



**District Plan Committee meeting
held on Wednesday 26 July 2017 at 9.00am
at Selwyn District Council Offices,
2 Norman Kirk Drive, Rolleston**

Present: The Mayor, Councillors M Alexander, M Lemon, J Morten, B Mugford, P McEvedy, N Reid, C Watson and Mr P Skelton (ECAN)

In attendance: Chairperson (Environmental Services Manager - T Harris), J Burgess (Planning Manager), D Kidd (Community Relations Manager), E Larsen (Strategy and Policy Planner), 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), J Tuilaepa (Strategy and Policy Planner), A Mactier (Strategy and Policy Planner), J Ashley (District Plan Project Lead), M Washington (Asset Manager), S Hill (Business Relationship Manager), E Sim (Communications Advisor – Engagement), S Styles (Senior Planner - Boffa Miskell), 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 Mr D Ward and Councillor G Miller, Cr M Lyall, Cr J Bland, D Hasson and Professor Hirini Matunga for absence and the Mayor and Cr McEvedy for lateness.

Moved: Councillor Morten / Seconded: Councillor Mugford

'That these apologies be accepted.'

CARRIED

2. Declaration of Interest

Nil.

3. Deputations by Appointment

Nil.

4. Confirmation of Minutes

Moved – Councillor Watson / Seconded – Councillor Lemon

‘That the Committee accepts the minutes of the 28 June 2017 as being true and correct’.

CARRIED

5. Outstanding Issues Register

Nil.

6 Heritage Items and Protected Trees

Mr Mactier and Ms Styles spoke to their report and powerpoint presentation.

Discussion held on consenting process associated with recognising the settings around heritage items, and the values that influence the heritage item. Noted that parts of land around the item may be included as part of the heritage item.

In response to a question by Councillor Lemon on restrictions around alterations to structure, Ms Styles responded that there are already restrictions in place, and at times a consent process may be required.

Mr Mactier requested Councillors agree to option 2, which is the option to include settings for each heritage item.

Councillor Morten questioned why this was different from what had been done previously. Mr Mactier responded that this option is giving better effect to the Act, noting that the old plan is almost 20 years old and things have developed since that time. Ms Styles commented that this is a generational issue, with the RMA definition having changed during this time. Councillor Morten commented that as there is the need to look wider than just the building itself, it is also a change in culture. Ms Styles responded that they are not necessarily talking about the whole site, as the definition does not use the word ‘site’. Rather, it is a piece of land that contributes to the value of the heritage item.

Mr Skelton commented that it was not clear from the report what work has been done to check against Heritage NZ register to identify items in the District. Ms

Styles responded that this work is currently being undertaken and this does include the area around the item.

Councillor Alexander questioned if the inclusion of the area around items meant that there was potential to restrict a landowners options for the whole of their site? Ms Styles responded that there are a number of layers, and if these items are listed then there are already a set of rules as to what can happen with those items. The setting could be defined as the whole or part of the property. Noted that the main focus of the rules would be around managing new buildings going into a heritage setting as they have the most potential to impact on the heritage item.

Councillor Watson spoke to changes in zoning and the ability to subdivide, and questioned whether heritage status prevents the ability to subdivide? Mr Mactier commented that he did not believe so, but there may be controls around protecting the values of the heritage item and its setting. Any restrictions will not be a blanket approach, and likely to be variety of permitted activities through to discretionary.

In response to a question by Councillor Watson on comments in the report about little cost involved, Ms Styles commented that the actual definition of the heritage setting or assessment process would be little additional cost. Councillor Watson questioned whether there would be cost implications when the structure required maintenance and had non heritage items/additions. Ms Styles responded that the protection of heritage values would need to be considered on a case by case basis.

Councillor Mugford questioned what happens if people do not want an item listed on the register? Mr Mactier responded that these will go through an assessment process. If any additional items meet the criteria (as determined by a heritage expert), but there is resistance to it being identified as a heritage item, then this will need to be considered as part of fulfilling Council's function to protect historic heritage.

Moved: Councillor Mugford / Seconded: Councillor Alexander

'That the Committee:

- Receives the report.*
- Confirms that settings are identified and mapped for all heritage items.*
- Confirms that there be one schedule with all heritage items listed equally and one set of rules that apply to all items listed.'*

CARRIED

7. Indigenous Vegetation Stakeholder Engagement

Mr Mactier and Ms Styles spoke to their report and presentation.

Councillor Watson questioned if there was value in having all those listed participants involved in the Biodiversity Working Group? Mr Mactier responded that they are all key stakeholders.

Mr Skelton noted his support for the working group, and utilising ECan planning staff to assist with achieving outcomes of the RPS.

Councillor Alexander commented on inclusion of the likes of zone groups and Te Ara Kakariki.

Councillor Lemon commented on his nervousness about outstanding natural landscapes and that he was unsure if you get more consensus or less, with more people around the table.

The Mayor in at 9.36am.

Mr Mactier responded to Councillor Lemon's comments that he believes it is better to have them all included early on.

Councillor Reid noted her support for talking to these groups now, rather than later. Questioned whether this process would be likely to affect our timeframes? Mr Mactier responded that it should not affect the timeframes, but will be dependent on this Committee's later discussion. Believes we can be ahead of where we need to be in terms of notification.

Councillor Morten commented that he was in agreement with having an inclusive process. Spoke to timeframes and having a quality document at the end.

Councillor McEvedy in at 9.40am.

Moved – Councillor Alexander / Seconded – Councillor Watson

'That the Committee endorses the establishment of a Vegetation and Ecosystems Working Group to provide a platform for strong stakeholder engagement.'

CARRIED

8. Update on Plan Framework

Ms Tuilaepa spoke to her presentation.

Noted that there was a change in preferred option since paper was brought to Committee in 2016. At that time the zone based option was preferred, with topic based being high up in the scores. However, since that time MfE through the National Planning Standards are proposing a combination of both hence the change of approach. This will include a more topic-based approach to

assist people being able to find their way around the plan. It is proposed that it will include generic definitions and metrics. .

Councillor Alexander commented on the structure and not having the inclusion of a rural business zone. Ms Tuilaepa responded that staff will be providing feedback to MfE as there is no real provision for a rural business zone or a zone for large lot residential. Staff had attended sessions with MfE on the proposed standards and there was concern raised regarding the suitability of zones.

Councillor Lemon commented on recession planes and whether we have ability to make specific to us? Ms Tuilaepa stated that it is still being discussed as to whether these would be mandatory or not, but believes they will be able to be moulded to local context.

The Mayor spoke to making sure that the District Plan copes with unforeseen activities such as upgrades in technology, highlighting space launch. Ms Tuilaepa commented that there is an ability to have subzones and overlays, so if a generic zone description did not fit an overlay with slightly different rules could be applied.

The Chair commented that there is a risk if we try to look after all types of activities. There will be resource consents and plan changes that might allow those activities to establish. We cannot make the plan all things to all people and want to keep the document as user friendly as possible.

Mr Skelton spoke to Regional Council feedback to MfE that councils should not be required to retrofit existing plans and it would assist if Selwyn District Council support that proposition in the SDC submission to MfE.

Ms Tuilaepa responded that the Project Team is drafting feedback to MfE, which is due 31 July 2017. The EPlan provider (Isovist) is currently putting the new plan framework into electronic format so they can visualise what it will look like.

Councillor Watson would like access to Eplan provider documentation once it has been prepared.

Moved – Councillor Watson / Seconded – The Mayor

‘That the Committee notes the presentation.’

CARRIED

9. Update on Draft Strategic Communications and Engagement Strategy

Councillor Reid left the room 10.04am.

Mr Hill and Mr Sim spoke to their presentation, which is a follow up from Maurice Hoban's session at the last meeting.

Councillor Reid in 10.05am.

Noted this is the preparation work for the draft engagement framework. which is intended to be presented to this Committee at the August meeting.

Councillor Alexander commented on engagement at officer level and questioned how engagement with Maori is progressing. Ms Hodgkin commented that the Project Team are meeting with Maahanui and discussing engagement at Runanga and Iwi level, including the cross over and representation on other groups and agencies (e.g. Zone Implementation Committee). It is also the DPR Project Team's intention to present on the DPR at the next Te Waihora Co-Governance meeting with the support from Murray Washington as the Council's staff representative on this group.

Councillor Watson left the room 10.13am.

Councillor McEvedy commented on the list of engagement risks by council staff and councillors, noting the importance of 'protecting rural use'.

Councillor Watson in at 10.13am.

Councillor McEvedy commented on the farming community already being involved in other engagement/issues, so this should be listed as a high risk around engagement. Selwyn is a rural community, so it is important that rural views are noted and recognising that they have existing use rights. Mr Hill responded that it is a high risk but we are already somewhat engaged with that community. Implementation plans will be assessing and addressing risks. Councillor McEvedy commented on confusion in the community as to what plan changes apply to them.

Mr Hill commented that staff will be collating and analysing stakeholder feedback provided through previous consultation processes.

Councillor Morten questioned how accurate our information is on stakeholders who are impacted by changes? Due to the size of the District Plan document, people may not see that these could impact on them personally, or impact on their ability to make a living for those in the rural community. The Chair responded that they have employed, on a short term contract, a person to prepare a database to capture those views already expressed, then we can go back to them to ask them if their views are still the same.

Councillor Morten questioned whether thought had been given to sending out reminders to the community on topics of interest, such as those sent by emergency management. Mr Hill responded that there are a number of technology tools they can use to communicate, and these will be used. Staff will be proactive in identifying topics that might be of interest to specific groups/areas.

In response to a question by Councillor Watson around the number of submissions, Mr Hill responded that if we have good quality submissions we can be assured we have given the right information and talked to the right people. Councillor Alexander responded that they want quality submissions, but also want a high level of engagement, as this shows that we have engaged with the right people and they have understood what we are doing.

The Mayor questioned if one of the engagement actions should be that the process is easy and enjoyable. Mr Hill responded that Mr Sim will be working on this, taking the jargon out and making it enjoyable and readable for people.

Councillor Alexander commented on his concern with fatigue, which may lead to confusion around combining with other Council engagement processes. Mr Hill responded that the intention is not to combine engagement, but to have some interaction with engagement as to how plans interact. Want to avoid confusion.

Councillor Watson commented on engagement with businesses. Mr Hill responded that this will be picked up through the development of specific stakeholder engagement plans.

It was moved and seconded to amend the recommendation, with the amendment being carried.

Moved – Councillor Mugford / Seconded – Councillor Watson

‘That the Committee notes the presentation.’

‘That the Committee confirm and endorse the following principles contained in that presentation:

1. *Engagement with key stakeholders and collaborators*
2. *Engagement outcomes*
3. *Engagement principles, and*
4. *Structure and content of engagement plan.’*

CARRIED

Committee broke for refreshments at 10.35am and reconvened at 10.47am.

10. District Plan Review Timeframes

Mr Burgess spoke to his report.

Mr Burgess reported that the timeframes as agreed in the District Plan Review (DPR) project brief signed in 2015 are no longer achievable. Since then there has been a number of new planning process legislative requirements introduced

by Central Government. This includes National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity and the National Planning Standards.

Mr Burgess commented that the Policy team have gathered evidence which has determined a number of significantly complex planning processes for the DPR and has shown the DPR may create issues that may run into the next Council triennium. Mr Burgess requested a pause on the DPR so it does not become an Election issue.

Mr Burgess briefed Councillors with the proposed four options as per report. Mr Burgess noted that option one is deemed most appropriate to ensure best utilisation of budget and to ensure robust public participation and engagement with the community, as well as meeting National Planning Standards requirements.

Councillor Watson advised of his concerns about the risk of more adjustment / legislative change down the track. Mr Burgess responded it is a complicated process and we have to make decisions based on the known legislative framework.

The Mayor clarified whether it was necessary to delay the timeframe or to agree on a revised timeframe. The Chair spoke to the adjustment of the recommendation to suit the purpose of a revised timeframe. Councillor Alexander spoke in support of the revised timeframe.

The Chair suggested an amendment made to recommendation, with the amendment being carried.

Moved – Councillor Watson / Seconded – The Mayor

‘That the Committee confirms the proposed timeframes presented in the report including the timeframe associated with the notification of the proposed plan so as to encompass the new legislative requirements of the National Policy Statement Urban Development Capacity, the National Planning Standards, as well as consultation around the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

CARRIED

11. Work Programme Update and Forward Meeting Schedule

Ms Hodgkin spoke to her and Ms Ashley’s presentation noting key achievements around the first wave of procurement process and evidence gathering. Ms Hodgkin noted difficulties with procurement for rural packages. Ms Hodgkin spoke of the robust contract system put in place to manage procurement process and establishing process for regular reporting requirements. Current work programme involves development of electronic tools to map and generate reports, risk management and finalising budget.

Ms Hodgkin also noted work programme involves refining tasks and determining what work can be done internally and externally as well as balancing capacity with workloads.

Ms Ashley spoke to her presentation providing a technical update: noting external resourcing has been managed well in a timely and cost effective manner. Ms Ashley noted the work the Council are procuring is fit for purpose. Ms Ashley briefly discussed August DPR Committee agenda as per her presentation.

Moved – The Mayor / Seconded – Councillor Reid

‘That the Committee notes the presentation.’

CARRIED

Meeting ended at 11.12am.