



**District Plan Committee meeting
held on Wednesday 24 May 2017 at 9.00am
at Selwyn District Council Offices,
2 Norman Kirk Drive, Rolleston**

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

In attendance: Chairperson (Environmental Services Manager - T Harris), M England (Asset Manager Water Services), J Burgess (Planning Manager), E Larsen (Strategy and Policy Planner), V Klimmer (Intern Strategy and Policy), C Nichol (Strategy and Policy Planner), J Lewes (Strategy and Policy Planner), E Hodgkin (Project Manager, District Plan), C Friedel (Strategy and Policy Planner), J Ashley (District Plan Project Lead), B Rhodes (Team Leader - Strategy and Policy), M Washington (Asset Manager), G Wolfer (Urban Designer/Planner), E Sim (Communications Advisor – Engagement) and Ms Hunt (note taker).

Standing Items:

1. Apologies

Apologies had been received from Messrs P Skelton, H Matunga and Councillor McEvedy for their absence and Councillor Hasson for lateness.

2. Declaration of Interest

Nil.

3. Deputations by Appointment

Nil.

4. Confirmation of Minutes

Moved – Councillor Watson / Seconded – Councillor Miller

‘That the Committee accepts the minutes of the 22 March 2017 as being true and correct’.

CARRIED

5. Outstanding Issues Register

Councillor Alexander questioned whether the NPS UDC should be noted on the Outstanding Issues Register? The Chair commented that he understood that outstanding issue risk register should be something that would require some action, whereas the NPS UDC this something to be aware of.

District Plan Project Lead responded that there is a risk register which is quite detailed, and which the NPS UDC is noted. They are currently condensing risk register and will bring it to the Committee.

6 Rezoning options for new ‘greenfield’ residential areas in the Malvern and Ellesmere Wards

Mr Rhodes spoke to his report/presentation.

Requested direction from the Committee on whether Council should proactively rezone greenfield sites in the Ellesmere and Malvern Wards or leave consideration of rezoning to the DPR submission phase. Noted this is in relation to expansion of towns, not intensification of existing zones.

- Option 1 being incorporation of rezoning proposal as part of the notified District Plan.
- Option 2 being request for rezoning proposal through a submission on notified District Plan.

Councillor Hasson in at 9.07am.

Noted that Area Plans had identified constraints to development and had capacity of existing zoned land for development reviewed. The Area Plans looked at zoned land and compared against growth projections to see if there was any shortfall, and every town was considered to have sufficient capacity out to 2031. The capacity analysis was revisited with regard to the updated projections for four towns have been identified as having short fall being Rakaia Huts, Lake Coleridge, Castle Hill and Dunsdanel.

Councillor Lyall in at 9.09am.

Area Plans had identified preferred areas for growth. The key question is should Council being zoning these through District Plan Review.

Scope of works has gone out to develop a new growth model, which will include more detailed analysis. Spoke to change of demographics and whether towns are providing appropriately for their communities.

The Team Leader Policy and Strategy spoke to Section 32 requirements of the RMA and the need to look at benefits and costs of effects, and assessing risk of acting or not acting. Costs of zoning has been approximated at \$100,000-\$120,000 per site but noted that efficiencies can be built in to that. Following a request for clarification from Councillor Miller, it was noted the cost of \$100,000 to \$120,000 is per land parcel.

Option 1 (active zoning through the Proposed District Plan PDP) would mean that Council would have to absorb those costs, but in Option 2 (not actively rezoning land but consider rezoning after hearing submissions to rezone land that are lodged in respect of the PDP) landowners/developers would have to absorb the costs.

Councillor Hasson questioned how we deal with land that gets rezoned, but rather than being developed is land banked? The Team Leader Strategy and Policy responded that there are difficulties. We could potentially try to assist or encourage with ODPs.

Noted a key question for Darfield and Kirwee is whether new zoning should occur ahead of a conversation with these communities around whether those towns should be reticulated. With Option 1 the cost of infrastructure falls on Council, which means this would need to be planned and financed for by Council, whereas with Option 2 landholders/submitters address through submission process with the costs falling on to submitter/developer.

Councillor Miller questioned what the risk factor is of a Private Plan Change under option 2 and being turned down? The Team Leader Strategy and Policy responded that the landowner/developer would have to consider the costs up front which could be a significant barrier to rezoning, however in the past there have not been many that have applied for a Private Plan Change and have been declined. Any submission that comes in, then needs to be assessed against s32. The Chair commented that will depend on background work on whether the submission stands up against the Act. Majority of decision makers through the submission process will be commissioners not councillors. The District Plan Review Project Lead responded that a S32 evaluation will show whether the proposed development stacks up.

Significant difference from Option 1 and Option 2 are the costs and who is paying for them. Risk is either taken by Council or landowner/developer.

The Team Leader Strategy and Policy requested direction from Council as to whether Option 1 or Option 2 was preferred. Noted the potential budget and timeframe impacts with Option 1.

The Chair commented on the report and attached legal opinion on the proposed options.

Councillor Alexander noted his support for Option 2, as the responsibility lies with developers rather than council. However felt Option 2 could be problematic with the community being locked out from commenting on the Private Plan Change. If Option 2 was the preferred option, then suggested having the likes of a 'friend of submitter service' aimed at township committees to help them understand the District Plan Review and to assist with writing submissions, so they can further submit on proposed plan changes. The Chair responded that this could certainly be looked at. Spoke to further submission process, noting that it in terms of the communication process we need to ensure that we get that right. Questioned whether we could do just one section of the community if we ran a friend of submitter service'. The District Plan Review Project Lead agreed that this idea had merit. Noted that it is up to individuals to look through submissions as to what is relevant to them, it is not notified to effected parties like a Private Plan Change, however we can investigate advising interested parties or having 'friendly submitter service'.

Councillor Hasson commented on need to explain location of DP lots as these mean nothing to the general public. Prefers Option 2, but questioned council submission process through predetermined basis. The District Plan Review Project Lead responded that in terms of location, the sites can be provided through the EPlan which will be online. In relation to question on predetermined basis, there is the need for evidence to be provided to the panel. Councillor Hasson requested clarification as to who does the s32 analysis? The District Plan Review Project Lead responded that in relation to Option 1 Council does, in relation to Option 2 the developer/landowner does, and then Council Officers would peer review. It was noted these would be an additional cost moving forward.

The Mayor commented that this is more about leadership, with the community expecting Council to make decisions. It is about how a town expects to grow and community expectations and feedback we received. He disagrees we should leave to developers/landowners as to what they think a town should be. The Mayor commented about constraints on zoned land not being available for development or not being developed. There is the need for Council leadership in our Ellesmere and Malvern towns. He would like to see the costs being shared, so how can we can claim back some costs. The Mayor's preference is for Option 1.

Councillor Lyall noted his preference is for Option 2 due to costs, but could understand the Mayor's comments. Councillor Lyall responded to comments by Councillor Alexander in relation to township committees and expectations that they will speak with one voice.

Councillor Morten commented that he thought the Mayor had made good points, however felt it that combination of both Option 1 and Option 2 was his preferred option. The working party has the opportunity to feed into this process from work that was done with the Area Plans. Councillor Morten

questioned if those submitters in the Area Plan are going to have to resubmit? The Team Leader Strategy and Policy responded that the working party would have discussion around zoned land not being up taken and greenfield zones. If Council was not leading, such as with Option 1 then Area Plans submitters would need to resubmit. The Area Plans does not lead to land being rezoned, and that was made clear to submitters. If Option 1 was the preferred option, then staff would need clear direction from Council as to what areas they want developed. Councillor Morten comments on costs of not doing anything and need to take some leadership, Council should not get caught up on the costs which may in fact save us money in the long term.

The Chair commented that at this time the growth model has not been done for these areas, so this discussion may be premature. Suggested that there could be middle ground. The Growth Model work is due September, secondly we have appointed working parties for Area Plans so up to them to work alongside the community as to what they want. The Growth Model may give better direction for the way forward.

Councillor Reid stated she could see benefits to both options. Worried about costs, but does not want this to be developer led. With zoning and costs, can we do a looser zoning that we can put into District Plan that does not have to fit in to current zoning patterns. The Team Leader Strategy and Policy responded that probably talking about deferred zoning, Could possibly doing floating zoning, but there would be the need to an evaluation, however this may be an option that could be applied. Councillor Reid requested that this be investigated. Can we make reference to number of documents that we will be referring to? The Team Leader Strategy and Policy responded the strategic documents will be used by developers and council.

Councillor Miller requested some comments from the Asset Manager around the issue of infrastructure. The Asset Manager responded this is significant political decision about risk and whether aspirational or real. There is the potential to do both as we could do the real need through Option 1 and leave the rest for the community. Spoke to Council not wanting to be too far ahead of expectation. Councillor Miller spoke to his concern around Option 2 as this tends to reward larger scale developers, not the 10-15 lot developer which tends to be infill. Commented on development in Darfield, as post CPW growth could be reasonable. .

Councillor Alexander commented that growth that Rolleston has experienced is not envisaged anywhere else, so comfortable with Option 2 as risk for unrestrained growth is much less. Liked Councillor Miller's comments, so suggested a hybrid model of the two options. Councillor Morten responded that in relation to his comments around the development of Rolleston, he was making a point and was not expecting that type of growth elsewhere. There will be small little pockets of growth but need some control over where that happens and would like to see infill.

Councillor Lyaal commented that a hybrid model of both options makes sense. Commented that Rolleston was developer led. We need to enable growth and

lead with infrastructure. Need to have better handle on the NPS discussion and growth model as to what options we go with.

Councillor Lemmon commented on land that is zoned within Leeston, but not being developed. How can we progress this? Does either of these two options gives us an ability to get zoned land developed? Might be that a hybrid option is the best option. The Chair responded that there is no clear mechanism to forcing development, however working parties can assist facilitating development.

Discussion followed on zoned land that is not being developed, or no intention of developing currently and blocking other land to be developed which constrains growth. The Chair commented that there appeared to be favour for a Hybrid so staff will give some consideration to that.

In response to a comment by Councillor Watson the Team Leader Strategy and Policy responded that we need to take some leadership, will be looking at intensification and infill through DPR. Spoke to lack of development of zoned land, Council can only rezone but can look to facilitate in some other way. Spoke to Area Plans providing leadership and development.

Councillor Hasson spoke to zoning impact and rural residential and how these will be dealt within Area Plans, ODP's? The Team Leader Strategy and Policy responded that Malvern and Ellesmere is Living 2, which is similar to rural residential and this will, be considered through the s32 process and dealt with on a case by case basis through submissions. Whether council looks to promote will be dealt with over next couple of years.

Councillor Mugford commented that Council really needs a third option. Commented on Darfield having little pockets of land everywhere, which will be costly to develop so will not happen.

The Chair will look at constraints of what is zoned, what is not zoned, so that a discussion can be held on a potential strategy of facilitation of undeveloped zoned land, and zone land that might assist towns to develop.

Councillor Lemon would like costs of infrastructure as well would like these included.

Paper to lie on table till September until results of growth model.

7. District Plan Review Work Programme Update

Ms Ashley and Mrs Hodgkin spoke to the presentation.

Significant progress in relation to supplier panel. Released 27 scopes of work, with proposals for all but 3 scopes being received. Allocated about \$510,000 which will be spent in 4-6 months. Next scopes of work will be released

around June/July. A lot of work will be coming back in over the next 4-6 months.

New file storage/project management software, BARI, specifically designed for DPR project. IT looking to give external access to consultants.

The District Plan Review Project Lead spoke to the Risk Register and looking at how to present to committee in a more condensed format. Noted that the NPS-UDC is high on radar.

Work programme will start increasing over the next 6 months. Have been looking at forward agenda but will be dependent on when work is available.

At the June meeting will have a new standing agenda 'matters arising from delivery of scope'. In July hoping to have a presentation to the Committee by GHD.

CEO spoke to remuneration authority and fee structure around the commitment from these meetings.

Councillor Lyall questioned when there is going to a public release of information? The District Plan Review Project Lead responded that have identified key stakeholders but need to have everything lined up before going to the public.

Councillor Morten questioned whether it was likely that the committee would need to meet twice a month when we get busy? The District Plan Review Project Lead responded that there is a tight timeframe, but probably in next 6 months will be in better position to see if we require more than one meeting a month.

Moved – Councillor Morten / Seconded – Councillor Lyall

'That the Committee receives the presentation.'

CARRIED

Meeting ended at 10.20am