

# **PUBLIC AGENDA**

FOR THE MEETING OF

**DISTRICT PLAN COMMITTEE** 

TO BE HELD AT THE

SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICES, COUNCIL CHAMBERS

**ON WEDNESDAY 6 DECEMBER 2017** 

**COMMENCING AT 9.00AM** 

### **Committee Members**

Independent Chair

Tim Harris (Environmental Services Manager)

Selwyn District Council

Mayor Sam Broughton

Councillor Mark Alexander

Councillor Jeff Bland

Councillor Debra Hasson

Councillor Murray Lemon

Councillor Malcolm Lyall

Councillor Pat McEvedy

Councillor Grant Miller

Councillor John Morten

Councillor Bob Mugford

Councillor Nicole Reid

Councillor Craig Watson

David Ward (Chief Executive)

Te Taumutu Rūnanga

Hirini Matunga

**Environment Canterbury** 

Councillor Peter Skelton

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)
Standing Items			
1. Apologies		Oral	
2. Declaration of Interest		Oral	
Deputations by Appointment		Oral	
4. Confirmation of Minutes		Written	
5. Outstanding Issues Register		Written	
Specific Reports			
6. Chairman's Report	14-19	Written	Tim Harris
7. District Plan Review Programme Planning	20-43	PowerPoint	Justine Ashley / Emma Hodgkin
Communication and Engagement     Implementation Plan	44-76	Written	Stephen Hill
Issues and Options Update for Flood and Coastal Hazard Risk Investigations	77-84	Written	Michael Rachlin

# **Standing Items**

1. APOLOGIES

Nil.

2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Nil.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

Nil.

### 4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Minutes from the meeting of the District Plan Committee on 27 September 2017.



# District Plan Committee meeting held on Wednesday 27 September 2017 at 9.00am at Dunsandel Community Centre, Dunsandel

**Present:** The Mayor, Councillors M Alexander, D Hasson, M Lemon, M Lyall, J Morten, G Miller, B Mugford, P McEvedy, N Reid, C Watson and Mr D Ward (CEO SDC)

In attendance: Chairperson (Environmental Services Manager - T Harris), J Burgess (Planning Manager), D Kidd (Community Relations Manager), M Rachlin (Strategy and Policy Planner), B Rhodes (Team Leader – Strategy and Policy), J Lewes (Strategy and Policy Planner), E Hodgkin (Project Manager, District Plan Review), J Tuilaepa (Strategy and Policy Planner), R Love (Strategy and Policy Planner), G Wolfer (Senior Urban Designer), C Friedel (Senior Strategy and Policy Planner), J Ashley (District Plan Review Project Lead), M Washington (Asset Manager), S Hill (Business Relationship Manager), E Sim (Communications Advisor – Engagement), J Gallagher (Malvern Community Board Chair), note takers T Van Der Velde (District Plan Administrator) and Ms Hunt (PA to Environmental Services Manager).

#### Standing Items:

#### 1. Apologies

Apologies had been received from Professor Matunga, Mr P Skelton and Cr J Bland for absence and Cr N Reid for lateness.

#### 2. Declaration of Interest

Nil.

#### 3. Deputations by Appointment

Nil.

#### 4. Confirmation of Minutes

#### Moved - Councillor Watson / Seconded - The Mayor

'That the Committee accepts the minutes of the 26 July 2017 as being true and correct'.

CARRIED

### 5. Outstanding Issues Register

Nil.

### 7. Vegetation and Ecosystems – Biodiversity Working Group

Mr Rhodes spoke to this report in Mr Mactier's absence.

The purpose of this report is to endorse the working group members and the draft Terms of Reference for this group, as well as to appoint a Councillor as Chair to the working group.

It was noted that DOC had been excluded in error from the resolution, but are included as part of the working group.

In response to a question around Fish and Game's involvement in the group, Mr Rhodes responded that they are a key stakeholder and it will be good to have them in discussions from the outset. They have been included in other Territorial Authorities Biodiversity Working Groups for District Plan Reviews so they would have an expectation to be involved. This will also likely minimise opposition through submissions, so worth having them involved early in the process. The working group will strive for unanimous agreement.

Councillor Hasson in at 9.07am.

Discussion followed on comfort level around makeup of the group and terms of reference. Councillor Morten commented that there may be a gap with landowner representation from the area below the high country.

Councillor Reid in at 9.08am.

Councillor Lemon was nominated to stand on the Biodiversity Working Group. No other nominations were received.

Amendment to resolution was made with addition of DOC to membership and Councillor Lemon as Chair of the Biodiversity Working Group.

#### Moved – Councillor Lyall / Seconded – Mugford

'That the Committee:

- 1. Appoints Cr Lemon as Chairperson of the Biodiversity Working Group;
- 2. Confirms membership of the Biodiversity Working Group as comprising:
  - Selwyn District Council Councillor (and Chairperson);
  - Te Taumutu Rūnanga;
  - Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga;
  - Forest and Bird;
  - Federated Farmers:
  - Waihora Ellesmere Trust:
  - Fish and Game:
  - Department of Conservation;
  - Independent Landowner;
  - Independent Landowner;
  - Independent Landowner;
  - Environment Canterbury (Management/Officer);
  - Selwyn District Council (Management/Officer).
- 3. Confirms that the draft Biodiversity Working Group Terms of Reference may be amended to reflect any discussions arising from this meeting; and
- 4. That subsequent to the draft Terms of Reference being amended, they become the adopted Biodiversity Working Group Terms of Reference.'

**CARRIED** 

### 6 Update on Strategic Directions

Mr Rhodes spoke to his presentation.

In response to a question as to whether heritage should be listed separately as a theme, Mr Rhodes responded that heritage had not been pulled out specifically, however staff can investigate this further when the strategic directions are considered in more detail at a later date. It was noted this list had been put together some time ago.

Discussion followed on risk of developing Strategic Directions too early and becoming out of date and difficult to change.

Staff commented on the updated themes, with discussion as to whether natural environment included the heritage theme. Councillor Alexander commented he would prefer it had its own theme and own focus. Councillor Hasson agreed that heritage should be separated out.

In response to a question from Councillor Watson, staff responded the strategic directions are high level and outline the significant issues and desired outcomes of the District Plan, with the specific topic chapters sitting below that, which include the topic specific objectives, policies and rules.

Councillor Reid noted her concern that potentially greater weight is given to what is in the District Plan rather than in the Area Plans/ Strategic Directions. Therefore do we need to pull those into the District Plan? Ms Ashley responded that could have Strategic Direction about giving effect to those documents. Alternatively, or in conjunction with a strategic direction, the District Plan could look to pull all the key aspects and direction of Structure/Area Plans into the District Plan as objectives, policies and rules, however the District Plan can only implement parts of these documents. Councillor Reid commented that structure plans have been agreed upon by Council, so want to ensure these continue in the future.

The Mayor asked why the Coast had been separately pulled out as a Strategic Direction theme and asked if this was better placed under the Natural Environment theme. Mr Rhodes responded that this was separated out as it is an issue addressed in a New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. The inclusion of Coast as a separate theme will be considered further by staff.

The Committee noted the presentation.

### 8. Topic Investigation – Neighbourhood Centres

Mr Rachlin spoke to his presentation.

He advised that the purpose of the Topic Investigations was to identify specific issues and record the findings. This does not necessarily give answers, but let's staff know what we may need to look at in more detail later in the District Plan Review process.

In response to a question from Councillor Watson, Mr Rachlin noted that the land identified as Neighbourhood or Local Centre on an Outline Development Plan is zoned Living. While the developer is compelled to provide for neighbourhood centres, there is no compulsion to develop, it is up to the market as to when (or if) it gets developed.

In response to a question from Councillor Hasson around how these are recorded on neighbouring LIMs Mr Rachlin stated that those lots are identified at time of the subdivision consent and the Business Zone rules apply. The Chair responded that he will check on Councillor Hasson's question on whether these are recorded on neighbouring LIMs.

In response to a question around the risk of objection to the commercial activity, if not rezoned, Mr Rachlin stated developers can rely on business rules, but the District Plan needs to look at a different approach for the ones

that people want to develop in the future. Do not want to see these becoming larger scale developments and taking away from the main town centres.

In response to a question raised about those communities expecting neighbourhood centres, but not being developed for long periods, the Chair responded that any framework will have that issue. The District Plan can provide for development, but it is up to the market as to whether this opportunity is realised. Councillor Watson commented that Council cannot force commercial development, however we should be clearly indicating on our electronic portal that these areas are available for development.

Discussion followed on need for purchasers of properties to complete their own due diligence around where neighbourhood and local centres are located.

The committee noted the presentation.

### 9. Topic Investigation – Strategic Infrastructure

Mr Rachlin spoke to his presentation.

In response to a question whether this issue was in relation to Council infrastructure, Mr Rachlin responded that this Topic Investigation only relates to regionally significant infrastructure, as defined in the RPS, and including those noted in the presentation. Councillor Watson commented that water races can be significant infrastructure.

In response to a question by Councillor Lemon around whether we are at risk of limiting and locking in these listed items, and therefore not being able to cater for changes to technology, Mr Rachlin responded that there is flexibility so that we can adapt as and when changes occur. Noting that the District Plan can be amended by way of a plan change.

The Committee noted the presentation.

### 10. Topic Investigation – Electricity Distribution

Mr Rachlin spoke to his presentation.

In response to a question from Councillor Lemon on people being able to use process to stall upgrades, Mr Rachlin responded that with some lines, certain activities in close proximity are controlled.

In response to a question by Councillor Miller as to whether our neighbouring councils use their District Plan's to get companies to underground their new lines, Mr Rachlin responded that he believes it is a permitted activity but the District Plan cannot force them to underground their lines.

In response to a question by Councillor Watson as to whether the District Plan stops Council closing down a significant infrastructure item, Mr Rachlin responded that they are a significant infrastructure item because of their importance to our community, so unlikely there would be a closure.

Panel at Christchurch District Plan Review who considered this issue in relation to Orion, felt this approach of a 'protection' corridor was the best way to provide a level of protection to the power line. Noted that Orion are a requiring authority. It is about protecting power lines from activities that interface with them.

The Committee noted the presentation.

### 11. DPR Engagement Framework

Mrs Hodgkin and Mr Sim spoke to their report and PowerPoint.

The document before DPC today is a Final Draft Framework for Engagement seeking DPC endorsement. In the preparation of this document, feedback and comments have been sought from ECan, Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd and from Professor Matunga directly in his capacity as Te Taumutu Rununga representative on the Committee. This document presented today has been endorsed by Prof Matunga, Mahaahui and ECan as well as internally by the Communications Team and Mr Harris.

It was noted that the pre-notification consultation date noted in Review Timeline had the incorrect year, and should be October 2018.

Discussion on Council's engagement with Runanga and who has delegated authority to speak on behalf of Runanga and on what issues. Mrs Hodgkin noted it is Council's responsibility to ensure that we are consulting with the correct organisation. At times it is appropriate for Mahaanui to be the conduit, however there is also an opportunity to have everyone together so they are all hearing the same story on matters where Runanga have asked to specifically engage with the Council directly. It was noted that there are capacity challenges for Te Taumutu, so want to open dialogue early. Mr Ward has a meeting with Te Taumutu next week, so will raise this with them at that time. It was suggested that we ask for a backup representative, due to inconsistent attendance from Professor Matunga who has academic commitments. Discussion followed on need to do as much consultation as possible as we want to reduce the number of overall submissions and appeals to the notified Plan. Staff are working to develop relationships. Staff are recording consultation activities with a range of stakeholders including mana whenua should issues around lack of consultation are raised later.

In response to a question by Councillor Hasson on engagement and alignment with Christchurch City Council given our shared infrastructure, Mrs Hodgkin's responded that adjacent TA's are key stakeholders, and we are assessing adjacent TA's District Plans to see how we align.

Noted that the District Plan Review website has been built, and waiting to be launched, with Mr Sim looking at refining content that has already been developed. Hope to have this live and ready to launch in November this year.

Discussion followed on engagement software 'Bang the Table', which is a mix of digital tools. Purpose of this software is to move people from being aware and informed to being engaged in decision making. Discussion followed on statistics provided following other council's use of the software.

In response to a question by the Mayor, it was commented this is just another tool and does not replace other methods, however this system provides better analysis of data collected which will allow Council to better understand communities and stakeholders' needs and viewpoints on issues.

In response to a question by Councillor Lyall about the cost effectiveness of this software, Mr Hill responded that this will not just be used for the District Plan Review, but would also be used for the Annual Plan, Long Term Plan and would be a standard consultation toolset. It was noted that this software will link with other digital platforms the Council is already using such as Facebook. The software is also moderated 24/7, so can set flags around abusive language etc. This software will allow for consistency around branding for Council.

Mrs Hodgkin will provide her PowerPoint to the Committee following the meeting.

Discussion followed on whether staff had contacted other Council's that had used this software. Mr Hill has spoken to a few other Councils that are using Engagement HQ (developed by Bang the Table), who have said they found it very useful.

Councillor McEvedy commented he is happy, as long as this is just one tool, however he noted his concern about cost. Mrs Hodgkin responded that the Toolbox is quite broad, and they can also set up closed stakeholder groups and simplify consultation.

Mr Elliot commented that this software is becoming the new industry standard in regards to consultation and is widely used by Local Government organisations including Environment Canterbury.

#### Moved – Councillor Cr Lyall / Seconded – Councillor Cr Miller

'That the Committee endorses the draft Engagement Framework'.

CARRIED

#### 12. Feedback on National Planning Standards

Ms Tuilaepa spoke to her presentation.

Informal feedback has been given to MfE, with the formal submission process occurring early next year. Our feedback was in alignment with ECan's feedback.

MfE are currently reviewing feedback and drafting standards.

As Selwyn District Council is a member of the pilot programme we have an opportunity to provide additional feedback to MfE. Noted that MfE have been relatively quiet on topics which we have provided feedback on to date.

### Moved - Councillor Hasson / Seconded - Councillor Lyall

'That the Committee notes the presentation and the feedback provided to MfE'.

CARRIED

#### 13. Forward Meeting Schedule

Moved - The Mayor / Seconded - Councillor Lyall

'That the Committee notes the provisional agenda items for November DPC meeting.'

**CARRIED** 

Meeting ended at 11.11am.

## 5. OUTSTANDING ISSUES REGISTER

Nil

Subject	Comments	Report Date / Action	Item Resolved or Outstanding
-	-	-	-

# **Specific Reports**

## 6. Chairman's Report

Author:	Tim Harris (Chair of DPC)
Contact:	(03) 347 2850

## **Purpose**

To provide the Committee with a brief update on District Plan Review process from the Chair's perspective.

#### Recommendation

"That the Committee notes the report."

#### **Attachments**

• Chair's report "District Plan Review Update".

## REPORT TO DISTRICT PLAN COMMITTEE

DATE: 6 December 2017

TITLE: District Plan Review Overview

PREPARED BY: Tim Harris, Environmental Services Manager

# 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to give an overview of the District Plan process to date, identify the challenges that have been met and provide a preview of the forthcoming years.
- 1.2 The District Plan Review process has been underway for two years. Much of that time has been spent establishing the appropriate structures and framework to allow the review to progress in a robust timely and successful manner. In so doing it has been necessary to define and establish the District Plan Committee, a Technical Advisory Group and the Project Team. Once that framework had been established a number of significant in-house systems were required to be developed, most importantly a procurement process and a project management system. While outwardly it may appear that progress has been slow, the District Plan Review Team have been working hard to provide a good foundation and structure for the substantive part of the review, that the project is now entering, to run smoothly.





# 2.0 Challenges over the last two years

- 2.1 A considerable amount of time in 2015 was taken finalising some of the earlier policy projects such as the Area Plans for Malvern and Ellesmere, the Land Use Recovery Plan Action 27, the subsequent amendments involved in the UDS update, the Lincoln Town Centre project, and also a number of private plan changes.
- 2.2 The initial District Plan work after the establishment of the governance structure and the project teams were the Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities and Threat (SWOT) analysis for topic areas in the Plan. These analysis looked at what the objective the Plan was trying to achieve in these topic areas and identifying the internal and external factors that are favorable and unfavorable to achieve that objective
- 2.3 What became clear during the 2016/2017 year was that the project was effectively commencing from behind the starting line as the absence of any structured monitoring of the District Plan over the last decade, meant that a substantial volume of work was required to create the level of information needed to assess the current performance of the District Plan.
- 2.4 At the same time the commencement of building the administrative framework for the project revealed that internally the Council had gaps in terms of resources and structures that needed to be put in place to allow the review process to unfold. Those gaps were highlighted in the areas of procurement and project management.
- 2.5 During this time a major challenge emerged around the projects ability to attract and then retain quality staff. Nationwide there is a significant shortage of planning staff with the required level of experience and expertise to undertake the quite complex tasks that are involved in the District Plan Review. Accordingly the project has relied heavily on external consultants and this has had some budgetary consequences. This continues to be a major factor and a risk to the review process.
- 2.6 The project has also had a significant challenge in developing a communications engagement process, due partly to the lack of resource and secondly the challenge of coordinating that communication and engagement process with the Long Term Plan process that is unfolding over the next year.



2.7 Another set of challenges that the project has needed to confront, is a changing and complex statutory environment. The National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity has created a separate work programme that was not anticipated at the beginning of the review process. This has been discussed at previous meetings but has meant a rethinking of the timing of the District Plan Review process and as explained at previous meetings, it is now anticipated that the notification of the District plan will be in the next triennium. In addition recent RMA amendments have introduced the potential implementation of national planning templates that could impose changes to the District Plans format and structure at a relatively late stage of its development in 2019.

# 3.0 How these challenges have been addressed

- 3.1 The Project Team has now set up a robust procurement process which has seen the development of a supplier panel with 22 approved consultants which include acoustic experts, landscape architects, engineers, planner's, traffic experts economists and a range of specialists and professionals. This pool of preapproved experts allows Council staff to develop briefs and engage with the supplier panel without the need to go out with a time consuming general tender. While this involved considerable administrative resource to get established it now seems to be functioning well and is benefits are starting to show.
- 3.2 This supplier panel, with staff, are in the process of developing a series of baseline assessments. Following the analysis of baseline reports, the team will begin to identify issues and options and, from that, will make a series of recommendations as to preferred options These baseline assessments have involved the development of a growth model, and has involved an assessment of topics which include rural character and amenity, the residential environment coastal hazards and flooding transport and subdivisions.
- 3.3 A comprehensive Community Engagement Implementation Plan has also been developed that has identified a number of different stakeholders and this will be the subject of a report on today's agenda. Once the preferred options are known, the District Plan Topic leads and managers will under the guidance of the District Plan Review Engagement Framework go back to the stakeholders to discuss these preferred options and other options available. In some instances, where the whole district may be affected, this may involve public consultation. The Community Engagement Implementation Plan, therefore, is to ensure the initial stakeholder engagement and public consultation on the preferred and other options provides sufficient input into the subsequent development of the Plan as it enters into its pre-notification phase
- 3.4 A District plan review work programme with reporting functionality has also been developed. This programme identifies in detail the key milestones of the review process broken down into its twenty nine different work streams up to notification in 2020. Again the detail of this this work programme is a subject of a report on today's agenda.



- 3.5 In conjunction financial reports, which has included the development of detailed cost coding, has been created to help track the budgetary impacts of the project. In addition a custom-made SharePoint document management database (called Bari) with an external portal available to consultants has been built. Another key development has been an online Risk Management tool.
- 3.6 The District Plan Review team have also developed a strong relationship with the Runanga with one representative each from Taumutu and Tuahuriri sitting on the District Plan Review Committee. Council also has a Service Level Agreement with Mahaanui which provides a framework for the work that Mahaanui does in relation to the District Plan. Council staff are now regular attendees at the Runanga relationship meetings.

## 4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1 The District Plan Review process has spent an enormous amount of time and resource in getting the correct structures and framework in place so that the substantive work over the next two years can roll out in an organised robust and successful fashion. Those structures mainly involve establishing the correct governance structures and developing the project team and the topic areas then building administrative systems for a procurement process, which has lead to the establishment of the supplier panel and finally the development of a detailed work programme and an engagement strategy. This has occurred during a period of considerable change in the legislative environment, especially around the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.
- 4.2 However most of those tasks have now been completed and it is considered that the project has the framework for addressing a number of significant issues over the next couple of years, leading up to the notification of the plan in 2020.
- 4.3 There are however major risks that need to be acknowledged, these risks relate to the retention and recruitment of experienced staff. This has been a challenge and has led to a relatively heavy reliance on outside contractors and consultants. This remains a risk and a challenge for the project.
- 4.4 The other major risk is the changing legislative environment and the resources that are required to address the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity in particular.



# 6.0 Recommendation to District Plan Committee

- 6.1 The Project Team recommends that:
  - 1. This report be received



### 7. District Plan Review Programme Planning

Author:	Justine Ashley (Project Lead), Emma Hodgkin (Project Manager)
Contact:	Justine Ashley (03) 347 2811 / Emma Hodgkin (03) 347 1808

#### **Purpose**

To provide the Committee with an overview of the District Plan Review Programme Planning that is being undertaken with assistance from RCP Consultants. Endorsement is also sought for 'DPC Noting and Approvals' procedures in order to streamline and prioritise the Committee's upcoming workload.

#### Recommendation

#### "That the Committee:

- Notes the presentation;
- Endorses the recommended 'DPC Noting and Approvals' procedures, being that:
  - For "Simple" work streams <u>and</u> where no substantial change from the operative District Plan is being recommended, the preferred option and/or draft provisions be approved by the Project Lead / Senior Advisory Group then provided to the DPC for <u>noting</u>;
  - For "Simple" work streams where there is a substantial change from the operative District Plan being recommended; and for "Medium" and "Complex" work streams, the preferred option and/or draft provisions be reviewed by the Project Lead / Senior Advisory Group then provided to the DPC for approval."

#### **Attachments**

- PowerPoint "District Plan Review Programme Development".
- A3 copy of the 'DPR Summary Programme'
- Table of proposed future DPC meeting agenda items

# The proposed

# Selwyn District Plan



District Plan Review Programme Development





# Final Draft Programme and Development Process





# Programme Process Overview

- Workshops with DPR Leads and team
- Understand and Develop Phases / tasks and current status of workstreams
- Develop categories and phase durations
- Categorise and group workstreams
- Prepare, test and finalise Master Programme
- Develop and produce detailed workstream programmes

RCP.

♣

# Proposed DPR Phases

BASELINE ASSESSMENTS

ISSUES AND OPTIONS PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

SECTION 32 AND DRAFTING

FINALISE

NOTIFICATION AND RELEASE





# Proposed DPR Topic Categories

	POTENTIAL TOPIC CATEGORIES	BASELINE ASSESSMENT	PREFERRED OPTION	FURTHER STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT	SECTION 32 AND DRAFTING	TEST AND FINALISE	TOTAL
SMALL / SIMPLE	<ul><li>Energy &amp; Infrastructure</li><li>District Wide</li></ul>	15	16	18 (if required)	20	12	63 (to 81)
MEDIUM	<ul><li>Business</li><li>Natural Hazards</li><li>Transport</li></ul>	23	20	20 (if required)	24	12	<b>79</b> (to 99)
LARGE / COMPLEX	<ul><li>Residential</li><li>Rural</li><li>Natural</li><li>Environment</li></ul>	28	28	20 (if required)	26	12	<b>94</b> (to 114)



# Proposed DPR Tasks - Baseline

# **BASELINE ASSESSMENT PHASE**

- Assigning resources and lead
- Developing Scopes of Work / 1wk
- Procuring technical services and advice / 4wks
- Gathering evidence and historical review / 8-21wks
- Defining engagement / 2wk
- Undertake DPC Gateway Test
- Prepare and issue Scopes of Work for next Stage /
   1wk
- Procure technical services for next stage / 4wks





# Proposed DPR Tasks - Preferred

# **PREFERRED OPTION PHASE**

- Prepare draft issues, options, preferred option report and undertake stakeholder engagement / 4—10 wks
- Project Lead / Senior Advisory review / 3wks
- Undertake Runanga Focus Group Gateway Review
   (Mahaanui led) / 2wks
- Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd / Runanga Focus Group review and endorse draft Preferred Option report / 4wks (if required)
- Prepare comms and engagement content
- Review and approval of comms/ engagement content
- Complete, finalise and issue report to DPC to confirm preferred option (10 days prior to meeting) / 2wks
- DPC Approval of Preferred Option Paper/ 4wks





# Proposed DPR Tasks - Engagement

# **ENGAGEMENT PHASE**

- Preparation/release of engagement content / 1-2wks
- Engagement period feedback received / 4-6wks
- Summarise feedback, review feedback against preferred option and make changes to preferred option as required / 2wks
- Project Lead / Senior Advisory review / 2wks
- Prepare and issue Scopes of Work for next phase
- Finalise and issue to DPC (for approval if preferred option changed) (10 days prior to meeting) / 2wks
- DPC Approval/noting of recommended option / 4wks





# Proposed DPR Tasks - Drafting

# **SECTION 32 & DRAFTING PHASE**

- Review technical inputs / mapping and prepare draft provisions & Sec 32 drafting / 8-14 wks
- Project Lead / Senior Advisory review / 4wks
- Undertake Runanga Focus Group Gateway Review (Mahaanui led) / 2wks
- Finalise Section 32 and draft provisions and issue to DPC for approval / noting (10 days prior to meeting) / 2wks
- DPC Approval / noting of Section 32 and Draft Provisions / 4wks





# Proposed DPR Tasks - Finalise

# **TEST, COMPILE & FINALISE**

- Communications planning for notification
- Finalisation of hearings panels
- Complete final drafting e-plan format
- Internal 'Road Test' and feedback
- Legal review and confirmation
- Prepare for First Schedule consultation and release
- Notice of Requirements
- Finalisation of Proposed District Plan
- Endorsement by DPC





# Proposed DPR Topic Durations

	POTENTIAL TOPIC CATEGORIES	BASELINE ASSESSMENT	PREFERRED OPTION	FURTHER STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT	SECTION 32 AND DRAFTING	TEST AND FINALISE	TOTAL
SMALL / SIMPLE	<ul><li>Energy &amp; Infrastructure</li><li>District Wide</li></ul>	15	16	18 (if required)	20	12	63 (to 81)
MEDIUM	<ul><li>Business</li><li>Natural</li><li>Hazards</li><li>Transport</li></ul>	23	20	<b>20</b> (if required)	24	12	<b>79</b> (to 99)
LARGE / COMPLEX	<ul><li>Residential</li><li>Rural</li><li>Natural</li><li>Environment</li></ul>	28	28	20 (if required)	26	12	<b>94</b> (to 114)



# DPR Summary Programme



#### **DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY PROGRAMME**

UPDATED DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION

	KEY				
1000	DPC meetings	DPC	STAKEHOLDER	FULL PUBLIC	
	Baseline Assessments	APPROVAL	ENGAGEMENT	CONSULTATION	
	I&O or Preferred Option Preparation				
	Engagement & Review Process				
	Section 32 & Provision Drafting				
	Test, Consolidate and Finalise		(note dates	are shown in fortnightly peri	ods)

-		
	 L) ,1	
_	 -	

						-	_	_								-	1 1				1 1	1 7									
LINE	REF CODE	WORKSTREAM / SUMMARY GROUP	ТОРІС	LEAD(S)	RESOURCE	CATEGORY	I&Ops or Preferred Opt Route?	Runanga	Full Public Consultation?	30/10/17	11/12/17	8/01/18	5/02/18	5/03/18 5/03/18 19/03/18	2/04/18 16/04/18 30/04/18	14/05/18 28/05/18	11/06/18 25/06/18	23/07/18 23/07/18 6/08/18	20/08/18 3/09/18 17/09/18	1/10/18	29/10/18 12/11/18 26/11/18	10/12/18 24/12/18	21/01/19	18/02/19 4/03/19 18/03/19	1/04/19	13/05/19	10/06/19 24/06/19	8/07/19 22/07/19 5/08/19	19/08/19 2/09/19	16/09/19 30/09/19	14/10/19 28/10/19 11/11/19 25/11/19
1	EI001-E1008	All Energy and Infrastructure Workstreams	ENERGY & INFRASTRUCTURE	MR	INT	Simple	Preferred	No																						T	
2	NH003	Geotech/Liquifaction	NATURAL HAZARDS	MR	EXT	Medium	Preferred	Yes																					П		
3	NH901 - NH010	Coastal Hazards and Flooding (no further modelling)	NATURAL HAZARDS	MR	EXT	Medium	Preferred	Yes																					П		
4	NH001 - NH010	Coastal Hazards and Flooding (further modelling approved)	NATURAL HAZARDS	MR	EXT	Medium	Preferred	Yes																							
5	NH004	Wild Fire	NATURAL HAZARDS	RL	INT	Simple	Preferred	No																							$\Pi$
6	DW004, DW006, DW007, DW204, DW206, DW207	Emergency Services, Lighting & Glare, Vibration	DISTRICT WIDE	VB / JA	EXT	Simple	Preferred	No															Ш						П		
7	DW009, DW010, DW2009, DW022	Transport & Subdivision (Vibration & Signs)	DISTRICT WIDE	CF	EXT	Medium	Preferred	Yes	Yes																						
8	DW012	Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Land	DISTRICT WIDE	RL	EXT	Simple	Preferred	No																							
9	DW011, DW01101, DW005, DW205, DW008,	Earthworks, Noise, Signs	DISTRICT WIDE	VB/JA/RL	EXT	Simple	Preferred	Yes	Yes																				Ш		
10	DW002, DW019, RE012, DW020	EDAs, Tourism, Resort Zones, Alpine Villages and DPMAs	DISTRICT WIDE	VB / JA	EXT	Medium	Preferred	No																					П		
11	DW013, DW014, DW017, DW018	Relocated Bldgs, Waste Disposal, Temp Activities	DISTRICT WIDE	VB / JA	INT	Simple	Preferred	No																П							
12	DW003, DW203, DW016, RE017	Council Assets and Buildings, Community Recreation	DISTRICT WIDE	JT	INT	Simple	Preferred	No																							
13	DW021	Keeping/Boarding of Animals	DISTRICT WIDE	VB/JA, RL	INT / EXT	Simple	Preferred	No																							
14	RU001, RU002, RU003, RU008, RU013	Rural Character & Amenity, Family Flats (Noise & Signs)	RURAL	RL	EXT	Complex	Preferred	Yes	Yes																						
15	RU006, RU007	Intensive Farming	RURAL	RL	INT / EXT	Medium	Preferred	No	Yes													通									
16	RU004, RU204, RU005	Quarrying & Airfields (Vibration & Noise)	RURAL	RL	EXT	Medium	Preferred	Yes	Yes																					П	
17	RU009, DW014	Plantation Forestry, Tree Shading and Wilding Trees	RURAL	RL	INT / EXT	Simple	Preferred	No																							
18	RU010, RU011, RU012	Stock Droving, Research Facilities, Scheduled Sites	RURAL	RL	INT / EXT	Simple	Preferred	No																						$\Box$	
19	BS001 - BS012	All Business Topic Workstreams	BUSINESS	MR	EXT	Medium	Preferred	No	Yes																					П	
20	NE001, NE201	Heritage Items and Protected Trees	NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	AM	EXT	Medium	Preferred	No	Yes																						
21	NE002, NE202	Sites and Areas of Cultural Significance	NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	AM	EXT	Medium	Preferred	Yes																							
22	NE003, NE203	Vegetation and Ecosystems	NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	AM	EXT	Complex	Preferred	Yes																							
23	NE004	Outstanding Natural Features & Landscapes	NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	AM	EXT	Medium	Preferred	Yes	Yes																						
24	NE005 - NE006	Coastal Environments, Water and Access to Water	NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	AM	EXT	Medium	Preferred	Yes																						П	
25	REODZ	Kainga Nohoanga Zone	RESIDENTIAL	AM	EXT	Simple	Preferred	Yes																						П	
26	RE003 - RE007, RE014, RE016, RE008	Residential Density, Character and Amenity, Elderly Persons	RESIDENTIAL	JL	EXT	Complex	Preferred	Yes	Yes																				$\Box$	$\Pi$	
27	RE010, RE014	Housing, Home Based Business Living 3, Deferred Living	RESIDENTIAL	JL	EXT	Simple	Preferred	No									-												$\top$	$\top$	
28	RE002, NPS001 - NPS003	NPS - Urban Development Capacity	RESIDENTIAL / BUSINESS	CF	INT / EXT	Complex	I & Opts	Yes																1						T	
29	DW015, RE001, RE011, RE013.	District Wide Urban Growth, Versatile Soils,	DISTRICT WIDE	BR	INT	Medium	Preferred	No							"""														$\top$	T	
	REUIS.																IIIII	100	-		dillo		100	1 111			man.				





# DPR Topic Programme Example





Topic Project Plan

TRANSPORT & SUBDIVISION (Vibration & Signs)											
Ref Code	Topic Lead	Resource	Category	Ecan Review	Runanga Review	Engagement Type					
DW009 DW010 DW2009 DW022	CF	EXT	Medium	Yes	Yes	Shareholder Consultation & Public Consultation					

KEY			
DPC meetings	DPC	STAKEHOLDER	FULL PUBLIC
Baseline Assessments	APPROVAL	ENGAGEMENT	CONSULTATION
I&O or Preferred Option Preparation			
Engagement & Review Process			
Section 32 & Provision Drafting			
Test, Consolidate and Finalise			

27.11.17 As at: Comments / Action Gathering evidence & historical review includes procurement of Phase 1 03.11.17 Undertake baseline enaggement 10 06.11.17 17.11.17 Prepare & issue Scope of Work 5 20.11.17 24.11.17 Procure technical services Phase 2 15 27.11.17 22,12,17 Prepare draft issues & option paper with preferred option & undertake internal engagement 29 08.01.18 19.02.18 Ecan engagement & approval 14 19.02.18 05.03.18 Stakeholder engagement 14 19.02.18 05.03.18 Project Lead/Senior advisory review of draft paper & challenge & update 14 05.03.18 16.03.18 Runanga Focus Group Gateway Review (Mahaanui led) 14 05.03.18 16.03.18 Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd / Runanga Focus Group review & endorse draft (if required) 14 16.03.18 06.04.18 Prepare communications & engagement content/format for public release 5 09.04.18 13.04.18 Complete final report & project lead/sponsor sign off, finalise & issue to DPC to confirm 5 09.04.18 13.04.18 Approval of content for public release 2 13.04.18 16.04.18 DPC Meeting 18.04.18 18.04.18 DPC Approval of Preferred Option Paper & Comms 18.04.18 18.04.18 Preparing consultation material for issue 32 23.04.18 08.06.18 Stakeholder Consultation 20 11.06.18 17.08.18 Public release of engagement & Comms 20.08.18 20.08.18 Engagement and feedback received 30 20.08.18 28.09.18 Prepare & issue scope of work Phase 3 49 20.08.18 29.10.18 Summarise feedback, review feedback against preferred option & make changes as required 10 01.10.18 12.10.18 Prepare DPC paper on engagement outcomes 10 15.10.18 29.10.18 Project Lead/Senior Advisory review & approval 30,10,18 02.10.18 Finalise & issue to DPC for noting unless change to preferred option 05.10.18 13.11.18 Procure Technical services Pase 3 (if required) 11 13.11.18 28.11.18 28.11.18 28.11.18 OPC review/approve engagement outcomes 28.11.18 28,11,18 Review technical inputs/mapping & prepare draft provisions & sec32 drafting 54 30.11.18 28.02.19 Project Lead/Senior Advisory review & challenge & update 21 01.03.19 29.03.19 Ecan review as required 21 01.03.19 29.03.19 Runanga Focus Group Gateway Review (Mahaanui led) 21 01.03.19 29.03.19 Finalise section 32 & draft provisions and issue to DPC 01.04.19 08.04.19 DPC Approval of Section 32 & Draft provisions 24.04.19 24.04.19 Complete final drafting - e-plan format 26.04.19 01.05.19 Internal 'road test' & feedback 04.05.19 15.05.19 Legal review and confirmation 11 15.05.19 29.05.19 Prepare for first schedule consultation and release 29.05.19 19.06.19 Council approval of entire draft district plan 26.05.19 26,05,19 Start preparing S42A reports Jun-19 2020



# DPC NOTING & APPROVALS

- Due to the workload of reviewing and approving each workstream at the end of each phase it is recommended that those categorised as "Simple" and where no substantial change from the operative District Plan is being recommended, be approved by the Project Lead / Senior Advisory Group then provided to the DPC for noting.
- Any workstreams and topics categorised as "Medium" and "Complex" will be reviewed by the Project Lead / Senior Advisory Group then recommended to the DPC for approval.
- The contents of the whole Plan requires DPC approval in June 2019.



# DPC – WHAT FUTURE MEETINGS WILL LOOK LIKE

• Refer to table in handout





# DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY PROGRAMME

RCP**♦** 

UPDATED DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION 29-Nov-17

KEY			
DPC meetings	DPC STAKE	HOLDER FULL	PUBLIC
Baseline Assessments	APPROVAL ENGA	GEMENT CONSU	ILTATION
I&O or Preferred Option Preparation			
Engagement & Review Process			
Section 32 & Provision Drafting			
Test, Consolidate and Finalise	(no	te dates are show	n in fortnightly periods)

LIN	IE REF CODE	WORKSTREAM / SUMMARY GROUP	ТОРІС	LEAD(S)	RESOURCE	CATEGORY	I&Ops or Preferred Opt Route?	Review Likely?	Full Public Consultation?	30/10/17 13/11/17 27/11/17	11/12/17	8/01/18 22/01/18 5/02/18	5/02/18 19/02/18 5/03/18	19/03/18 2/04/18	16/04/18 30/04/18	28/05/18 11/06/18	25/06/18 9/07/18 23/07/18	6/08/18	3/09/18 17/09/18 1/10/18	15/10/18 29/10/18	12/11/18 26/11/18 10/12/18	24/12/18 7/01/19	4/02/19 18/02/19	4/03/19	1/04/19 15/04/19 29/04/19	13/05/19	10/06/19 24/06/19 9/07/19	22/07/19 22/08/19	19/08/19 2/09/19 16/09/19	30/09/19 14/10/19 28/10/19	11/11/19
1	EI001-E1008	All Energy and Infrastructure Workstreams	ENERGY & INFRASTRUCTURE	MR	INT	Simple	Preferred	No																							
2	NH003	Geotech/Liquifaction	NATURAL HAZARDS	MR	EXT	Medium	Preferred	Yes																							
3	NH001 – NH010	Coastal Hazards and Flooding (no further modelling)	NATURAL HAZARDS	MR	EXT	Medium	Preferred	Yes																							
4	NH001 - NH010	Coastal Hazards and Flooding (further modelling approved)	NATURAL HAZARDS	MR	EXT	Medium	Preferred	Yes																							
5	NH004	Wild Fire	NATURAL HAZARDS	RL	INT	Simple	Preferred	No																							
6	DW004, DW006, DW007, DW204, DW206, DW207	Emergency Services, Lighting & Glare, Vibration	DISTRICT WIDE	VB / JA	EXT	Simple	Preferred	No																							
7	DW009, DW010, DW2009, DW022	Transport & Subdivision (Vibration & Signs)	DISTRICT WIDE	CF	EXT	Medium	Preferred	Yes	Yes																						
8	DW012	Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Land	DISTRICT WIDE	RL	EXT	Simple	Preferred	No																							
9	DW011, DW01101, DW005, DW205, DW008,	Earthworks, Noise, Signs	DISTRICT WIDE	VB/JA/RL	EXT	Simple	Preferred	Yes	Yes																						
10	DW002, DW019, RE012, DW020	EDAs, Tourism, Resort Zones, Alpine Villages and DPMAs	DISTRICT WIDE	VB / JA	EXT	Medium	Preferred	No																							
11	DW013, DW014, DW017, DW018	Relocated Bldgs, Waste Disposal, Temp Activities	DISTRICT WIDE	VB / JA	INT	Simple	Preferred	No																							
12	DW003, DW203, DW016, RE017	Council Assets and Buildings, Community Recreation	DISTRICT WIDE	JT	INT	Simple	Preferred	No																							
13	DW021	Keeping/Boarding of Animals	DISTRICT WIDE	VB/JA, RL,	, INT / EXT	Simple	Preferred	No																							
14	RU001, RU002, RU003, RU008, RU013	Rural Character & Amenity, Family Flats (Noise & Signs)	RURAL	RL	EXT	Complex	Preferred	Yes	Yes																						
15	RU006, RU007	Intensive Farming	RURAL	RL	INT / EXT	Medium	Preferred	No	Yes																						
16	RU004, RU204, RU005	Quarrying & Airfields (Vibration & Noise)	RURAL	RL	EXT	Medium	Preferred	Yes	Yes																						
17	RU009, DW014	Plantation Forestry, Tree Shading and Wilding Trees	RURAL	RL	INT / EXT	Simple	Preferred	No																							
18	RU010, RU011, RU012	Stock Droving, Research Facilities, Scheduled Sites	RURAL	RL	INT / EXT	Simple	Preferred	No																							
19	BS001 – BS012	All Business Topic Workstreams	BUSINESS	MR	EXT	Medium	Preferred	No	Yes																						
20	NE001, NE201	Heritage Items and Protected Trees	NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	AM	EXT	Medium	Preferred	No	Yes																						
21	NE002, NE202	Sites and Areas of Cultural Significance	NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	AM	EXT	Medium	Preferred	Yes																							
22	NE003, NE203	Vegetation and Ecosystems	NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	AM	EXT	Complex	Preferred	Yes																							
23	NE004	Outstanding Natural Features & Landscapes	NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	AM	EXT	Medium	Preferred	Yes	Yes																						
24	NE005 - NE006	Coastal Environments, Water and Access to Water	NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	AM	EXT	Medium	Preferred	Yes																							
25	RE002	Kainga Nohoanga Zone	RESIDENTIAL	AM	EXT	Simple	Preferred	Yes																							
26	RE003 – RE007, RE014, RE016, RE008	Residential Density, Character and Amenity, Elderly Persons	RESIDENTIAL	JL	EXT	Complex	Preferred	Yes	Yes										GEORGE CONTROL OF THE PERSON NAMED IN CONTROL OF THE PERSON NA												
27	RE016, RE008	Housing, Home Based Business Living 3, Deferred Living	RESIDENTIAL	JL	EXT	Simple	Preferred	No												111											H
28		NPS - Urban Development Capacity	RESIDENTIAL / BUSINESS		INT / EXT	Complex	I & Opts	Yes										IIII					11								H
29	DW015, RE001, RE011,	District Wide Urban Growth, Versatile Soils,	DISTRICT WIDE		INT	Medium	Preferred	No						"				11111											+		H
25	RE013.	District Wide orbain Growth, Versuche Sons,	DIOTING! WIDE	1,						100 May 12 12 1		<b>100</b> 100 100											55 N.S. 144	M			.IIXII				ш

Month	Phase of the Review	Type of Report	Topic/s	Complexity & Timings		
January 2018						
February 2018	Preferred Options Preparation	Issues and Options with a Preferred Option	<ul> <li>Emergency Services</li> <li>Lighting and Glare</li> <li>Vibration</li> <li>Kainga Nohoanga Zone</li> </ul>	Simple (approx. 15mins each)		
	Preferred Options Preparation	Issues and Options with a Preferred Option	Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features	Medium/Complex (30- 60mins each)		
	Preferred Options Preparation	Issues and Options with a Preferred Option	Energy and Infrastructure     Hazardous Substances     and Contaminated Land	Simple (approx. 15mins each)		
March 2018	Preferred Options Preparation	Issues and Options with a Preferred Option	<ul><li>Intensive Farming</li><li>Quarrying</li><li>Airfields</li></ul>	Medium/Complex (30- 60mins each)		
April 2018	Preferred Options Preparation	Issues and Options with a Preferred Option	<ul> <li>Geotech/Liquefaction</li> <li>Coastal Hazards and Flooding (if no further modelling work is undertaken)</li> <li>Heritage Items and Notable Trees</li> </ul>	Medium/Complex (30- 60mins each)		

Month	Phase of the Review	Type of Report	Topic/s	Complexity & Timings
			<ul> <li>Transport</li> <li>Subdivision</li> <li>NPS – Urban         Development Capacity     </li> </ul>	
	Preferred Options Preparation	Issues and Options with a Preferred Option	Sites and Areas of Cultural Significance	Medium/Complex (30- 60mins each)
May 2018	Engagement and Review Process	DPC update following consultation and engagement (for noting if no changes to occur and simple) or amended Preferred Option if changes to occur	Kainga Nohoanga Zone	Simple (for noting)
June 2018	Preferred Options Preparation	Issues and Options with a Preferred Option	<ul> <li>Wild Fire</li> <li>Stock Droving</li> <li>Research Facilities</li> <li>Scheduled Sites</li> <li>Relocated Buildings</li> <li>Waste Disposal</li> <li>Temporary Activities</li> <li>Council Assets and Community &amp; Recreation</li> <li>Earthworks</li> <li>Noise</li> <li>Signage</li> </ul>	Simple (approx. 15min each)
	Preferred Options Preparation	Issues and Options with a Preferred Option	<ul> <li>Rural Character and Amenity (including noise and signage)</li> <li>Family Flats</li> <li>District Wide Urban Growth</li> <li>Versatile soils</li> <li>Business</li> </ul>	Medium/Complex (30- 60mins each

Month	Phase of the Review	Type of Report	Topic/s		Complexity & Timings
	Section 32 & Provision Drafting	Draft S32 Report & Draft Provisions	<ul><li>Emergency Services</li><li>Lighting and Glare</li><li>Vibration</li></ul>	•	Simple (approx. 15min each)
	Preferred Options Preparation	Issues and Options with a Preferred Option	<ul> <li>EDA's, Tourism, Resort Zones, Alpine Villages and DPMA's</li> <li>Residential Character and Amenity</li> <li>Elderly Persons Housing</li> <li>Home Based Business</li> </ul>	•	Medium/Complex (30-60min each)
July 2018	Engagement and Review Process	DPC update following consultation and engagement (for noting if no changes to occur and simple) or amended Preferred Option if changes to occur	Energy and Infrastructure	•	Simple (for noting)
	Section 32 & Provision Drafting	Draft S32 Report & Draft Provisions	Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Land	•	Simple (approx. 15min each)
August 2018	Preferred Options Preparation	Issues and Options with a Preferred Option	<ul> <li>Keeping/Boarding of Animals</li> <li>Plantation Forestry, Tree Shading and Wilding Trees</li> <li>Living 3</li> <li>Deferred Living</li> </ul>		Simple (approx. 15min each)
	Preferred Options Preparation	Issues and Options with a Preferred Option	<ul><li>Coastal Environments</li><li>Water and Access to Water</li></ul>	•	Medium/Complex (30-60min each)

Month	Phase of the Review	Type of Report	Topic/s		Complexity & Timings
	Engagement and Review Process	DPC update following consultation and engagement (for medium/complex recommendation for approval will be made)	<ul> <li>Geotech and Liquefaction</li> <li>Coastal Hazards and Flooding (if no further modelling occurs)</li> <li>NPS – Urban Development Capacity</li> </ul>	•	Medium/Complex (30-60min each)
	Preferred Options Preparation	Issues and Options with a Preferred Option	<ul> <li>Coastal Hazards and Flooding (with further modelling)</li> <li>Vegetation and Ecosystems</li> </ul>	•	Medium/Complex (30-60min each)
September 2018	Engagement and Review Process	DPC update following consultation and engagement (for medium/complex recommendation for approval will be made)	Sites and Areas of Cultural Significance	•	Medium/Complex (30-60min each)
Engagement and Review Process DPC update consultation engagement medium/con recommend		DPC update following consultation and engagement (for medium/complex recommendation for approval will be made)	<ul> <li>Earthworks</li> <li>Noise</li> <li>Signage</li> <li>Rural Character and Amenity</li> <li>Family Flats</li> <li>Intensive Farming</li> <li>Quarrying</li> <li>Airfields</li> <li>Vibration</li> <li>Heritage Items and Notable Trees</li> <li>Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features</li> <li>Business</li> </ul>	•	Medium/Complex (30-60min each)
	Section 32 & Provision Drafting	Draft S32 Report & Draft Provisions	<ul><li>Relocated buildings</li><li>Waste disposal</li></ul>	•	Simple (approx. 15min each)

Month	Phase of the Review	Type of Report	Topic/s	Complexity & Timings
			<ul> <li>Temporary activities</li> <li>Council Assets &amp;         Community and         Recreation</li> <li>Kainga Nohoanga Zone</li> </ul>	
	Engagement and Review Process	DPC update following consultation and engagement (for noting if no changes to occur and simple) or amended Preferred Option if changes to occur	<ul> <li>Wild Fire</li> <li>EDA's, Tourism, Resort Zones, Alpine Villages and DPMA's</li> <li>Stock Droving</li> <li>Research Facilities</li> <li>Scheduled Sites</li> </ul>	Simple (approx. 15min each)
November 2018	Engagement and Review Process	DPC update following consultation and engagement (for medium/complex recommendation for approval will be made)	<ul> <li>Transport</li> <li>Subdivision</li> <li>Coastal Environment</li> <li>Water and Access to Water</li> <li>Residential Density, Character and Amenity</li> <li>Elderly Persons Housing</li> <li>Home Based Business</li> <li>District Wide Growth</li> <li>Versatile Soils</li> </ul>	Medium/Complex (30-60min each)
	Section 32 & Provision Drafting	Draft S32 Report & Draft Provisions	Energy and Infrastructure	Simple (approx. 15min each)
	Section 32 & Provision Drafting	Draft S32 Report & Draft Provisions	NPS – Urban     Development Capacity	Medium/Complex (30- 60min each)
December 2018		No	Meeting	
January 2019	Section 32 & Provision Drafting	Draft S32 Report & Draft Provisions	<ul> <li>Keeping/Boarding of Animals</li> <li>Plantation Forestry, Wilding Trees and Tree Shading</li> </ul>	Simple (approx. 15min each)

Month	Phase of the Review	Type of Report	Topic/s	Complexity & Timings
				Circula (annua) 15min
	Section 32 & Provision Drafting	Draft S32 Report & Draft Provisions	<ul><li>Living 3</li><li>Deferred Living</li></ul>	Simple (approx. 15min each)
February 2019	Section 32 & Provision Drafting	Draft S32 Report & Draft Provisions	<ul> <li>Geotech/Liquefaction</li> <li>Coastal Hazards and Flooding (if no further modelling occurs)</li> <li>Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features</li> </ul>	Medium/Complex (30- 60min each)
	Section 32 & Provision Drafting	Draft S32 Report & Draft Provisions	<ul> <li>Wild Fire</li> <li>Earthworks</li> <li>Noise</li> <li>Signage</li> <li>Stock Droving</li> <li>Research Facilities</li> <li>Scheduled Sites</li> </ul>	Simple (approx. 15min each)
	Section 32 & Provision Drafting	Draft S32 Report & Draft Provisions	<ul> <li>Transport</li> <li>Subdivision</li> <li>EDA's, Tourism, Resort Zones, Alpine Villages and DPMA's</li> <li>Rural character and amenity</li> <li>Intensive Farming</li> <li>Quarrying</li> <li>Airfields</li> <li>Business</li> </ul>	Medium/Complex (30-60min each)

Month	Phase of the Review	Type of Report	Topic/s	Complexity & Timings					
	Section 32 & Provision Drafting	Draft S32 Report & Draft Provisions	Heritage Items and Notable Trees     Sites and Areas of Cultural Significance     Vegetation and Ecosystems     Residential Density, Character and Amenity     Elderly Persons Housing     Home Based Business     District Wide Urban Growth	Medium/Complex (30-60min each)					
			Versatile Soils						
May 2019	Road Te	esting of Provisions to Occu	ır and Final Preparation of Pro	posed Plan					
June 2019		DPC Sign Off of Proposed District Plan							

#### 8. Communication and Engagement Implementation Plan

Author:	Stephen Hill (Business Relationship Manager)
Contact:	(03) 347 940

#### **Purpose**

To brief the Committee on the draft Communication and Engagement Implementation Plan for the District Plan Review process.

#### Recommendation

#### "That the Committee:

- Notes the presentation;
- Endorses the 'Communication and Engagement Implementation Plan' for the District Plan Review process."

#### **Attachments**

- Powerpoint "Community Engagement Implementation Plan".
- Draft "Communication and Engagement Implementation Plan".

# The proposed

# Selwyn District Plan



# District Plan Review

Community Engagement Implementation Plan



# Stakeholder Engagement and Public Consultation to end 2018



# Overview

- Engagement Framework completed and signed off by DPC in September 2017
- One-on-one engagement continues with Key Stakeholders
- Development of Engagement Implementation Plan and Topic Engagement Plans October-November
- Preparations now underway for more detailed engagement with stakeholders and targeted landowners and the public

# Document Hierarchy

District Plan Review - Engagement Framework and Appendices

District Plan Review - Community Engagement Implementation Plan

Residential Topic Engagement Plan Rural Topic Engagement Plar Natural Environment Topic Engagement Plan

District-Wide Topic Engagement Plan

Other Topics
Engagement Plan



# Review and Engagement Timeline

**Engagement Planning** October 2017 - December 2017 Internal and key stakeholder consultation in the development of November 2017 - September Issues and Options (including 2018 ECan and Runganga endorsement where required) Public nominations for February 2018 Heritage Items & Notable Trees **Targeted Landowner Consultation** March - December 2018 (across a range of topics July - August 2018 **Public Consultation on issues** relevant to the Rural Topic (6 weeks) **Public Consultation on issues** August - September 2018 relevant to the Residential & (6 weeks) **Business Topics** 

# Primary Key Messages

- The District Plan is essentially a 'rule book' which sets district-wide rules for sustainably managing Selwyn's natural and physical resources.
- Our current District Plan now outdated. We need a modern Plan which provides clear objectives, policies and rules to manage the effects of land use activities on the environment.
- Rules in the District Plan set a clear direction for our district's development and reflects our communities' needs and expectations.
- Next year, we will be starting our public consultation phase and we will come to you when we need your feedback.
- It's time to think about what you value, the things that you want to protect and how we can improve our district going forward.
- It's important for you to be involved because a District Plan controls what you can do on your land and how it can be developed.

# Engagement Risks

- Uncertainty around depth of engagement and capturing the right key stakeholders
- Engagement fatigue, especially after LTP consultation
- Lack of interest in Council affairs by key stakeholders
- Relationship difficulties between Council and partners
- Hot-button issues become a media focus
- Adequate resourcing of the communications and engagement function

# Mitigation of Risks

- A comprehensive Implementation Plan followed by DPR staff and consultants, Selwyn staff and Councillors.
- A clear understanding of who does what to achieve the Implementation Plan's success
- Communications that are simple, concise, easy to understand, and timely
- Communications directly addressed to those most affected in a way they will relate to
- Communications disseminated in local print and social media
- Plenty of opportunity for people to engage directly with Council

# Engagement Toolbox

- Clear, concise key messaging relevant to recipients
- Personally addressed letters or emails to key stakeholders; face-to-face meetings
- News releases, advertorial, advertisements, Facebook posts
- DPR Website and EngagementHQ to inform, engage and enable feedback
- Drop-in sessions and presence at community and/or District events

# Implementation Plan Outcomes

- Stakeholder and landowner databases are kept accurate and up-to-date
- Evaluation shows stakeholders, targeted landowners and the community feel they were kept well informed and were provided a range of opportunities to engage
- Feedback is relevant and meaningful
- A range of digital tools are utilised via the EngagementHQ platform

# Implementation Plan Outcomes

- The DPR is generally viewed as positive by local media and this is reflected in the stories and articles published
- Our distribution methods to disseminating our communications and information are regular, relevant, kept up-to-date and easily accessible via a range of methods (e.g. traditional vs e-tools)
- Face to face engagement such as drop-in sessions are well attended and provide useful feedback to inform decision making
- Public feedback is adequately recorded and stored for the purposes of reporting and future use

# Next Steps

### From now on:

- Prepare materials for engagement due to commence February 2018 (nominations for Heritage Items and Notable Trees)
- Assist Topic Leads with ongoing key stakeholder engagement
- Rollout of tools to support Implementation Plan
- Continue building and maintaining relationships with key stakeholders
- Further resource mapping/planning

# Selwyn District Council

# District Plan Review



# Community Engagement Implementation Plan

### **Contents**

Contents	
Table of Figures	1
1.0 Introduction	2
2.0 Engagement Documentation & Timeline	2
2.1 Document Hierarchy	3
2.2 Review and Engagement Timeline	3
3.0 Engagement Goal	
4.0 Key Audiences and Parameters	4
5.0 Engagement Barriers and Risks	4
6.0 Engagement Outcomes	
7.0 Key Messages	6
7.1 Primary Messages	6
7.2 Secondary Messages	
8.0 Engagement Type by Topic	7
Key Partners – Environment Canterbury and Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd	
Key Stakeholders	8
Targeted Landowners	8
General Public	8
9.0 Engagement Tactics	8
9.1 Key Stakeholder Engagement	9
9.3 General Public Consultation	10
10.0 Resourcing	11
11. Role of DPC in Communications and Engagement	11
12.0 Engagement Action Plan and Timeline	12
Appendix 1 – Engagement Type by Topic	18
Table of Figures	
Table 1: Summary of Tactics for Public Consultation by Topic	
Table 2. Engagement Action Flan by Month, Type and Topic	12

#### 1.0 Introduction

Selwyn District Council is currently reviewing its District Plan, much of which has remained the same since it became fully operative in 2004 (when decisions on submissions were released). A number of plan changes have occurred since then, and the Council agreed to a full review of the Operative District Plan in May 2015. Since then, the Council has set up a District Plan Review team, which has segmented the Plan into a series of Chapters or Topics. Topic leads then began a process of research and analysis, initiated of a range of baseline reports for each Topic, and engaged with partners (Environment Canterbury and Mahaanui, representing mana whenua) and key stakeholders. Following the analysis of baseline reports (a process that commenced towards the end of 2017 and will continue into 2018), the team will begin to identify issues and options and, from that, will make a series of recommendations as to preferred options.

Once the preferred options are known, the District Plan Topic leads and managers will – under the guidance of the District Plan Review Engagement Framework – go back to the stakeholders to discuss these preferred options and other options available. In some instances, where the whole district may be affected, this may involve public consultation.

The resulting feedback will feed into the pre-notification phase in 2019, when further consultation will occur. The next Council elections are due to occur in October 2019. The Proposed District Plan is due to be notified in early to mid-2020, when formal RMA Schedule 1 consultation will take place.

The purpose of this Community Engagement Implementation Plan, therefore, is to ensure the initial stakeholder engagement and public consultation on the preferred and other options provides sufficient input into the subsequent development of the Plan as it enters into its pre-notification phase.

To date, some engagement with partners and key stakeholders has already occurred. As 2017 draws to a close, this end-of-year planning period provides the necessary reflection to prepare for a series of engagement implementation activities due to begin early in 2018 and move progressively through the year.

The preparation of this Plan has necessarily had to happen before some of the Topic baseline reports have been produced, and indeed before some of the baseline reports have been commissioned, so it is therefore incomplete as far as some topics are concerned, and several timelines are consequently unconfirmed.

### 2.0 Engagement Documentation & Timeline

The District Plan Review Engagement Framework which was approved by Council in September 2017 outlined a hierarchy of the engagement and communications documents that would guide the District Plan Review process through the remainder of 2017 and through to Notification of a Proposed District Plan scheduled for February 2020. This document hierarchy is outlined again below:

#### 2.1 Document Hierarchy

District Plan Review - Engagement Framework and Appendices

District Plan Review - Key partner, stakeholder and Community Engagement Implementation Plan

Topic-specific engagement plan Topic-specific engagement plan

Topic-specific engagement plan Topic-specific engagement plan Topic-specific engagement plan Topic-specific engagement plan

#### 2.2 Review and Engagement Timeline

Selwyn District Council aims to have decisions released on the second generation District Plan by February 2022. There are a number of phases in this process, with engagement to be undertaken at key stages throughout the review of the Plan, prior to a complete Proposed Plan being notified in early 2020. These phases are outlined below:

Engagement Planning	October 2017 – December 2017
Internal and key stakeholder consultation in the development of Issues and Options (including ECan and Runganga endorsement where required)	November 2017 – September 2018
Dublicarsoninstians for	
Public nominations for Heritage Items & Notable Trees	 February 2018
Targeted Landowner Consultation (across a range of topics	 March – December 2018
Public Consultation on issues relevant to the Rural Topic	 July – August 2018 (6 weeks)
Public Consultation on issues relevant to the Residential & Business Topics	 August – September 2018 (6 weeks)

#### 3.0 Engagement Goal

This Community Engagement Implementation Plan aims to outline the approach, barriers, issues, timing and methods of ensuring that all stakeholders— are informed and, where appropriate, engaged and consulted on the options as well as the preferred option proposed for the District Plan.

More detailed communication and engagement plans are set out in eight individual Topic Engagement Plans.

### 4.0 Key Audiences and Parameters

This Community Engagement Implementation Plan encompasses external stakeholders only. It does not canvass how internal Council staff and Councillors are engaged with, nor does it encompass engagement with contractors and consultants assisting with the development of the District Plan.

The Plan encompasses external stakeholders as follows:

- <u>Strategic Partners</u> Environment Canterbury and Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd (representing mana whenua)
- <u>Key Stakeholders</u> those organisations that the Council needs to engage with and keep informed, in order to most effectively develop and articulate a range of preferred options as well as a preferred option.
- <u>Targeted Landowners</u> the individuals and businesses that could be affected by the proposed changes in the District Plan, segmented in many instances into how they will be affected.
- <u>General Public</u> residents, businesses, visitors, organisations and other parties that could be affected by the preferred option(s) proposed for the District Plan.

### 5.0 Engagement Barriers and Risks

The following barriers to and risks in engaging with stakeholders and/or landowners have been identified:

- Establishing who should be consulted with and when, managing stakeholder expectations and selecting the best method of communication without casting the net too wide. This is difficult across a number of topics. For example, with Business, is it acceptable to only make contact with the District's major operators, or do all businesses need to be engaged, no matter how small? Another example, when the only landowners directly affected by, say, a change in residential density in a defined area, should consultation be restricted to those directly affected or should it involve the entire District on the basis that character and amenity might be affected?
- For a number of topics, where baseline reports have yet to be completed, or even commissioned, it is not yet possible to gauge who will be affected.

- Consultation for several topics relies on one-on-one engagement with individual stakeholders.
   There is a risk they don't respond or are not as engaged as we would like them to be, resulting in less feedback received
- A number of topics have the potential to get a community upset and heighten media interest such as quarrying; intensive farming; landowners being told what they can and can't do to their land; and changes that might alter the character of a town or area, such as more intensive development.
- One of the most common barriers to effective engagement for local authorities is "consultation overload", where stakeholders and the public feel they have been asked to "have their say" over so many topics during what seems to them a short timeframe. Because consultation over Selwyn's Long-Term Plan is due to occur between approximately March and June 2018, this is a very realistic risk.
- Another common barrier to engagement is lack of understanding about the issues involved and what they might mean for them – not realising until it is too late that they might be affected or misunderstanding the formal RMA process that follows once the Proposed District Plan is notified.

This Community Engagement Implementation Plan aims to overcome these barriers through:

- Implementing a comprehensive Community Engagement Plan that is accepted and followed by DPR staff and consultants, Selwyn staff and Councillors.
- A clear understanding of who does what to achieve the communication goals
- Communications that are simple, concise, easy to understand, and timely
- Communications directly addressed to those most affected
- Communications disseminated across a range of platforms including traditional and online/digital tools
- Council staff, management and Councillors are easily accessible to stakeholders, landowners and the wider community to discuss issues and concerns
- Coordination of the timing and presentation of community engagement to clearly differentiate from other Council consultation activities

### **6.0 Engagement Outcomes**

The following results of the Community Engagement Implementation Plan will measure the success of this Plan:

- Stakeholder and landowner databases are kept accurate and up-to-date and existing Council communication tools for engaging these individuals and groups are well utilised (such as the Rates Database);
- Evaluation of our engagement shows that stakeholders, targeted landowners and the community were kept well informed and were provided a range of opportunities to engage in the District Plan Review;
- Feedback received from stakeholders, landowners and the general public is relevant and meaningful which indicates that the issues and preferred options have been well articulated and communicated to a range of audiences;
- A range of e-tools are utilised via the EngagementHQ software and analysis shows that these
  methods are increasing the numbers of the public aware, informed and engaged in the District
  Plan Review;
- The District Plan Review is generally portrayed in a positive tone in stories and articles published in local media:
- Our distribution methods to disseminating our communications and information are regular, relevant, kept up-to-date and easily accessible via a range of methods (e.g. traditional vs digital tools);
- Face to face engagement such as drop-in sessions are well attended and provide useful feedback to inform decision making;
- Public feedback is adequately recorded and stored for the purposes of reporting and future use

### 7.0 Key Messages

#### 7.1 Primary Messages

- The District Plan is essentially a 'rule book' which sets district-wide rules for sustainably managing Selwyn's natural and physical resources.
- Our current District Plan is now outdated. We need a modern Plan which provides clear objectives, policies and rules to manage the effects of land use activities on the environment.
- Rules in the District Plan set a clear direction for our district's development and reflects our communities' needs and expectations.
- Next year, we will be starting our public consultation phase and we will come to you when we need your feedback.

- It's time to think about what you value, the things that you want to protect and how we can improve our district going forward.
- It's important for you to be involved because a District Plan controls what you can do on your land and how it can be developed.

#### 7.2 Secondary Messages

- Under the Resource Management Act, Councils are required to review their District Plan every 10 years to make sure it's still fit for purpose;
- The new District Plan rules will help to do this by determining whether any future change of land use or new development can go-ahead, or require a resource consent first.
- The review will update any changes in legislation, national and regional policy statements, environmental standards and other regulations.
- We want to make sure our rural, industrial and commercial areas thrive while ensuring our neighbourhoods remain uniquely Selwyn.
- The review of our current plan will help us to decide things like:
  - ✓ what type of building can be built next to your house
  - ✓ the appropriate housing density in your town or in the rural area
  - √ how much noise a factory can produce
  - √ how many carparks are required
  - ✓ how to protect important parts of our district like heritage items, biodiversity, significant landscapes and our coastal environment
  - ✓ how to provide for the productive use of rural land
  - √ how to minimise the impact of natural hazards like flooding and fire on people and infrastructure.

### 8.0 Engagement Type by Topic

A District Plan Review is a large and complex programme of work, largely driven by the interdependencies that exist across topics and issues, the depth and breadth of both stakeholders and targeted landowners required to be either engaged or kept informed during the process and the potential public and media interest in contentious issues such as intensive farming, quarrying and coastal and flooding hazards.

Included in Appendix 1 is a breakdown of the types of engagement that will occur during the Review process prior to Notification of the Proposed District Plan. It is intended that a range of audiences will have the opportunity to feed into the Review process at a number of different points. These are summarised below:

#### Key Partners - Environment Canterbury and Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd

- ✓ During the development of baseline reports and assessments if applicable. Both Partners have a dual role here as key strategic partners with responsibility for implementing and monitoring a range of other regional strategic documents such as the lwi Management Plan and Regional Policy Statement and as a provider of technical input and expertise.
- ✓ In the development of a range of options and the preferred option or approach if applicable
- ✓ Facilitating engagement and endorsement through their respective structures. In the case of Environment Canterbury, through their management structure and in the case of Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd, facilitating discussions, endorsements and approvals via the Nga Runanga Forum.

#### **Key Stakeholders**

- ✓ During the development of baseline reports and assessments if applicable
- ✓ In the development of the range of options and the preferred option or approach
- ✓ Following DPC approval of the preferred option (if required)
- ✓ Road tests of draft provisions prior to final DPC sign off and Notification

#### **Targeted Landowners**

- ✓ Following DPC approval of the preferred option to obtain feedback on the range of options proposed as well as their view on the Council's preferred option
- ✓ This will occur in parallel with the stakeholder consultation of the options/preferred option
- ✓ Note that should feedback warrant a change to the preferred option, this can be done via the District Plan Committee prior to consultation with the general public commencing.

#### **General Public**

- ✓ Following targeted landowner and stakeholder consultation residents, ratepayers and the wider public will be asked for their views on the range of options proposed as well as their view on the Council's preferred option
- ✓ Wider public consultation will focus on the large Zone Chapters (that is Residential, Rural and Business) as well as other issues of District interest and significance including Heritage Items and Notable Trees and Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features.

### 9.0 Engagement Tactics

A broad range of engagement tools in person, in print and online are being employed to fulfil the Engagement Implementation Plan objectives in 2018. These will be employed over the full year (with no public consultation during the Long-Term-Plan consultation period approximately April to June).

The tactics used in our consultation and engagement are outlined further in the Topic Engagement Plans for each workstream as well as the detailed actions and timings. A mix of traditional engagement

methods such as editorials and media releases will be used to promote the key messages and opportunities for engagement. In addition to this, a range of e-tools will also be utilised via the Engagement HQ online platform. This will allow us to offer a range of platforms for engagement and communications with the intention of reaching a broader cross-section of our communities. These tools, along with the DPR website, will provide platforms to communicate updates and information as well as offer specific tools to support topics where wider consultation with the general public will occur.

A summary of the key tactics intended for use when engaging stakeholders, landowners and the general public is outlined below:

#### 9.1 Key Stakeholder Engagement

The majority of stakeholder engagement will be managed directly as a relationship between the DPR Project Lead or Topic Lead and the stakeholder's nominated contact person. For many topics, these stakeholders are required to be involved in the Review process at a number of stages such as baseline and the development of issues and options, and for many they will have interest and/or be involved in a number of topics or issues. It is recommended that where one stakeholder has an interest or involvement in more than one topic, one primary contact within the Team is assigned to manager this relationship, therefore becoming the primary Stakeholder Relationship Manager.

Some stakeholders will also provide a supporting role to the DPR Team in a technical advisory capacity (eg NZTA) while others may assist with engaging with a wider landowner group (eg Federated Farmers). It is important that these relationships are open, transparent and meaningful throughout the Review process and this will be achieved through regular informal and formal communications such as emails, letters and face-to-face meetings. Other forums may also be appropriate such as workshops with groups of stakeholders or establishing working groups such as the Biodiversity Working Group to provide regular and ongoing advice and input.

Any formal communications being distributed to a large group of stakeholders will be prepared in conjunction with the SDC Communications Team, who will also approves all content prior to external dissemination.

#### 9.2 Targeted Landowner Consultation

Targeted landowner consultation will be undertaken for those topics where there is a likely impact or effect on a group of specific landowners. This form of consultation will occur over a number of topics such as Coastal Hazards and Flooding, either prior to public consultation or, in many cases, in place of wider public consultation due to the limited impact these issues have on the wider public across the District.

In some cases the affected landowners will be a small group (such as Alpine Villages) but for other topics (eg Transpower protection corridors) it will involve larger pockets across the District. In some instances it may be possible that these relationships can be managed at a one-on-one level but it is more likely that these groups will have to be consulted, engaged and informed on a large scale such as via the use of formal letters, drop-in sessions and media activity. It is likely that some tools from the EngagementHQ platform will also be useful during this phase of consultation, particularly to disseminate newsletters, let people share stories and photos or join discussion forums on a particular issue.

Any formal communications being distributed to a large group of stakeholders will be prepared in conjunction with the SDC Communications Team, who will also approves all content prior to external dissemination.

#### 9.3 General Public Consultation

A multi-pronged approach will be required to reach all our target audiences and to gather a good range of feedback for those topics requiring wider public consultation. A breakdown of the types of tactics intended for use across these topics is outlined in the table below:

Table 1: Summary of Tactics for Public Consultation by Topic

	Traditional Engagement Methods				Engagement HQ Tools - via DPR Website											
Workstream	Formal Communication (email/letter)	Face to Face meeting	Editorials & Advertorials		Social Media &	Drop in Sessions	Presence at Community Events	Newsletter	Discussion Forum		Guest book	Q&A			Mapping	Brainstormer
Heritage Items and Protected Trees	1	<u> </u>	√	V	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>							<b>√</b>			
Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes	<b>√</b>		V	V	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>						<b>V</b>	V			
Residential <sup>1</sup>			√	$\sqrt{}$	<b>√</b>		$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$		$\sqrt{}$		$\sqrt{}$	<b>√</b>			
Rural <sup>2</sup>	√		V	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>		V	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>						<b>√</b>	
Business <sup>3</sup>	2/	ما		2/				2								

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Note that public consultation on the Residential topic will address issues relating to density, character and amenity, transport, subdivision, elderly persons housing, home based businesses, residential growth, vibration, lighting and glare, noise, signage and earthworks

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Note that public consultation on the Rural topic will address issues relating to character and amenity, intensive farming, quarrying, airfields, lighting and glare, vibration, transport, noise, signage and earthworks, heritage items and notable trees, outstanding natural features and landscapes

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Note that public consultation on the Business topic will address issues relating to earthworks, noise, signage, lighting and glare, transport, business growth, and vibration

#### 10.0 Resourcing

The implementation of this document along with each individual topic level Engagement Plan will require considerable resource and effort to ensure that priorities are managed, milestones and targets are met and that issues and risks are escalated, managed and mitigated.

This document, along with the topic level Engagement Plans and the high level Engagement Framework are intended to be living documents, requiring ongoing review and revision.

The scale and volume of work will be significant during 2018 to ensure that SDC not only effectively meets any legislative obligations to engage, consult and inform, but to also effectively meet the a range of outcomes sought by the Review including the reduction in submissions once the Plan is notified as well as reaching as many people as possible in our approaches.

While one-on-one stakeholder engagement will be predominately led by the Topic Leads with, in many cases, support from external consultants, there is significant work in developing the content and implementing engagement activities which will be resourced internally. Other work and tasks to be led by SDC Communications with support and input from the DPR Project Lead, Project Manager and Project Team include:

- Approving content for release (and endorsement at DPC prior to dissemination);
- Further development and maintenance of the DPR Website;
- Development of specific engagement pages and tools using the EngagementHQ platform;
- Dealing with enquires from the media;
- Providing advice and support to the DPR Project Team and Topic Leads;
- Supporting the DPR Project Team to identify, manage and mitigate engagement risks as well as advancement planning of likely contentious issues;
- Attending drop-in sessions, community events and public consultation activities when required;
- Working with the DPR Project Team and Topic Leads to ensure that the Engagement Framework, Implementation Plan and Topic Plans are accurate and updated

# 11. Role of DPC in Communications and Engagement

As the governance group of the District Plan Review, DPC will be required to endorse all content prepared for targeted landowner and public consultation prior to its dissemination. As per the DPR Programme Plan, this content will be prepared and presented to DPC along with the Issues and Options and Preferred Options papers for approval. This will ensure that DPC is well informed and in advance of information going into the public arena.

### 12.0 Engagement Action Plan and Timeline

The tactics outlined above will be used to implement each of the Topic Plans and across the following timings. It is intended that these Plans will remain living documents and will be adapted to meet the needs of the Project and ultimately the stakeholders, landowners and members of the community which we will be engaging and consulting with. Note that shaded months indicate consultation timing of SDC's Long Term Plan.

Table 2: Engagement Action Plan by Month, Type and Topic

Month	Phase of Engagement	Type of Engagement	Topic
November 2017	Development of Preferred Options	<ul> <li>Stakeholder</li> <li>Environment         Canterbury (if         applicable)</li> <li>Mahaanui Kurataiao         Ltd / Runanga (if         applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul><li>Emergency Services</li><li>Lighting and Glare</li><li>Vibration</li><li>Kainga Nohoanga Zone</li></ul>
December 2017		No Engagement	
January 2018	Development of Preferred Options	Stakeholder Environment Canterbury (if applicable) Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd / Runanga (if applicable)	<ul> <li>Energy and Infrastructure</li> <li>Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Land</li> <li>Quarrying</li> <li>Airfields</li> <li>Heritage Items and Protected Trees</li> <li>Outstanding Natural Landscapes</li> <li>Kainga Nohoanga Zone</li> </ul>
February 2018	Development of Preferred Options	Stakeholder     Environment     Canterbury (if     applicable)     Mahaanui Kurataiao     Ltd / Runanga (if     applicable)	<ul> <li>Energy and Infrastructure</li> <li>Geotech/Liquefaction</li> <li>Coastal Hazards and Flooding</li> <li>Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Land</li> <li>Earthworks</li> <li>Noise</li> <li>Signage</li> <li>Rural Character and Amenity and Family Flats</li> <li>Intensive Farming</li> <li>Quarrying</li> <li>Airfields</li> <li>NPS – Urban Development Capacity</li> <li>Transport</li> <li>Subdivision</li> </ul>

	Public Consultation	General Public	Heritage Items and Notable Trees
	Baseline	Stakeholders	EDA's, Tourism,     Alpine Villages and     DMPA's
March 2018	Development of Preferred Options	<ul> <li>Stakeholder</li> <li>Environment         <ul> <li>Canterbury (if applicable)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mahaanui Kurataiao         <ul> <li>Ltd / Runanga (if applicable)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Transport</li> <li>Subdivision</li> <li>Earthworks</li> <li>Noise</li> <li>Signage</li> <li>Rural Character and Amenity and Family Flats</li> <li>NPS – Urban Development Capacity</li> </ul>
	Consultation on Preferred Option	<ul><li>Stakeholder and/or</li><li>Targeted Landowner</li></ul>	Kainga Nohoanga Zone
April 2018	Baseline	Stakeholders	EDA's, Tourism,     Alpine Villages and     DMPA's
	Development of Preferred Options	Stakeholder     Environment     Canterbury (if     applicable)     Mahaanui Kurataiao     Ltd / Runanga (if     applicable)	<ul> <li>Wildfire</li> <li>Relocated Buildings</li> <li>Waste</li> <li>Temporary Activities</li> <li>Council Assets and Community and Recreation</li> <li>Business</li> <li>Residential Density, Character and Amenity, Elderly Persons Housing, Home Based Business</li> <li>District Wide Growth</li> <li>Versatile Soils</li> </ul>
	Consultation on Preferred Option	<ul><li>Stakeholder and/or</li><li>Targeted Landowner</li></ul>	Kainga Nohoanga Zone

May 2018	Development of Preferred Options	Stakeholder     Environment     Canterbury (if     applicable)     Mahaanui Kurataiao     Ltd / Runanga (if     applicable)	<ul> <li>Wild Fire</li> <li>Relocated Buildings</li> <li>Waste</li> <li>Temporary Activities</li> <li>Council Assets and Community and Recreation</li> <li>Business</li> <li>Stock Droving</li> <li>Research Facilities</li> <li>Scheduled Sites</li> <li>Vegetation and Ecosystems</li> <li>Residential Density, Character and Amenity, Elderly Persons Housing, Home Based Business</li> <li>District Wide Growth</li> <li>Versatile Soils</li> </ul>
	Consultation on Preferred Option	Stakeholder and/or     Targeted Landowner	<ul> <li>Energy and Infrastructure</li> <li>Intensive Farming</li> <li>Quarrying</li> <li>Airfields</li> <li>Outstanding Natural Landscapes</li> <li>NPS- Urban Development Capacity</li> </ul>
June 2018	Development of Preferred Options	Stakeholder     Environment     Canterbury (if     applicable)     Mahaanui Kurataiao     Ltd / Runanga (if     applicable)	<ul> <li>EDA's, Tourism,         Alpine Villages and         DPMA's</li> <li>Stock Droving</li> <li>Research Facilities</li> <li>Scheduled Sites</li> <li>Vegetation and         Ecosystems</li> <li>Coastal         Environments,         Access to Water and         Water</li> <li>Residential Density,         Character and         Amenity, Elderly         Persons Housing,         Home Based         Business</li> <li>Living 3 &amp; Deferred         Living</li> </ul>
	Consultation on Preferred Option	<ul><li>Stakeholder and/or</li><li>Targeted Landowner</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Geotech/Liquefaction</li> <li>Transport</li> <li>Subdivision</li> <li>Intensive Farming</li> <li>Quarrying</li> <li>Airfields</li> </ul>

	Development of Preferred Options	Stakeholder     Environment     Canterbury (if     applicable)     Mahaanui Kurataiao     Ltd / Runanga (if     applicable)	<ul> <li>Heritage Items and Notable Trees</li> <li>Sites and Areas of Cultural Significance</li> <li>Outstanding Natural Landscapes</li> <li>NPS – Urban Development Capacity</li> <li>Coastal Hazards and Flooding</li> <li>Keeping/Boarding of Animals</li> <li>Plantation Forestry, Tree Shading &amp; Wilding Trees</li> <li>Vegetation and Ecosystems</li> <li>Living 3 &amp; Deferred</li> </ul>
	Consultation on Preferred Option	<ul><li>Stakeholder and/or</li><li>Targeted Landowner</li></ul>	Living  Transport Subdivision Sites and Areas of Cultural Significance NPS- Urban Development Capacity
July 2018	Public Consultation	General Public	Rural Zone including:      Earthworks     Noise     Transport     Vibration     Lighting and Glare     Signage     Rural Character and Amenity     Family Flats     Intensive Farming     Quarrying     Airfields     Heritage Items and Notable Trees     Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes
August 2018	Development of Preferred Options	<ul> <li>Stakeholder</li> <li>Environment         <ul> <li>Canterbury (if applicable)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mahaanui Kurataiao         <ul> <li>Ltd / Runanga (if applicable)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Coastal Hazards and Flooding</li> <li>Vegetation and Ecosystems</li> </ul>
	Consultation on Preferred Option	<ul><li>Stakeholder and/or</li><li>Targeted Landowner</li></ul>	<ul><li>Wild Fire</li><li>Transport</li><li>Subdivision</li><li>Stock Droving</li></ul>

# District Plan Review Community Engagement Implementation Plan

			<ul> <li>Research Facilities</li> <li>Scheduled Sites</li> <li>District Wide Urban Growth</li> <li>Versatile Soils</li> </ul>
	Public Consultation	General Public	Residential Zone Continued Residential Zone including:
			<ul> <li>Transport</li> <li>Subdivision</li> <li>Earthworks</li> <li>Noise</li> <li>Signage</li> <li>Residential Density, Character and Amenity,</li> <li>Elderly Persons Housing,</li> <li>Home Based Business</li> <li>Residential growth</li> <li>Lighting and glare</li> <li>Vibration</li> <li>Business zone including:</li> <li>Earthworks,</li> <li>Noise, Signage,</li> <li>Lighting and glare,</li> <li>Transport,</li> <li>Business growth, and</li> </ul>
	Development of Preferred Options	Stakeholder     Environment     Canterbury (if     applicable)     Mahaanui Kurataiao     Ltd / Runanga (if     applicable)	Vibration     Vegetation and Ecosystems
September 2018	Consultation on Preferred Option	Stakeholder and/or     Targeted Landowner	<ul> <li>Wild Fire</li> <li>EDA's, Tourism, Alpine Villages, DPMA's</li> <li>Stock Droving</li> <li>Research Facilities</li> <li>Scheduled Sites</li> <li>Coastal Environments, Water and Access to Water</li> <li>District Wide Growth</li> <li>Versatile Soils</li> </ul>
	Public Consultation	General Public	<ul><li>Residential continued</li><li>Business continued</li></ul>

# District Plan Review Community Engagement Implementation Plan

October 2018	Consultation on Preferred Option	•	Stakeholder and/or Targeted Landowner	•	EDA's, Tourism, Alpine Villages, DPMA's Coastal Environments, Water and Access to Water
November 2018	Consultation on Preferred Option	•	Stakeholder and/or Targeted Landowner	•	Coastal Hazards and Flooding
December 2018	Consultation on Preferred Option	•	Stakeholder and/or Targeted Landowner	•	Coastal Hazards and Flooding



# Appendix 1 – Engagement Type by Topic

			Pre-DPC Approval o	of Preferred Option	n	Post-DPC App	proval of Preferre	ed Option
					Timings In Parallel			
Workstream	Baseline Consultation	Internal Consultation	Ecan Consultation and Approval	Stakeholder Consultation	Mahaanui/Runanga Consultation and approval	Stakeholder Consultation	Landowner Consultation	Public Consultation
Energy and Infrastructure								
Geotech/Liquefaction								
Coastal Hazards and Flooding (no further modelling)								
Coastal Hazards and Flooding (with further modelling work)								
Wild Fire								
Heritage Items and Protected Trees								
Sites and Areas of Cultural Significance								
Vegetation and Ecosystems								
Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes								
Coastal Environment and Access to Water								
Kainga Nohoanga Zone								
Residential Density, Character and Amenity Workstreams								
Elderly Person's Housing								
Family Flats								
Home Based Business								
Living 3								
Alpine Villages								
Deferred Living								
Residential and Business Growth								
Business								
Rural Character and Amenity (Links with Signage, Noise & Transport)								
Intensive Farming								
Quarrying (links with vibration, signage and transport)								
Airfields (links with Vibration, Signage and Transport)								
Plantation Forestry, Wilding Trees and Tree Shading								
Stock Droving								
Research Facilities								
Scheduled Sites								
Lighting and Glare								
Vibration								

## **District Plan Review Community Engagement Implementation Plan**

Emergency Services				
Transport (links with Rural, Residential, Vibration, Signage)				
Subdivision				
Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Land				
Noise				
Signage				
Earthworks				
EDA's, Tourism, Resort Zones and DPMAs				
Relocated Buildings				
Waste Disposal				
Scheduled Sites				
Council Assets and Buildings, Community and Recreation,				
Keeping/Boarding of Animals				
District Wide Urban Growth				
Versatile Soils				

## 9. Issues and Options Update for Flood and Coastal Hazard Risk Investigations

Author:	Michael Rachlin (Strategy & Policy Planner)
Contact:	Michael Rachlin (03) 347 2936

## **Purpose**

To seek the Committee's endorsement for the recommended scale, timing and cost of technical investigations relating to flood risk and coastal hazards necessary to support the District Plan Review, including mapping of hazard areas.

#### Recommendation

### "That the Committee:

#### Flood-risk:

- Approves the development of a district-wide rain on grid model that is to be run by DHI and requests that Environment Canterbury:
  - carries out a revised modelling of flooding from the Halswell/Huritini River as an update to report R12/68;
  - agrees a programme of flood investigation for the Upper Selwyn, Hawkins, Waianiwaniwa and Hororata Rivers;

as part of the programme of flood risk investigations and associated programme of variations/plan changes to incorporate flood mapping into the Proposed District Plan.

### Coastal hazards:

- Confirms that, as an interim measure, the coastal hazard lines contained in Appendix 5 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan.
- That the Proposed District Plan manages development seaward of these coastal hazard lines up to the boundary with the Coastal Marine Area instead of the Regional Coastal Environment Plan."

## **Attachments**

Report "Flood and Coastal Hazard Investigations and Mapping

## REPORT TO DISTRICT PLAN COMMITTEE

**DATE:** 6 December 2017

**ISSUES & OPTIONS:** Flood and Coastal Hazard Investigations and Mapping

**PREPARED BY:** Mike Rachlin – Strategy and Policy Planner

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Issue	Confirmation of the scale, timing and cost of technical investigations
	relating to flood risk and coastal hazards necessary to support the District Plan Review, including mapping of hazard areas.
Recommended Option	Flood-risk – Option:
	To approve a district-wide rain on grid model be developed and run by DHI and that Environment Canterbury be requested to:
	<ul> <li>carry out a revised modelling of flooding from the Halswell/Huritini River as an update to report R12/68</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>agree a programme of flood investigation for the Upper Selwyn, Hawkins, Waianiwaniwa and Hororata Rivers</li> </ul>
	as part of the programme of flood risk investigations and associated programme of plan changes/variations to incorporate flood mapping into the Proposed District Plan as agreed by DPC on 22 <sup>nd</sup> February 2017.
	Coastal hazards — Option:
	To continue with the option agreed by DPC on 22 <sup>nd</sup> February 2017 that, as an interim measure, the coastal hazard lines contained in Appendix 5 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan.
	That the Proposed District Plan manages development seaward of these coastal hazard lines up to the boundary with the Coastal Marine Area instead of the Regional Coastal Environment Plan.
DPC Decision	



## 1.0 Introduction to Issue

1.1 As part of the District Plan Review, Council needs to undertake investigations to understand flood and coastal hazards, and to manage those risks to people and property. This is to give effect to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS), and is also a matter of national importance under s6(h) to the RMA. This was the subject of an Issues and Options report considered by DPC at its meeting on the 22<sup>nd</sup> February (Report to DPC 22 Feb 2017). At that meeting DPC agreed to the following:

'That in relation to the scale, timing and cost of the technical investigations relating to flood risk and coastal hazards the Committee Adopts:

Flood-risk – option 2:

- Environment Canterbury to update the Lower Plains and Te Waihora/Lake Ellesmere flood maps.
- A programme of flood risk investigations for other at-risk areas, as guided by Environment Canterbury, plus an associated programme of plan changes to incorporate flood mapping into district plan.

#### Coastal hazards – Option 6:

- Incorporate coastal hazard lines contained in Appendix 5 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement into the district plan.
- The district plan to manage development seaward of these coastal hazard lines instead of the Regional Coastal Environmental Plan.
- 1.2 A key factor in recommending the above options was the anticipation that guidance was due to be published by the Department of Conservation (DoC) on implementing Policy 24 to the NZCPS, including guidance on the scale and methodologies for investigation of coastal hazards and processes. It was also anticipated the Ministry for the Environment's guidance on climate change would also soon be published.
- 1.3 The 22<sup>nd</sup> February report to DPC noted that if Council wished to proceed in advance of the DoC and MfE guidance:
  - "In the absence of guidance from the Department of Conservation on the implementation of Policy 24 to the NZCPS, a methodology for such a study would need to be independently developed. The recent experience in Christchurch highlights the lack of clear direction for Councils trying to implement the requirements of the NZCPS. This option involves greater costs and time implications than Option 6 as well as carrying with it a reputational risk for the Council if the methodology is challenged."
- 1.4 The DoC guidance on the NZCPS and the MfE guidance on climate change have still to be published and it continues to be unclear as to when they will be (Councillors may be aware that a draft of the MfE guidance was leaked during the national elections). They were both originally due in late 2016.



In the meantime Council has received the draft flood investigation report from Environment Canterbury providing updates to the Lower Plains and Te Waihora/Lake Ellesmere flood maps plus recommendations for further flood investigations. The project team has also discussed with DHI the likely cost and timing of a district-wide rain on grid flood model, something which the Environment Canterbury report recommends be undertaken to improve the understanding of flood risk in the district. DHI are water environment specialists who have developed flood modelling software and undertake flood modelling exercises. They have assisted the Council's Asset team and also undertook modelling work for Christchurch City Council as part of the review of their district plan.

#### 1.5 The purpose of this report is to:

- seek DPC approval to commission DHI to develop and run their rain on grid model (based on the model they developed for Council's Assets team, modelling storm water) as a key tool to implementing the approved flood risk investigation programme; and
- re-affirm the option of incorporating the coastal hazard lines from Appendix 5 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement into the Proposed District Plan as an interim measure until further guidance is available from DoC.

## 2.0 Rain on grid flood modelling

- 2.1 DHI developed a rain on grid flood model for the Council's Assets team to help model stormwater for 1 in 10 year and 1 in 50 year rainfall events; to aid in the management of the Council's stormwater system. It was primarily restricted to mapping stormwater flows through the settlements rather than a wider understanding of surface water flooding. This modelling work has now been completed. As the name suggests the model is based on modelling an assumed rate of rainfall against a series of grids across the target area. A number of assumptions/parameters therefore need to be included in such a model including the physical boundaries of the target area. For example, do the grids and water flow patterns stop at the administrative boundaries of the district and if not how far should they extend? The other boundary is the sea and so assumptions are needed in relation to sea level, and rainfall duration (for example over a 24 hour period or over a 48 hour period?). Other factors such as infiltration rates and ground conditions also need to be accounted for in such modelling work; for example the existence of culverts and soil drainage rates which will influence water flow pathways.
- 2.2 The model developed for the stormwater project can be modified and run to test against the 1 in 200 year and 1 in 500 year rainfall events as required by the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement for the purposes of managing natural hazard risk in the district. Some initial testing was carried out for these scenarios and the results sent to Environment Canterbury for review. This review determined that the model needed further refinement to ensure an appropriate level of robustness. Environment Canterbury flood hazard analysts have also provided guidance on assumptions and scenarios that should be included when the model is run.



- 2.3 The cost to develop and run the model would be in the order of \$46,500. This includes providing for additional runs of the model to test differing scenarios and to undertake sensitivity analysis. These are needed to ensure the robustness of the results. Running the model across the district would take appropriately a month to complete. Maps down to property level can be developed from these runs, identifying areas at risk of inundation in the 1 in 200 year event, and high hazard areas (i.e. where flood water depths exceed 1m in a 1 in 500 year event).
- 2.4 The completion of the modelling within a month is considerably faster than was anticipated at the time of the original issues and options report back in February. However a large amount of data (GIS shapefiles and rasters) and associated mapping work would be generated. This mapping will need to be tested for accuracy and possibly 'ground truthed', as well as investigating to identify and assess the impacts on properties and settlements. There is also the issue of the timing, scale and form of any public engagement that should wrap around this project given the likely high community interest in relation to the results and mapping from this modelling work.
- 2.5 The DPC has already agreed that the flood modelling for the wider district would sit outside of the district plan review and that any changes required to incorporate the flood hazard maps would be by way of a programme of plan changes. It is still considered appropriate that this continue to be the preferred option given the potential scale of the flood mapping and testing requirements, and the need to consider and develop a community engagement programme as part of this project. In the interim the findings of the Environment Canterbury flood investigation report for the lower plains area of the district would be used to inform other aspects of the Proposed District Plan as well as other activities of Council.

## 3.0 Coastal Hazard Risks

- 3.1 At its meeting on the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2017, DPC agreed **not to pursue** the following option:
  - "To identify and map coastal hazard areas by:
  - Commissioning a specific study and modelling of coastal processes based on the requirements of Policy 24 to the NZCPS.
  - That the use, development and subdivision of land in coastal hazard areas are managed by the district plan, replacing the provisions of the RCEP, as directed by the RPS."
- 3.2 A key reason for this was the expectation of publication of DoC and MfE guidance being available later in the year, which would help direct the Council at that time to develop a coastal processes study/model for what is a highly technical topic area, and which has proved problematic at other councils. An interim position of using the coastal hazard lines in Appendix 5 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement was recommended. The limitations and risks associated with this option were identified in the original issues and options report. Notwithstanding these, this option was still considered appropriate since it enabled the Council to wait until the guidance was available.



- implementing Policy 24 to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement still has not yet been published. Nor have any dates been provided as to when they might be. Equally no indication has been given of any intention for this guidance not to be issued, which leaves the Council in limbo on this matter. Consequently the project team has sought further guidance from Environment Canterbury on the likely cost of commissioning a coastal hazards study. It has also sought guidance from DoC on what they think should be within the coastal hazard study and what should be the physical extent of such a study. For example should it include Te Waihora and/or the Rakaia River (outwash from the river feeds Kaitorete Spit) which influence or are influenced by coastal processes as well as freshwater processes. Guidance was also sought from DoC regarding what climate change scenarios should be included in the model. These comments will be reported orally to the Committee when they are received.
- 3.4 Staff at Environment Canterbury have suggested a ball park figure of \$70,000 for the commissioning and carrying out of a coastal hazards investigation and model. They consider this is likely to be conservative, but the project team consider it is useful to assume a cost of this order given the uncertainties involved in determining what might need to be included within the model, plus to make allowances for peer review processes. Thus if it is considered that Te Waihora and the processes associated with the Rakaia River need to be included, then the scale and extent of the investigation and modelling required would be increased given the need to then investigate the freshwater processes that influence them. Environment Canterbury have, however, identified published work that has already been undertaken on some coastal processes affecting Selwyn's coast line and Te Waihora, which could be updated at minimal cost, and which would represent key pieces of an overall study. These would help manage the costs of the study.
- 3.5 Undertaking this investigation/modelling without published guidance from DoC and MfE carries with it the risks identified in the original issues and options paper, plus ballpark costs of \$70,000 to Council. Equally the adopted option of using the RPS Appendix 5 coastal hazard lines also involves risk, not least the fact that both Environment Canterbury and DoC do not consider that they give effect to the RPS or NZCPS. This opens up the ability for challenge to the provisions of the Proposed District Plan by way of submissions and/or appeals during the DPR process.
- 3.6 The project team would nonetheless still recommend the adopted option, but on the basis that Council will undertake the necessary coastal hazard investigations and any associated plan changes when the DoC and MfE guidance is available. It is also recommended that at that time, a team made up of key stakeholders, being Council, Taumutu Runanga, Ngai Tahu, DoC and Environment Canterbury develop the scope for the coastal hazards investigation and oversee this work. The ability to undertake this study and subsequent variations/plan changes post the DPR will also need to be budgeted for by Council.

## Stakeholder Interests

3.7 **Environment Canterbury:** Comments received to date indicate that it is difficult to provide an Environment Canterbury position on the interpretation of NZCPS Policy 24 because like Selwyn District Council they are also waiting for the guidance documents to be released. In that respect



they are very supportive of the questions that the Project Team is posing to the Department of Conservation. In terms of the technical aspects of the model, Environment Canterbury are happy to provide as much advice and assistance as they can.

**Department of Conservation**: Comments still awaited.

## 4.0 Conclusion

- A rain on grid model has been identified for investigating surface water flood risk in the district at a cost and timing that is reasonable given the scale of the subject being investigated. This modelling and the appropriate incorporation of mapping into the Proposed District Plan is necessary to implement the RPS and S6(h) RMA requirements. It is also considered that the outputs from the model could be used to inform Council planning and responsibilities under the LGA, outside of the district plan review process. There is also a need to engage with Environment Canterbury to address the need to model flood risk from the rivers in the district, as identified in their draft flood investigation report for Selwyn. Both pieces of work are necessary to understand overall flood risk in the district and this needs to be an on-going process.
- 4.2 The scale of the work including mapping of at-risk areas, plus the need to develop and implement a community engagement process, places the timeline for this work outside of the current DPR schedule.
- 4.3 The adopted option for coastal hazards continues to provide a pragmatic response to the requirements of the higher order documents (RPS and NZCPS) and the associated uncertainties identified in the DPC report of the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2017

## 5.0 Recommendation to DPC

- 5.1 The Project Team recommends:
  - 1. That the DHI rain on grid surface water flood model be used to implement the adopted option agreed at DPC on the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2017.
  - 2. That Environment Canterbury be asked to undertake a review of the Halswell/Huritini River floodplain report reference R12/68 as recommended in their draft Flood hazard update report for Selwyn District Plan Review report.
  - 3. That Environment Canterbury be asked to include in their work programme flood investigations of the Upper Selwyn, Hawkins, Waianiwaniwa and Hororata Rivers as recommended in the draft Flood hazard update report for Selwyn District Plan Review report to implement the adopted option agreed at DPC on the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2017.
  - 4. That a community engagement process be developed for approval by DPC, associated with the district wide flood investigation programme set out in 1. to 3. above.



5. That option 6 (use of RPS Appendix 5 coastal hazard lines) for coastal hazards as agreed at DPC on the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2017 continue to be the adopted option. This is to be reviewed as and when DoC and MfE guidance has been issued on the implementation of Policy 24 to the NZCPS and climate change.



### 10. 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	
1	Environment Canterbury Flood Investigation Report			
2	Overview of Selwyn Growth Model	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)	

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&	Maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through:	Section
2	<ul> <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 2(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>	7(2)(f)

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