



**District Plan Committee meeting
held on Wednesday 22 February 2017 at 1.00pm
at Lincoln Event Centre,
15 Meijer Dr, Lincoln**

Present: Councillors M Alexander, J Bland, D Hasson, M Lemon, M Lyall, P McEvedy, J Morten, B Mugford, N Reid, G Miller, C Watson, Messrs P Skelton (ECAN) and D Ward (CEO SDC) and Professor H Matunga (Te Taumutu Runanga)

In attendance: Chairperson (Environmental Services Manager - T Harris), Project Lead District Plan Review (J Ashley), Project Manager District Plan Review (E Hodgkin), Policy and Strategy Planners (M Rachlin, E Larsen, C Nichol), Planning Manager (J Burgess), Asset Manager (M Washington) and note taker PA to Environmental Services Manager (K Hunt)

Standing Items:

1. Apologies

Apologies had been received from the Mayor for his absence.

2. Declaration of Interest

Nil.

3. Deputations by Appointment

Nil.

4. Confirmation of Minutes

Following comments from a committee member, the Chair noted that there will be a comprehensive presentation at the next committee meeting on the NPS for Urban Development Capacity in relation to the potential need for further zoning of greenfield land. It was commented that policy planners need to

ensure that they work closely with Assets around infrastructure requirements in relation to rezoning any greenfield land.

Moved – Councillor Mugford / Seconded – Councillor Lemon

‘That the Committee accepts the minutes of the 23 November 2016 as being true and correct’.

CARRIED

5. Outstanding Issues Register

Nil.

6 Issues and Options Report on Flood and Coastal Hazard Investigations

Professor Matunga joined the meeting at 1.05pm where he was welcomed to the Committee.

Mr Rachlin spoke to his report/presentation.

He advised that an update had been received from the Christchurch office of DOC since the production of the report/presentation on the coastal hazard investigation options.

There are five main options available in relation to fresh water flood investigation:

1. Rollover of mapping from the operative plan in to new plan, plus a wider programme of flood hazard investigations for the remainder of the District.
2. The second option is his recommendation, being the use of Environment Canterbury to update modelling on Lower Plains and Te Waihora flood areas, then sitting behind this will be wider programme of flood hazard investigations for the remainder of the District.
3. The third option is the ‘gold plated option’, of seeking expert advice and getting a model developed for the Lower Plains. Again sitting behind this will be a wider programme of investigations. This option has cost implications and potential time delays.
4. The fourth option involves commissioning studies across district. This option has cost implications and potential time delays. Waimakariri District Council has done something similar to this option.
5. The final option is no mapping, and all applicants must undertake site specific investigations at the time of building consent. Cost is on the applicant. SDC would map flood hazard information in to its GIS, which can then be provided to others.

In response to a question from a committee member, Mr Rachlin advised that when modelling is done, SDC could provide the draft results to land-owners asking if there is anything that we need to be aware of either by way of past or future risks. Both Waimakariri and Hurunui District Councils have used this approach in their flood mapping processes.

For coastal hazards Mr Rachlin advised that since production of this report/presentation DOC has come back with some comments in relation to investigating coastal hazards. It is anticipated that MFE guidance on sea level rise and DOC guidance on coastal hazards will be available in March 2017, however need to be aware that these documents were expected prior to Christmas. DOC have recommended that SDC does not use the RPS coastal hazards lines and should instead commission a study and within that prioritise the work, being Te Waihora and its margin, Rakaia Huts and Muriwai/Coopers Lagoon.

Mr Rachlin summarised the options for investigating flood hazards as per his report.

Option one is that Council use the RPS coastal hazard lines, and manage development seaward of that line, but this would be an interim measure only.

Option two is that SDC commission modelling of coastal processes.

DOC and Ecan recommend SDC do not use the RPS coastal hazard lines, and that Council should be commissioning studies. Both organisations consider that the RPS lines do not give full affect to NZCPS. SDC staff have been trying to get clarity in relation to this matter given that the lines were only recently updated. Staff still recommend that until MFE and DOC guidance has been received, that Council use the RPS as an interim measure.

In conclusion it was recommended that Council use the Environment Canterbury flood investigation option, as we can then use their expertise to guide us with prioritising future flood investigation. For coastal hazards the recommendation to utilise the RPS costal hazard lines as an interim measure remained the preferred option. When further advice comes in, Council could revisit this matter.

In response to a question as to how Maori cultural values are being assessed and incorporated in identifying options, Mr Rachlin stated that this would best be assessed/incorporated as part of the modelling work. In particular for coastal hazards this could be an integrated approach and joint project between ECan, Council and local runanga. The NZCPS promoted an integrated approach and the guidance when received hopefully would reflect this. It was also agreed that this approach should be clearly stated as part of this on-going workstream.

Moved – Councillor -McEvedy / Seconded – Councillor Miller

'That the Committee receives the Issues and Options report and notes the presentation.

'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.*

CARRIED

7. District Plan Review Work Programme Update

Ms Ashley and Ms Hodgkin spoke to their presentation.

The Project Team has developed a project planning process, which gives a clear pathway through issues to drafting rules. A lot of work going on in the background in relation to each topic.

Ms Hodgkin gave an update on the Request for Proposals (RFP) that had been released for prior to Christmas to establish the DPR Advisory Services Supplier Panel. Overall, One hundred and two (102) proposals received across a range of disciplines required. Twenty two (22) suppliers have been admitted to the Supplier Panel and contracts will be sent out next week for signing.

Any potential conflict of interest will be managed closely, and noted the use of a conflict of interest register in both the initial RFP phase and future Request for Service processes to allocate work to Panel members.

At this stage, suppliers have quoted on an hourly rate, not fixed rate. When it comes to allocation of work, work will be commissioned to Panel members in accordance with the DPR procurement plan. Any spend under \$20,000 can be by direct appointment from the Planning Manager, however anything above that needs to be offered to all suppliers that are on the Panel for that particular discipline or be signed by the Environmental Services Manager as a special exemption. If for those that look to go over cap, there will need to be a separate discussion and subsequent

approval by the Environmental Services Manager. Scopes of work are currently being prepared and a schedule for their release developed.

Runanga engagement is being progressed in conjunction with Mahaanui with regular team meetings occurring to discuss setting up of work streams for different projects/topics. Mahaanui have provided staff with a draft priority list of topics as they see it. Integrating values has been prioritised, and that is their first project. Invitation has been sent to Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to appoint a representative to the District Plan Committee.

A discussion followed on keeping Selwyn Waihora Zone Committee up to date, as they may have particular aspects of the DPR that they wish to comment on. Councillor Lemon stands on that committee, so there is potential to use him to keep them apprised of developments.

Moved – Councillor Alexander / Seconded – Councillor Lemon

‘That the Committee notes presentation.’

CARRIED

8. District Plan Committee Forward Meeting Schedule

Ms Ashley spoke to her report.

Moved – Councillor Mugford / Seconded – David Ward

‘That the Committee receives the report.’

CARRIED

Meeting ended at 1.56 pm