



**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.*