



**District Plan Committee meeting
held on Wednesday 06 December 2017 at 9.00am
at Selwyn District Council,
Rolleston**

Present: The Mayor, Councillors M Alexander, D Hasson, M Lemon, M Lyall, J Morten, G Miller, B Mugford, J Bland, N Reid, C Watson, Mr D Ward (CEO SDC), Tania Wati (Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga), Hirini Matunga (Te Taumutu Rūnanga) and Councillor Peter Skelton (Environment Canterbury).

In attendance: Chairperson – T Harris (Environmental Services Manager), J Burgess (Planning Manager), M Rachlin (Strategy and Policy Planner), B Rhodes (Team Leader – Strategy and Policy), E Hodgkin (Project Manager, District Plan Review), R Love (Strategy and Policy Planner), 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), Rodney Yeoman (Market Economics), Hilary Riordan (Student Planner), Felicity Price (Communications Consultant), note taker T Van Der Velde (District Plan Administrator).

Standing Items:

1. Apologies

Apology received from Councillor Pat McEvedy

2. Declaration of Interest

Nil.

3. Deputations by Appointment

Nil.

4. Confirmation of Minutes

Moved – Councillor Mugford / Seconded – Councillor Alexander

‘That the Committee accepts the minutes of the 27 September 2017 as being true and correct’.

CARRIED

5. Outstanding Issues Register

Nil.

6. Chairman’s Report

Chair welcomed Tania Wati representative of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga to Committee.

‘Councillor Reid in at 9.04am’

Chair spoke to his Report. The District Plan Review has been underway for two years now with the establishment of the District Plan Committee, a Senior Advisory Panel and the Project Team, including a Supplier Panel made of 22 consultants.

Chair noted significant challenges over the last two years – one particular struggle has been the challenge of attracting and retaining Planning staff.

Chair noted it is a nationwide issue in terms of recruiting with a shortage of Planners. The Management team are in a constant mode of recruiting and retaining planners – has been a major issue and will be going forward.

In process now of bringing baseline assessments to table and developing preferred options to report to committee.

The Council in the last two years had struggled with maturity of internal processes and capacity around areas such as procurement and project management, however these are now in place and we are beginning to make progress.

Councillor Miller touched on problem with recruiting and retaining staff and questioned who is managing budgets and the oversight of spend?

Chair discussed reporting to the Committee on a monthly basis excluding this month. There will be an update on budget at next Committee meeting.

Ms Hodgkin spoke of the procurement process in place where Council is negotiating project price with Suppliers. As sits we have used under thirty percent of budget sitting slightly under forecasted 33% and we are monitoring every invoice that comes in which is being double checked by accounts and Project Manager.

Councillor Watson questioned with the challenge of recruiting staff -Where would you think we sit on meeting target for timeline?

Chair responded there is always a risk with losing staff. We are on target – not much we can do about it as nationwide issue in regards to recruitment. At the moment we have two vacancies yet we are on course.

Moved – Councillor Lyall / Seconded – Councillor Alexander

‘That the committee notes the report’

CARRIED

‘Chair gave overview of Runsheet to explain Public Excluded items returning to Public Meeting than back into Public Excluded’.

7. District Plan Review Programme Planning

Ms Hodgkin spoke to her Presentation noting RCP Consultants have assisted in preparation of the District Plan Review (DPR) Programme of work against different topics. The work has been broken down to different phases and stages, and grouping of work streams. The DPR Programme, associated tasks and timings goes hand in hand with the Community Engagement Implementation Plan.

Ms Hodgkin talked Committee through Proposed DPR Phases, DPR Topic Categories and Durations, noting Baseline assessments involve a lot of technical work. Topics have been categorised into small/simple, medium, large/complex and from that have worked out how many weeks each phase will take for each category, building worst case scenarios into timeline.

Ms Ashley spoke to her presentation noting since the start of the DPR process a lot of legislative amendments that have come into effect. Ms Ashley broke down the different phases for the Committee noting Baseline assessments have been fairly enormous tasks. Most Baselines have reached the positions where they have a recommendation and preferred option and once District Plan Committee (DPC) have endorsed this approach, we can move into engagement phase. We will be working on communications and engagement to try and streamline the work streams along the way. Ms Ashley noted timings are very critical.

Ms Ashley discussed steps of having Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd review and comment on all baseline assessments and provide guidance on what will need Nga Rūnanga review and endorsement. The project team are also working with Iovist to draft into the e-plan as we go so we are able to test before finalising. The Proposed District Plan will be brought to DPC for endorsement prior to Council elections, in June 2019.

Ms Hodgkin discussed Breakdown of engagement types including internal SDC, partners (Environment Canterbury and Mana Whenua via Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd), key stakeholders, targeted landowners and the general public.

Councillor Watson questioned why there is no full public engagement for certain topics such as the 'Keeping / Boarding of Animals' due to them being fairly emotive topics. Ms Hodgkin responded that a number of District Wide topics will be aligned with the consultation and engagement on the Zone chapter. For example, 'Family Flats' will be part of the rural consultation, in order to avoid going to rural land owners about five or six topics.

In response to a question from Councillor Alexander about leaving certain topics (Keeping / Boarding of Animals) out of the District Plan and a suggestion to have them as Bylaws as an alternative, Ms Ashley responded that DPC will have an opportunity to assess these options at the preferred option phase and identify whether it belongs in the District Plan.

A discussion was held around the National Planning Standards template with Mr Burgess confirming Jessica Tuilaepa in the DPR Project team is working closely with Ministry for the Environment (MfE) as part of the pilot programme providing and receiving feedback.

In response to a question from Councillor Skelton about talking to Regional Councils about progress Ms Ashley confirmed there is a contact person at Environment Canterbury (Ecan) and we have a good relationship with Ecan.

A discussion followed to clarify that Biodiversity was part of the Vegetation and Ecosystems Topic and 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 appraised of certain topics. There is potential to keep other committees informed as well such as West Melton.

Mr Matunga commented about adding another column in the Summary Programme that looks at issues for Mana Whenua to trigger Council of what might be relevant to Mana Whenua. Ms Ashley responded that all Baseline reports will be sent to Mahaanui as a gateway and in regards to internal work there is review of the Iwi Management Plan and Project Team is well versed in that space.

The Mayor commented about the number of times Council want to engage with public with suggestion if we are doing something at one location we should be covering all aspects rather than meeting with people regularly. Ms Hodgkin clarified that they have tried really hard to align timing so when they do have consultation it is for the whole zone for example the rural community and business community will find out at the same time. Part of that would be how communication is managed.

'Councillor Morten left the room 9.41am'

The Mayor asked Ms Hodgkin and Ms Ashley how confident they are that by next Christmas all public consultation would be completed. Ms Hodgkin answered we are

on course, it largely comes down to risks that the Chair mentioned in his report.

Ms Ashley Highlighted how the workload can be streamlined with 'Simple' work streams where no substantial change (can be rolled over) from Operative District Plan is being recommended is approved by the Senior Advisory Group but still provided to DPC for noting. Medium to Complex will be reviewed by Senior Advisory Group but approved by the Committee.

'Councillor Morten in 9.44am'

A discussion was held about the portion size of the plan to be rolled over and the importance for everyone involved in the process to have a full understanding of the plan with a balanced view. Ms Ashley indicated it has been 20 years since the plan was last drafted with a lot to be update so is difficult to put a percentage on portion to be rolled over. Ms Ashley reinforced that the Project Team will certainly report back to the committee and that any concerns can still be raised.

Ms Hodgkin conversed about the Summary Programme essentially mapping out worst case scenario and allowing time for Runanga to follow their approval process signifying to the committee that it is a balancing act.

Ms Ashley indicated that the date we are working towards for Council endorsement is June 2019 before Local Government Elections. Actual date for formal notification is February 2020 so there is a bit of wriggle room built in but trying to achieve that June 2019 date.

In response to a question from Councillor Hasson about rural character included in rural subdivision and how the DPR team are going to differentiate that in the Regional Policy Statement (RPS), Ms Ashley responded that all will be addressed in the Baseline report.

Ms Ashley spoke to her presentation and discussed the table looking at DPC programme with June 2018 looking really full. Appreciating that June is a busy month for Long Term Plan (LTP), the Project Team will therefore try and move ahead of time or make up some time in July 2018.

Councillor Alexander asked for clarification of what the Kāianga Nohoanga Zone work stream entailed. Mr Matunga explained that it is essentially the same as Papakāinga, however Papakāinga, is more of a Northern term and Kāianga Nohoanga is Ngāi Tahu term.

In response to a question regarding to the potential an overlap with proposed and operative plan Ms Ashley responded that when proposed plan is notified the provisions have effect but has little weight at first while it is subject to being challenged and then has more weight after final decisions on submissions have been released.

Moved – Councillor Lyall / Seconded – Councillor Alexander

‘That the Committee:

1. Notes the presentation;

2. Endorses the recommended ‘DPC Noting and Approvals’ procedures, being that:

- For “Simple” work streams and 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 noting;*
- 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.’*

CARRIED

8. Communication and Engagement Implementation Plan

Mr Hill acknowledged Felicity Price (Communications Consultant) for working with team to pull Community Engagement Implementation Plan together.

Mr Hill spoke to his presentation discussing document hierarchy. In September 2017 the Committee signed off high level Engagement Framework and now looking at Implementation plan stage, then will work through to topic engagement plans. One-on-one engagement continues with Key Partners and Key Stakeholders. Preparing for more detailed engagement with stakeholders and targeted landowners and the public.

During the 2018 Engagement period a window has been left open to allow the LTP to be focused on.

Mr Hill discussed a list of Primary Key Messages that will allow the Project team to be clear with the Community about timeframes, encourage people with their thinking and give opportunity for people to engage.

Mr Hill touched on Engagement Risks noting it is important to capture the right Key Stakeholders, not over consulting the community and making engagement timely to fit in with the LTP. Mr Hill also noted making it an engaging experience making sure people understand the relevance of the District Plan Review and the impact on their daily lives encouraging for awareness of issues and being ahead of the game as much as possible while mitigating risks.

Resourcing in-house staff and consultants to make sure resourced appropriately

Implementation Plan Outcomes includes Database up to date and try not to miss anyone out. Feedback is rich in its content and relevant and meaningful. A lot of resources into upskilling our teams to make the best use of the tools. Good recording, storage and systems that are being worked on now.

Next steps for Implementation plan mid to late January launching the DPR website. Engagement tools include: Social media, Engagement HQ, letters, e-mails, and website.

Communications for National Policy Statement - Urban Capacity is being led by the Greater Christchurch Partnership however will ensure alignment between this process and the DPR programme.

Councillor Alexander commented that a Key Stakeholder seemed to be missing in the form of developers who are currently at the frontline working with the District Plan seeing what works and does not work. Councillor Alexander indicated he would like to hear from the Key Developer Group who can inform the Committee of issues.

Mr Rhodes responded that a 'Housing Working Party' has been established which includes developers and housing parties, this has continued on and we are receiving feedback of the issues.

Councillor Alexander continued to comment that he would like to hear first-hand from developers and hold a forum. Chair responded that there is a risk if committee engages in one sector we run the risk of other sectors wanting to engage with them.

Councillor Hasson commented in regards to notable trees, she wanted to highlight the difficulties of baseline assessment being done in-house without visiting sites to make sure co-ordinates are correct (as mapping is not always correct).

Ms Hodgkin responded that there have been consultants and sub-contractors contracted to do this work. Ms Ashley added that we will be calling for nominations for Heritage Items and Notable Trees in February.

The Mayor commented the plan is comprehensive and messaging is key, but also expressed his concern over Rural and Residential timing noting people in the community care about all aspects rather than a particular part.

Ms Hodgkin responded a lot came down to a number of factors including timing, capacity, internal and external. In terms of messaging this will be consistent but agreed that this can be looked at further as logical case for aligning all public consultation processes.

In response to a question from The Mayor about community events and bundling community drop in sessions. Mr Hill responded that we will certainly look at those opportunities and people will self-engage.

Moved – Councillor Watson / Seconded – Councillor Lyall

‘That the Committee:

1. Notes the presentation;
2. Endorses the ‘Communication and Engagement Implementation Plan’ for the District Plan Review process.’

CARRIED

9. Resolution to Exclude the Public

Moved – Councillor Hasson / Seconded – Councillor Mugford

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

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:

10&12	<p>Maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(ii) The protection of such members, officers, employees and persons from improper pressure or harassment.</p>	Section 7(2)(f)
-------	---	-----------------

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

CARRIED

The meeting moved to Public Excluded at: 10.30am

The meeting adjourned for a 10 minute break at 10.33am

The meeting reconvened to Public Excluded at 10.43am

10. Environment Canterbury Flood Investigation Report

Mr Rachlin spoke to his report and presentation which provides a review and update on the flood risk areas identified on the operative planning maps.

Mr Rachlin informed Committee of Key Findings noting areas at risk of surface water floods is greater than initially mapped. Map in report is high level.

‘Councillor Watson in at 10.47am’

High Hazard Flood Area mapping is now available at property level showing high hazard areas associated with flooding from Halswell / Huritini River and the Selwyn / Waikirikiri River. Maps can be used to identify at risk properties and those areas where consent for new buildings have been granted. Can utilise these maps to zoom in at particular properties. The next steps would be to take this information and use it for the District Plan Review.

A Community Engagement Plan needs to be developed to decide how best to engage people located within the high hazard areas, including the use of tools such as direct letters, web browsers and meetings.

Mapping is sophisticated and very robust. Part of engagement will seek feedback on the accuracy of the mapping from those affected and inform them of what it means for them. Rationale is to raise people’s awareness.

Councillor Lemon commented on how the ground levels in the district changed since post-earthquake and whether we start using this information now for Resource Consents or Private Plan Changes. Mr Rachlin responded that it is only a draft at this stage and will pay to wait until it has been developed a bit more with feedback from community. Chair agreed and commented that there is a need to be careful in using this material in relation to Resource Consents while it is draft and forms part of the DPR process

There was discussion around holding this information and the potential risk of litigation to Council. Chair commented that Staff are risk aware and robust questions have been asked in regards to effects of flooding and this may act as a warning bell to ask fairly close questions.

Councillor Hasson questioned exacerbation of floor heights that currently sit in these particular high hazard areas and commented people who gain access to those properties have built up their driveways creating a dam effect. High risk of not gaining insurance after being flooded if landowners have exacerbated the risk of flooding.

Mr Rachlin advised in terms of floor height exacerbation, that while the report will not give us the answers, some of the mapping does look at things closer. Report is telling us what the level of risk is, where that is and in terms of where we go from here is for the next stage.

'Mr Ward left room 11.00am'

There was discussion around more intensification required post-earthquake and engaging with neighboring authorities.

Councillor Miller questioned why the LII River was not included in the mapping. Mr Rachlin responded we will be going back to Environment Canterbury (Ecan) to do that modelling for us, with a series of waterways to get the full picture.

Chair commented some of questions will be answered in Mr Rachlin's next presentation on the agenda.

Moved – Councillor Miller / Seconded – Councillor Lyall

"That the Committee:

- 1. Endorses Environment Canterbury's draft 'Flood hazard update for Selwyn District Plan Review' report;*
- 2. Confirms that the findings of the 'Flood hazard update for Selwyn District Plan review' report be used to develop a planning framework for managing flood risk to people and property;*
- 3. Endorses a community engagement strategy that:*
 - For high hazard areas, landowners are engaged directly in terms of the accuracy of the mapping and in understanding the risk to their property and land.*

- *For the Lower Plains inundation area, the community is engaged by way of an issues and options process, where a preferred option will be identified for discussion purposes.”*

CARRIED

Moved – Councillor Alexander / Seconded – Councillor Lyall

The meeting reconvened to Public at: 11.07am

CARRIED

11. Issues and Options Update for Flood and Coastal Hazard Risk Investigations

Mr Rachlin Spoke to his report and presentation ‘Technical Investigations of Flood Risk and Coastal Hazards’, to provide Key Recommendations for flood risk to approve a District Wide rain on grid model, which is to be developed and run by DHL. In addition SDC will need to go to Ecan and ask them to carry out improved rain on grid flood modelling.

With regard to the coastal hazard mapping, Mr Rachlin advised that an update had not been received from the Department of Conservation (Doc) in regards to DoC and MfE guidance on climate change and implementing Policy 24 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. As such, a date for publication has still not been set.

Mr Rachlin therefore recommends taking an interim position and that the coastal hazard lines in the Regional Policy Statement be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan until such time as the guidance is available. This work would fall outside the DPR timeframes.

The Project team has sought further guidance from Ecan on the likely cost of commissioning a coastal hazards study.

Councillor Hasson questioned if there was any way that we can share our costs with ECan. She commented that as Ecan would require access to this sort of Coastal Hazards information for their own use could they look at contributing towards it.

Mr Rachlin responded that Ecan have provided a lot of technical assistance in terms of funding the flood modelling undertaken to date to determine the high hazard areas. It is therefore SDC’s responsibility to fund the modelling of surface level flooding. In terms of coastal matters, Mr Rachlin advised that once we receive DoC guidance we have to make a worst-case assumption of what is required.

Councillor Lemon asked for clarification in regards to flood investigations for the Waikirikiri Hawkins and Hororata Rivers? He commented about the issue at this

winter's rain event where rain fell in different area than expected and whether this will be factored into the modelling? Mr Rachlin responded we are mindful of these factors and any modelling will incorporate different scenarios for testing.

Councillor Skelton commented that the DPR provides an opportunity to update the coastal hazard lines. Mr Rachlin agreed, however he did not support SDC expenditure (approximately \$70,000) on coastal hazard mapping in the absence of guidance from DoC regarding the scope of this work.

'Councillor Lemon left at 11.19am'

Councillor Miller sought confirmation that the recommendation would include modelling for the LII River. He also commented that for the Upper Plains flooding it would be wise to engage CPW (Canterbury Plains Water Ltd.).

Mr Matunga queried whether the flood modelling work would be incorporated into the Kaianga Nohoanga work stream. Chair responded that yes, there will be a match up.

'Councillor Lemon in at 11.22am'

Moved – The Mayor / Seconded – Councillor Lemon

'That the Committee:

Flood-risk:

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

- 4. 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.*
- 5. 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.'*

CARRIED

The meeting moved to Public Excluded at: 11.25am

CARRIED

12. Overview of Growth Model

Mr Rhodes spoke to his Report. Report provides an outline of the development of the Growth Model and seeks the Committee's endorsement for the use of the Growth Model through the DPR and National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC).

Rodney Yeoman from Market Economics introduced himself to the Committee. Mr Yeoman spoke to his presentation and provided context and an overview on the fast growth rate of Selwyn, the NPS-UDC and the relevance of the Growth Model. He noted that under the NPS-UDC, the Council is required to report on the demand and supply of Residential and Business Zone land every three years.

In summary:

1. Demand (Residential and Economic Projections)
2. Supply (Capacity Assessment)
3. Demand in Supply context (Selwyn Capacity Growth Model).

Mr Yeoman presented on the modules that made up the final model. Residential Projections (Module 1) looked at Population Cohorts and Residential demand projections out to 2048 and projections demand for number of dwellings. Statistics NZ information is now out of date as growth in Selwyn has been faster than anticipated. Market Economics has incorporated Net Migration findings of Dr. Natalie Jackson into the Model. Cohort-Component Population Model is a structure of population over time in terms of age and gender which establishes the level of residential demand (dwellings) that could be expected in the District. The model applies two steps, Household formation and Habitation density.

Mr Yeoman provided an overview of Economic Projections (Module 2) which has the purpose of establishing a set of economic projections including number of jobs located within the District over the coming decades and the associated demand for floor space and business land. This did not take into account people working in own houses or in rural zones which is not business zoned.

'The Mayor left the room at 11.37am'

In past the Council has had no economic projections therefore the Economic Futures Model is highlighted as being important and useful. It is a detailed model that Market Economics has been developing for last ten years and most high growth Councils have subscribed to it.

'The Mayor in at 11.39am'

Mr Yeoman provided an overview of Capacity (Module 3) which has the purpose to identify capacity of residential and business land within the Selwyn District and discussed how the assessment is conducted at the parcel level using GIS.

Mr Yeoman went on to provide the Committee an overview of the Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model noting Residential and Business capacity have been measured differently. Mr Yeoman provided a summary of results at a District level for Residential and Business if under Medium-High scenario and Modified Capacity providing figures of supply for the forecasted period. Mr Yeoman noted NPS-UDC is likely to impact on the level of capacity as more work needs to be done to work out feasibility of this capacity and this will be completed in a separate phase of work.

Councillor Watson commented that currently a lot of people work from home in the absence of business space in the district.

'Mr Ward left at 11.55am'

Mr Yeoman responded that the District Plan provided reasonable height limits and opportunities for development in the business zone to allow for more building space, but this was not being met by the market.

Councillor Lyall commented that we currently have land zoned but not using it. He is interested to know what boundary the Residential capacity was taken from, i.e. is it the LURP boundary or RPS infrastructure boundary (IB)?

Mr Rhodes responded that the Model has taken capacity from existing zoned land. However it does enable ability to assess capacity, and the impacts of this, should the areas within the IB be rezoned.

Mr Yeoman added that he was provided GIS files with existing zones from the operative District Plan and has provided for future zones.

Councillor Skelton questioned if it includes special housing zones to which Mr Rhodes replied that yes it did and they have been classed as 'plan enabled'.

Councillor Hasson commented that once Southern Motorway is in place we may have to do this exercise again taking into consideration growth factors outside of UDS area. Mr Yeoman responded that he sees it as a living model and key changes that may impact it can be factored in later.

Chair clarified to Committee that the purpose for today was to introduce the Growth Model to which Mr Rhodes agreed and reinforced that we will continue to report back to the Committee.

Moved – Councillor Lyall / Seconded – Councillor Alexander

"That the Committee:

- 1. Notes the report and accompanying presentation from Market Economics.*
- 2. Endorses the Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model for use in the District Plan Review and National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity projects.*
- 3. Confirms that the Residential 'Projections' to be applied in the Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model are:*
 - Medium High for the Greater Christchurch Partnership Area*
 - Medium for the Ellesmere and Malvern Areas*
- 4. Confirms that the Residential 'Capacity Type' in the Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model be set at 'Modified'.*
- 5. Confirms that the Business 'Employment Model' used in the Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model be the Economic Futures Model.*
- 6. Gives delegated authority to the Team Leader – Strategy and Policy to set final settings for all controls other than 'Projections', 'Capacity Type' 'and Employment Model' in the Selwyn Capacity for Growth Model.*
- 7. Gives delegated authority to the Team Leader - Strategy and Policy to set final assumption numbers for each control with these numbers outlined in relevant planning documents supporting the District Plan Review or National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity."*

Moved – Councillor Alexander / Seconded – Councillor Hasson

CARRIED

The meeting reconvened to Public 12.00pm

CARRIED

The meeting concluded 12.02pm