedin City District Plan (pDCDP); and
- Draft New Plymouth District Plan (dNWPDP).

These plans were chosen as they have recently been made operative or are proposed second generation plans. The CDP and pQLDP are particularly relevant as they apply to 'High Growth Areas' under the NPS-UDC. The CDP is also subject to Chapter 6 of the CRPS and the Land Use Recovery Plan and has been made operative following a comprehensive process under an Order In Council.

In summary, the findings of the best practice review are:

- None of the second-generation plans that were reviewed contain any specific strategic directions, objectives, policies or methods that identify how the effectiveness and efficiency of the provisions are to be monitored. The CDP contains objectives relating to the intensification targets to 'give effect' to the CRPS. Policies also require residential housing supply to be monitored, which is also a requirement of the NPS-UDC.
- The pQLDP includes a general statement on monitoring in the Chapter 1 Introduction that targets each of the seven chapters that make up the pQLDP. However, no guidance on what, how or when the plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring is to be undertaken.

- The absence of any guidance on how district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring is to be undertaken is attributed in part to the RMA noting that district plans may state the significant resource management issues for the district and the anticipated environmental results. The absence of these baseline measures reduces the practical ability to implement a robust monitoring regime as it is difficult to define key environmental indicators and the approaches for monitoring how they are tracking.
- Confirmation that council's generally struggle to resource and fund a comprehensive monitoring regime from both the staffing and budgetary perspectives as other priority tasks under the RMA inevitably take precedence. There are also several other processes that effectively prioritise where this monitoring resource is allocated, including the National Monitoring System, administering private plan changes, promulgating council-initiated changes, managing district plan reviews and giving effect to the NPS-UDC and other higher order planning instruments.

These findings establish that there isn't a strong case for a comprehensive monitoring regime to be included in the Proposed Plan. It also emphasises the importance of a non-statutory monitoring strategy as a tool for developing and implementing an integrated monitoring regime to measure how well the district plan is managing priority resource management issues and determining appropriate responses where improvements are required.

## 6.0 Summary of the Issues Analysis

The previous sections have documented the information that has been gathered to enable options on how the effectiveness and efficiency of the SDP is monitored to be evaluated. This information also assisted to substantiate the issues outlined in more detail [Section 2.0](#), which include:

### ***Issue 1: Practical and cost-effective district plan effectiveness monitoring***

*Clear direction is required on how the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan is monitored that is practical and cost-effective to implement.*

### ***Issue 2: Recording, reporting and actioning district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring***

*The outcomes of district plan monitoring need to be recorded, reported and actioned in a practical and cost-effective way.*

The issues analysis has highlighted that there is a disconnect between the Appendix 1 Monitoring Schedules and the balance of the Plan, with several examples of inconsistencies between the two iterations of Table E1.1. The lack of dedicated resourcing to implement the SDP Appendix 1 Monitoring Schedules, coupled with unclear guidance within Tables E1.1, has contributed to limited ad hoc monitoring having been carried out.

The statutory review has established there is no mandatory requirement that district plans must state the significant resource management issues for the district or the anticipated environmental results. There is also no specific requirement in the National Planning Standards

for district plans to identify how the efficiency and effectiveness monitoring and reporting is to be undertaken.

The best practice review confirmed that none of the second-generation plans that were reviewed contained any specific strategic directions, objectives, policies or methods setting out how the effectiveness and efficiency of the provisions are to be monitored. This review also reaffirmed the view that councils generally struggle to resource and find a comprehensive monitoring regime given that other priority tasks under the RMA inevitably take precedence. There are also several other processes that effectively prioritise where this monitoring resource is allocated, including the National Monitoring System, administering private plan changes, promulgating council-initiated changes, managing district plan reviews and giving effect to the NPS-UDC and other higher order planning instruments.

The issues analysis has confirmed that the Monitoring Schedules contained in the SDP are no longer fit for purpose and are inconsistent with contemporary best practice district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring and reporting. An analysis of appropriate options to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan provisions and to report these findings to the level necessary to address these issues is provided in the following section.

## 7.0 Preferred Options Analysis

This section recommends a Preferred Option following an evaluation of the status quo against two alternative options to determine the most appropriate for addressing the Issues relating to the Monitoring Topic.

### 7.1 Monitoring - Issues and options

The following three options have been considered and evaluated to determine the most effective and efficient approach that enables Council to satisfy its duties under section of the RMA.

#### **Option 1: (Status Quo)**

Option 1 evaluates the appropriateness of retaining the existing SDP Monitoring Schedules in the appendix of the Proposed Plan.

#### **Options 2: Monitoring statement (Preferred option)**

Option 2 recommends inserting a monitoring statement outlining how Council intends to monitor and report on the efficiency and effectiveness of the Proposed Plan that includes the development and implementation of a non-statutory monitoring strategy.

#### **Option 3: Comprehensive monitoring regime (Principal alternative)**

Option 3 evaluates the appropriateness of including objectives, policies and methods for monitoring the effectiveness and efficiency of the priority resource management issues within each chapter of the Proposed Plan.

## 7.2 Option analysis - Methods to monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of the Proposed Plan

### ***Context and Issues identification***

The status quo approach (Option 1) requires updates and the 'rolling-over' of the Monitoring Schedule contained in Appendix E1 of the Plan to monitor the effectiveness and efficiency of the objectives and methods of the Proposed Plan. The Monitoring Schedule would need to be updated to align with the priority resource management issues that have been identified in the Strategic Directions of the Proposed Plan and the subsequent decision-making processes to formalise an operative district plan.

Option 2 entails the inclusion of a 'monitoring statement' in the Proposed Plan that establishes how the effectiveness and efficiency of the objectives and methods are to be monitored and addressed. This statement would refer to the mandatory monitoring and related section 32 evaluations that are required to be undertaken under the NPS-UDC and 1<sup>st</sup> schedule plan change processes. A non-statutory monitoring strategy would also be required to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency monitoring of the Proposed District Plan is informed by a wider integrated monitoring regime that includes the results of state of the environment and resource consent monitoring.

The principal alternative approach (Option 3) would include inserting a comprehensive monitoring provision into each chapter of the Proposed Plan. This would be an expansion of Option 1 and require substantial additions to the draft provisions to include objectives, policies and methods and to reference the following for each topic:

- (a) 'Significant resource management issues' to prioritise what outcomes are anticipated to be maintained;
- (b) 'Monitoring indicators' to measure performance in maintaining the outcomes;
- (c) 'Methodologies' to ensure monitoring is undertaken within the necessary timeframe using the identified monitoring processes; and
- (d) 'Anticipated monitoring outcomes' to determine whether the desired outcomes relating to each priority resource management issue have been met.

### ***Option analysis***

In respect to **Option 1**, the baseline analysis in Section 3.3 has established that the monitoring schedules contained in the Plan are ineffective and inefficient to implement. The best practice review established that 2<sup>nd</sup> generation plans are not actively addressing monitoring, which is likely to be a result of resourcing pressures, the absence of mandatory direction on how district plan effectiveness monitoring is managed under the National Planning Standards and that the inclusion of specific provisions are optional<sup>34</sup>. There are appropriate opportunities already provided within RMA and LGA processes to monitor and report on the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan. Council already undertakes monitoring and reporting of specific sections of the Plan to meet its statutory obligations, including for example monitoring housing

<sup>34</sup> Pursuant to section 75(2)(a)(e) of the RMA



and business development capacity under the NPS-UDC. Option 1 may therefore result in unnecessary duplication of the monitoring and reporting tasks that are already undertaken as part of Council's statutory functions.

The inclusion of a Monitoring Statement in the Proposed Plan with a supporting non-statutory monitoring strategy under **Option 2** is considered the most appropriate way to document how Council will carry out its duties under section 35 of the RMA because it:

- (a) Will assist Council to undertake its functions under section 35 in an efficient and effective manner that is commensurate to the scale of the issue;
- (b) Provides the ability to avoid the previous duplication and uncertainty associated with the monitoring schedules, removes the disconnection between the monitoring objectives and the policies and methods and enables responses to be developed in a non-statutory strategy;
- (c) Will provide certainty to plan users that district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring is to be managed through a combination of RMA and strategic planning processes that is consistent with the statutory context and responds to the resourcing that exists within Council to implement a more detailed monitoring regime.

A separate monitoring strategy sitting alongside the Proposed Plan presents greater opportunities to integrate the outcomes expressed in strategic planning documents developed and implemented under the LGA with the SDP, such as S2031, Area Plans, sub-regional growth management strategies, township-based spatial plans, urban design guides. This approach is consistent with the Canterbury Regional Council's approach to monitoring outlined in Section 4.0. It also ensures consistency with contemporary best practice and how second-generation plans have evolved. Removing any reference to the procedures for monitoring the effectiveness or efficiency of the Proposed Plan would risk diluting the importance monitoring plays in the policy cycle. It is therefore important to include an overarching statement to provide certainty to Council, its stakeholders and the people who live in or visit the district.

**Option 3** would require the integration of a comprehensive monitoring regime within each chapter of the Proposed Plan. The need to develop targeted objectives, policies and methods to monitor the effectiveness and efficiency of the priority resource management issues would have significant implications from a resourcing perspective. This is both in respect to requiring significant drafting changes as part of the DPR to establish the framework for how this monitoring is targeted and prioritised and implementing the monitoring identified in the Proposed Plan on an ongoing basis. This has traditionally required the identification of significant resource management issues, key anticipated environmental outcomes and environmental performance indicators. Rules or other methods would need to be incorporated to identify exactly what, when and how the monitoring is to be carried out and what response to the findings is required.

There is a risk that these provisions may become outdated relatively quickly and the RMA 1st Schedule process to evaluate changes to the monitoring provisions is time consuming, costly and generally less responsive than a non-statutory monitoring system. As with Option 1, the best practice review established that 2nd generation plans are not actively addressing monitoring,

which is likely to be a result of resourcing pressures, the absence of mandatory direction on how district plan effectiveness monitoring is managed under the National Planning Standards and that the inclusion of specific provisions are optional under section 75(2)(a)(e). As a result, there is a risk that the incorporation of a more comprehensive monitoring regime into each chapter of the Proposed Plan would be costly and ineffective in addressing the significant resource management issues identified in the Strategic Directions of the Proposed Plan.

***Effectiveness in addressing Issue:***

The baseline investigations have confirmed that there are several mandatory processes under the RMA that require the provisions of the Proposed Plan to be effectively and efficiently monitored. The development and ongoing implementation of a non-statutory monitoring strategy will assist in ensuring the benefits associated with an integrated monitoring regime are delivered. The statutory context also provides scope for 2<sup>nd</sup> generation plans to be less ‘hands-on’ when it comes to monitoring how well plans are working as it isn’t a mandatory requirement under the National Policy Statement.

Council already undertakes monitoring and reporting of specific sections of the Plan to meet its statutory obligations, including for example monitoring housing and business development capacity under the NPS-UDC. Options 1 and 3 may therefore result in unnecessary duplication of the monitoring and reporting tasks that are already undertaken as part of Council’s statutory functions. As a result, it is not considered to be necessary or appropriate for the Proposed Plan to identify the significant resource management issues (in addition to the Strategic objectives and objectives), key anticipated environmental outcomes, environmental indicators or any specific monitoring actions (Options 1 and 3).

The statutory and non-statutory processes listed in the proposed monitoring statement contained in Appendix 1 of this report will ensure that monitoring and reporting of the effectiveness and efficiency of the district plan provisions are targeted to priority reviews undertaken as part of the changes and reviews. These processes include steps to gather information, evaluate issues and options, make this information available to the public to encourage participation and for decisions and subsequent actions to be informed by the monitoring outputs.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed monitoring statement for inclusion in Part 1 - Introduction and General Provisions chapter of the Proposed Plan is the most cost effective and efficient option to document how council will implement section 35 of the RMA. The prioritisation of developing and implementing a non-statutory monitoring strategy to ensure this monitoring is informed by Council’s wider monitoring duties under the RMA and LGA is critical to effectively and efficiently address the identified issue. The alternative options (Option 1 and Option 3) that have been evaluated are less appropriate in providing the necessary level of certainty, efficiency and effectiveness to respond to the identified issues in comparison to the preferred option (Option 2).

***Risks:***

The statutory context, issues assessment and best practice reviews establish that there is limited risk in inserting the recommended Monitoring Statement in the Proposed Plan (Option 2) when

compared to Option 1 and Option 3. The successful implementation of an integrated monitoring regime has a direct influence on how effective and efficient the Proposed Plan is in managing the district's priority resource management issues. The recommended preferred option includes the need for Council to establish their level of commitment to investing in the development, and ongoing implementation, of a non-statutory monitoring strategy. There is a low risk associated with acting in the manner proposed, with the 1<sup>st</sup> schedule consultation process under the RMA providing appropriate opportunities for any changes to the Proposed Plan to be reviewed and refined through the subsequent phases of the DPR.

***Budget or Time Implications:***

The Preferred Option to include a monitoring statement in the Proposed Plan will not incur a significant amount of time and cost to Council when drafting the Proposed Plan.

***Other:***

There is a need for Council to coordinate the development and prioritisation of a non-statutory Monitoring Strategy to ensure an integrated approach that addresses Council's duties under section 35 of the RMA and LGA is implemented.

***Recommendation:***

Proceed with the Preferred Option (Option 2), which is to insert the draft monitoring statement included in [Appendix 1](#) and to incorporate any further changes that occur between now and when the Proposed Plan is publicly notified. The recommendations of this report seek a commitment from Council to develop and resource the implementation of a non-statutory monitoring strategy. This will ensure an integrated monitoring regime is in place to assist in determining the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan, including through monitoring the state of the environment, administration of resource consents and the outcomes of delegated duties.

### 7.3 Option analysis - Methods for recording, reporting and actioning the efficiency and effectiveness monitoring of the Proposed Plan

***Context and Issues identification***

The RMA requires Council to review the efficiency and effectiveness of the policies, rules and methods in the Plan within five years, recording this monitoring and making the findings available to the public.

Council reports and actions the monitoring that is required a part of its duties to administer the district plan by:

- Recording and reporting on the mandatory monitoring required to implement the NPS-UDC;
- Publishing monitoring information to determine the appropriateness of proposed changes to the SDP to encourage participation in resource management processes;
- Making the findings of monitoring available to the public to demonstrate how resource management issues are identified and addressed by the SDP, while incorporating changes to improve the efficiency of resource consent processes, district plan compliance and measuring the state of the environment; and

- Participating in sub-regional and national monitoring forums and publishing the results of any monitoring outputs.

The status quo approach (Option 1) would require updates and the rolling-over of the Monitoring Schedule contained in Appendix E1 of the Plan following substantial updates to ensure that the methods for recording, reporting and actioning the outcomes of monitoring are clearly articulated. The Monitoring Schedule would need to reference the contemporary methods for capturing monitoring information, including the systems and processes that are used by Council and other agencies. The indicators, information sources and the frequency monitoring is required to be undertaken would also need to be updated to ensure consistency with the scale of the resource management issue.

Option 2 entails the inclusion of a 'monitoring statement' in the Proposed Plan to establish how the monitoring of the objectives and methods are to be recorded, reported and actioned. This statement would reference the mandatory monitoring and reporting that is required for section 32 evaluations, 1<sup>st</sup> schedule plan change processes, resource consent and state of the environment monitoring and the preparation of non-statutory plans and strategies. A non-statutory monitoring strategy would be a critical tool in ensuring that the recording, reporting and actioning of monitoring is undertaken in an integrated way that is practical to implement.

The principal alternative approach (Option 3) includes inserting a comprehensive monitoring provision into each chapter of the Proposed Plan. This would be an expansion of Option 1 and require substantial additions to the draft provisions, including objectives, policies and methods, to reference how monitoring is recorded, reported and actioned.

### ***Option analysis***

In respect to **Option 1**, the baseline analysis in Section 3.3 has established that the monitoring schedules contained in the Plan are ineffective and inefficient to implement, which has contributed to a failure to source relevant information within the stated time periods. Limited monitoring data has been available to report on the efficiency and effectiveness of the SDP, the state of the environment or the appropriateness of consent conditions to Council staff, members of the public, interest groups or decision-makers. The best practice review established that 2<sup>nd</sup> generation plans are not actively stating how monitoring is recorded, reported or actioned, which is likely to be a result of resourcing pressures, the absence of mandatory direction on how this is managed within district plans under the National Planning Standards and that the inclusion of specific provisions are optional under section 75(2)(a)(e). Council already reports on the monitoring outcomes where specific sections of the Plan are reviewed to meet its statutory obligations. Option 1 may therefore result in unnecessary duplication of the monitoring and reporting tasks that are already undertaken as part of Council's statutory functions. The refinement of the current Monitoring Schedule would require a significant time investment for Council to determine appropriate indicators, information sources and the frequency of monitoring, which would need to be tailored to the priority resource management issues. It would also be inflexible to respond to changes in information sources, evolving technologies that can achieve efficiencies in how resources are monitored.

The proposed monitoring statement in Part 1 - Introduction and General Provisions chapter of the Proposed Plan (**Option 2**) that is accompanied by a non-statutory monitoring strategy is the most cost effective and efficient approach for Council to meet its duties under section 35 of the RMA. Option 2 is the most appropriate means of recording, reporting and actioning the monitoring that is undertaken to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan as it will:

- (a) 'Give effect' to the priority monitoring reporting and implementation requirements in the RMA, including the NPS-UDC;
- (b) Enable the Council to fulfil its statutory obligations, section 35 duty to gather information and keep records and implement the findings of this monitoring through changes to the operative plan;
- (c) Ensure that any unforeseen adverse effects are managed appropriately by gathering, reporting and implementing the findings of monitoring as required by the Act and to meet council's wider duties under the LGA; and
- (d) Appropriately manages and prioritises the available resources and capabilities that are allocated to recording, reporting and implementing district plan monitoring.

This approach is consistent with the findings of the best practice review, the statutory context and provides the necessary flexibility for determining what, how and when the appropriate responses for managing the district's resources are actioned. It will also avoid the risk of significant resourcing having to be invested in tailoring specific monitoring tasks against each resource management issue contained in the Proposed Plan, which may not necessarily address the identified resource management issue in the most efficient and effective manner.

**Option 3** would require the integration of a comprehensive recording, reporting and process orientated regime to action the findings of monitoring into the Proposed Plan. This option would require substantial additions to the draft provisions, including objectives, policies and methods, to reference the following for each topic:

- (a) 'Significant resource management issues' to prioritise what outcomes are anticipated to be maintained;
- (b) 'Monitoring indicators' to measure performance in maintaining the outcomes;
- (c) 'Information sources' to ensure contemporary methodologies and information systems are used; and
- (d) 'Monitoring frequency' to ensure monitoring is undertaken within reasonable timeframes to track progress.

Rules or other methods would need to be incorporated to identify exactly what, when and how the monitoring is to be carried out and what response to the findings is required. There is a risk that these provisions may become outdated relatively quickly and the RMA 1st Schedule process to evaluate changes to the monitoring provisions is time consuming, costly and generally less responsive than a non-statutory monitoring and reporting approach. As with Option 1, the best practice review established that 2nd generation plans are not actively addressing monitoring reporting, which is likely to be a result of resourcing pressures, the absence of mandatory direction on how district plan effectiveness monitoring is managed under the National Planning

Standards and that the inclusion of specific provisions are optional<sup>35</sup>. There is a risk that the incorporation of a more comprehensive monitoring recording and reporting regime required under Option 3 would be costly to implement and ineffective in addressing the identified resource management issue.

***Effectiveness in addressing Issue:***

The preferred option appropriately recognises the importance of recording, reporting and actioning monitoring in the policy cycling, while demonstrating how Council will continue to meet its monitoring duties under the RMA. The direction provided by the monitoring statement highlights how the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan will be managed. The benefits and costs associated with recording, reporting and actioning monitoring information on environmental, social and cultural values, and the related provisions in the Proposed Plan, can to be appropriately responded to through the processes that are listed in the monitoring statement. The economic benefits in applying the preferred option outweigh the potential costs arising from the duplication and uncertainty associated with the more comprehensive frameworks under Options 1 and 3. The preparation and implementation of a non-statutory monitoring strategy to coordinate how district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring is undertaken, reported and actioned, and to integrate this with Council's other RMA and LGA monitoring duties, will provide additional certainty that any changes to the Proposed Plan are informed by technically robust evidence.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed monitoring statement for inclusion in Part 1 - Introduction and General Provisions chapter of the Proposed Plan is the most cost effective and efficient option to document how council will implement section 35 of the RMA. The prioritisation of developing and implementing a non-statutory monitoring strategy is critical to effectively and efficiently addressing the identified issue. The alternative options (Option 1 and Option 3) that have been evaluated are less appropriate in providing the necessary level of certainty, efficiency and effectiveness to respond to the identified issues in comparison to the preferred option (Option 2).

***Risks:***

The statutory context, issues assessment and best practice reviews establish that there is limited risk in inserting the recommended Monitoring Statement in the Proposed Plan (Option 2) to guide how monitoring outcomes are recorded, reported and actioned when compared to Option 1 and Option 3. The successful implementation of an integrated approach for recording, reporting and actioning monitoring related information has a direct influence on how effective and efficient the Proposed Plan is in managing the district's priority resource management issues. The recommended preferred option includes the need for Council to establish their level of commitment to investing in the development, and ongoing implementation, of a non-statutory monitoring strategy to ensure monitoring reporting is integrated.

---

<sup>35</sup> Pursuant to section 75(2)(a)(e)

There is a low risk associated with acting in the manner proposed, with the 1<sup>st</sup> schedule consultation process under the RMA providing appropriate opportunities for any changes to the Proposed Plan to be reviewed and refined through the subsequent phases of the DPR.

***Budget or Time Implications:***

The Preferred Option to include a monitoring statement in the Proposed Plan will not incur a significant amount of time and cost to Council when drafting the Proposed Plan.

***Other:***

There is a need for Council to coordinate the development and prioritisation of a non-statutory Monitoring Strategy to ensure an integrated approach for recording, reporting and actioning monitoring under section 35 of the RMA and LGA is implemented.

***Recommendation:***

Proceed with the Preferred Option (Option 2), which is to insert the draft monitoring statement included in [Appendix 1](#) into the Proposed Plan. The recommendations of this report seek a commitment from Council to develop and resource the implementation of a non-statutory monitoring strategy. This will ensure an integrated monitoring regime is in place to assist in determining what, when and how the district's resources are monitored, what methods are appropriate for reporting these findings and processes are to be initiated to action responses to address the findings of this monitoring.

## 7.4. Conclusion - Issues and Options analysis

[Section 3.0](#) establishes that the existing monitoring schedules that are the primary tool under Option 1 (status quo) are overly ambitious, and the uncertainty associated with what, when and how district plan monitoring is carried out, reported and actioned has contributed to poor implementation. Consequently, Option 1 has been determined to be ineffective and inefficient and an alternative approach for monitoring the efficiency and effectiveness of the Proposed Plan is required. The benefits of establishing and implementing a comprehensive monitoring framework within each chapter of the Proposed Plan (Option 3) are outweighed by the ongoing resourcing requirements, inefficiencies in duplicating monitoring and reporting tasks and its unresponsiveness for the approach to adapt to contemporary resource management issues and priorities.

Option 2 is the preferred option and recommends inserting a monitoring statement outlining how Council intends to monitor and report on the efficiency and effectiveness of the Proposed Plan. It is the most appropriate option to address the key resource management issues identified in [Sections 2 and 3](#) above. A monitoring statement is proposed for inclusion in the final sub-section of the 'How Your Plan Works' section in 'Part 1 - Introduction and general provisions of the Proposed Plan' (refer to [Appendix 1](#)). This statement provides clear direction on how the effectiveness and efficiency of the district plan is to be monitored and how the findings are to be reported and actioned. This is targeted to the priority monitoring that is required to inform changes and reviews to the Proposed Plan so that resources are optimised and duplication avoided. A non-statutory monitoring strategy is more efficient in prioritising an integrated

monitoring system across Council to establish what, when and how the district's resources and outcomes are monitored.

## 8.0 Conclusion

This issues and options report has evaluated the optimal approach to apply to ensure effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan is monitored in accordance with section 35 of the RMA.

Overall, it is considered that the monitoring statement under Option 2 is the most appropriate option available to address the identified issues associated with district plan monitoring and reporting. The development and implementation of non-statutory monitoring strategies, compliance with the NPS-UDC mandatory monitoring requirements, ten-year district plan review and changes to the Plan under the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule of the RMA will all assist in ensuring the effectiveness and efficiency of the objectives, policies, rules and other methods are to monitored, reported and actioned. The commitment to prioritising a non-statutory monitoring strategy is identified as a key method for ensuring that district plan effectiveness monitoring is integrated with council's other duties under section 35 of the RMA and the LGA, including the monitoring of the exercise of resource consents and the state of the environment.

The alternative options (Option 1 and Option 3) that have been evaluated are less appropriate in meeting the desired outcomes and responding to the identified Issues in comparison to the preferred option (Option 2). This is on the basis that the status quo monitoring schedules (Option 1) have proven to be ineffective and a more comprehensive approach (Option 3) would require significant ongoing resourcing that would be costly to implement without providing substantial benefits over and above what are likely to be achieved through the preferred approach (Option 2).

## 9.0 Preferred Options for further consideration

The Project Team recommends that:

- (i) *The Environmental Services Department proceed with the development of a non-statutory monitoring; and*
- (ii) *The Environmental Services Department proceed with the development of a non-statutory monitoring strategy to assist in delivering the integrated outcomes expressed in the proposed Monitoring Statement under Recommendation (i) above.*



## APPENDIX 1: District Plan Monitoring Statement

# Part 1 Introduction and General Provisions

...

## How the Plan Works

...

### Monitoring Statement

The RMA requires Council to review the efficiency and effectiveness of the policies, rules and methods in the Plan, to implement appropriate changes to address the findings of this monitoring and to publish the results every five years.

Council monitors the effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan by:

- Undertaking the mandatory monitoring and reporting required under the NPS-UDC;
- Gathering and evaluating information to determine the appropriateness of proposed changes to the Plan, including Council led and privately initiated plan changes and the implementation of national planning instruments and regulations;
- Preparing and implementing non-statutory plans and strategies to address priority resource management issues;
- Participating in sub-regional and national monitoring forums; and
- Integrating the Council's other monitoring functions, including responses to the identification of issues when processing resource consent applications, determining compliance with resource consent conditions and measuring the state of the environment.

The outcomes of this monitoring may result in changes to the Plan. Monitoring information that is gathered when undertaking the above tasks and actions are to be made available to the public to encourage public participation in resource management processes.

Council is committed to preparing a non-statutory monitoring strategy to co-ordinate, prioritise and carry out its district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring and reporting functions. A monitoring strategy also provides the opportunity to integrate district plan effectiveness and efficiency monitoring with Council's wider monitoring and reporting duties under the RMA and LGA, including monitoring the state of the environment and the exercise of resource consent and delegations.

## 7. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

### Recommended:

1. *'That the public be excluded from the following proceedings of this meeting. The general subject matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason of passing this resolution in relation to the matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:*

General subject of each matter to be considered		Reasons for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution	Date minutes can be released
1.	Public Excluded Minutes 19 February 2020	<i>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</i>	<i>Section 48(1)(a)</i>	Date of commencement of landowner engagement

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act or Section 6 or Section 7 or Section 9 of the Official Information Act 1982, as the case may require, which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

1	Enable the local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	Section 7(2)(f)
---	--	-----------------

2. *That appropriate officers remain to provide advice to the Committee.*