



**District Plan Committee  
meeting  
held on Wednesday 28 March 2018 at 9.00am at  
Selwyn District Council,  
Rolleston**

**Present:** The Mayor, Councillors M Alexander, D Hasson, M Lemon, B Mugford, J Bland, N Reid, C Watson, P McEvedy, M Lyall, Hirini Matunga (Te Taumutu Rūnanga) & P Skelton (Environment Canterbury).

**In attendance:** Chairperson – T Harris (Environmental Services Manager), J Burgess (Planning Manager), B Rhodes (Team Leader – Strategy and Policy), J Ashley (District Plan Review Project Lead), E Hodgkin (Project Manager, District Plan Review), A Mactier (Strategy and Policy Planner), J Lewes (Strategy and Policy Planner), R Love (Strategy and Policy Planner), S Hill (Business Relationship Manager), V Barker (Planning Consultant), K Johnston (Communications Consultant), S Dawson (Sarah Dawson Consulting), J Bentley & S Styles (Boffa Miskell), & note taker T Van Der Velde (District Plan Administrator).

**Standing Items:**

**1. Apologies**

Mr D Ward (CEO SDC)  
Councillor J Morten  
Councillor G Miller  
Ms T Wati (Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga)

Apologies for lateness:  
Councillor M Lyall

**Moved** – The Mayor / **Seconded** – Councillor Mark Alexander

*‘That the apologies received from the above Councillors be received for information.’*

**CARRIED**

## **2. Declaration of Interest**

Nil.

## **3. Deputations by Appointment**

Mr N Boyes Planning Consultant from Planz Consultants and Mr D Armstrong executive member of Canterbury Aero Club and Director of the Aviation Academy presented to Council on the issues over the recommended preferred option report for Airfields, Airstrips and Helicopter landing pads.

Mr Armstrong provided a recap of the West Melton Aerodrome discussion on the day of Councils visit.

Mr Armstrong advised that the Aviation Academy was established to help extend and secure recreational training and operation the Aero Club as operations are expensive.

The club is principally based at Harewood Aviation Club, a unique placing not available to any other training facility in New Zealand. The club is very protective and does not want to relocate.

Initial flight training is carried out in Harewood, then West Melton and Rangiora Airfields but Harewood is the principal site. The club acquired long term lease from Environment Canterbury 40 years ago.

Mr Armstrong commented that the West Melton Aero Club had the only sealed runway outside of Harewood and can be used for the wider public any time for emergencies. The Aero Club has planned to extend the seal but other things have taken priority. There is no long term plan for significant development, however there are plans to increase flight training numbers at the facility. The preferred option makes it difficult for the club to progress with further development.

Mr Boyes set out issues regarding the recommended preferred option for Rural Topic – Airfields, Airstrips and Helicopter Landing Pads.

Mr Boyes questioned the report with respect to the assessment of the approach surfaces provisions. In Mr Boyes' view there is no overlap with Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) legislation and the provisions work. If approach surfaces provisions were removed, and a third party was to erect a structure the CAA has no bearing over this third party and they simply go to the airfield and shut it down.

The report considers that the West Melton Aerodrome is not strategic in accordance with the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS or RPS). Mr Boyes advised he has a different view of this. The strategic infrastructure definition that applies to the Greater Christchurch area includes Rangiora Airfield as an example of strategic infrastructure and as such, it is equally applicable to West Melton aerodrome. Mr John Key and other politicians flew into West Melton following the earthquakes, showing the importance that the aerodrome be considered strategic infrastructure under Chapter 6

of the CRPS.

In Mr Boyes' view retaining the rural zoning is not protecting the aerodrome club.

Mr Boyes touched on the approaches in Ashburton and Rangiora and stated the Ashburton Aerodrome is scheduled and the Rangiora Airport is to be designated.

Mr Boyes does not agree with the preferred option where there be no special management approach for West Melton Aerodrome.

Mr Boyes believes resource consenting is a hurdle as resource consents come with inherent risk. Mr Boyes advised that the Aerodrome's strong preference is to provide specific tailored provisions in the District Plan for West Melton aerodrome and that the club would appreciate continued dialogue with Council.

Councillor Alexander commented the ideal situation would be zoning created for airfields to allow for greater protection under the resource consent process. It is still early days and to continue dialogue with the club.

Councillor Hasson commented the Christchurch-West Melton water zone committee have a lease for that particular site but it is also a recharge area for Christchurch City. Might be some issues to be considered wider than what deputations are bringing to us.

Mr Armstrong advised the aero club have the right to renew lease, every 21 years is the turn over period.

#### **4. Confirmation of Minutes**

Taken as read and accepted.

**Moved – Councillor Alexander / Seconded – Councillor Mugford**

*'That the Committee accepts the minutes of the 28 February 2018 as being true and correct'.*

**CARRIED**

#### **5. Outstanding Issues Register**

Nil.

## **9(a) Preferred Options Report – Airfields, Airstrips and Helicopter Landing Pads**

Ms Barker spoke to her report starting with an overview of the issues and options report.

Ms Barker advised that there are two large Airfields in the Selwyn District, West Melton operated by the Canterbury Aero Club who we just heard from in Deputations by Appointment and Springfield Aerodrome operated by the Canterbury Gliding Club. The Hororata club is no longer operational. Springfield is primarily a recreational gliding club. West Melton is more of a commercial club with Pilot training but also has a recreational element. There are also a number of rural airstrips and helicopter landing pads in the district.

In terms of the current District Plan approach, certain aircraft movements are permitted activities as of right and do not need to comply with any other rules in the plan for example emergency flights & military aircraft flights.

Other aircraft movements are not permitted as of right and need to comply with certain rules – two key rules are specified noise limits and aircraft moment restrictions of 28 moments per week if movements are within 1km of a living zone. If these rules are not met discretionary activity resource consent is required. Scale of activity rules for the likes of buildings and hangars and approach surface rules and transport rules also apply.

Ms Barker gave a brief summary of the resource consent history for the District in relation to aircraft activities. For West Melton Airfield the most recent resource consent was granted in 2016 for a new hanger building, the only reason for consent was that it is located in a flood zone.

No resource consent was required for Springfield as it was established by certificate of compliance in 2009 and therefore was considered to be fully permitted. Only one consent on record for a rural airstrip in the district, this is likely because such activity is permitted under the current rules. Helicopter operation Wyndon Aviation was established in 2009 by way of certificate of compliance and there are two operators looking to establish in Prebbleton and West Melton. Prebbleton is currently subject to a resource consent application and the West Melton application has not been lodged yet.

Looking at the plan rules and trying to distil the issues, with 6 key issues being identified with the rules.

Firstly Definitions and Terminology: the definition of airport in the plan is very broad and the two aerodromes are not considered airports. Utility definition lists airports and utility buildings as being exempt from the scale of activity rule which sets a permitted building limit of 100m<sup>2</sup>. Therefore large hangar buildings have been permitted. The definitions and terminology is also overlapping and unclear.

Suitability of range of activities that are permitted: emergency, military and other specific flights are permitted under the plan. Need to consider further whether this list of permitted activities is still appropriate and what other flights such as flights associated with temporary events for example can be permitted.

Rules that apply to other aircraft movements are permissive and unclear: Noise rule does not look at noise in relation to sensitive activities like Hospitals and Schools. Rule does not differentiate between powered aircraft, helicopter activities and gliders and there is no reference to the New Zealand Standards that measure noise in association with powered aircraft and helicopter movements which are commonly referred to in other District Plans around the Country. The Baseline noise report completed by the Council's Acoustic Consultants recommended that this rule be reconsidered. Another example is the aircraft movement rule which restricts aircraft movement to 28 per week. This rule only applies to airstrips or helipads located within 1km of the nearest boundary of any Living Zone. The rule provides no ability to consider the impact of frequent flight movements on dwellings and other sensitive activities located in Rural Zones (the only control is the noise limit).

Approach surface rules: West Melton has touched on these. The Baseline Report raised question marks about whether these rules should sit in the District Plan. The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) did not respond to requests to engage through this process. On balance, agree they be retained in the Plan and simplified so easily understood.

Regional Policy statement (RPS): Environment Canterbury (ECan) reviewed both the baseline report and the preferred options report and considered the assessment against the RPS is sound. West Melton is not considered to be part of the strategic transport network and it is questionable whether aircraft activity should be provided for under the transport policies in the plan as they are currently. Stand-alone aircraft policies would be clearer and more consistent with the CRPS. This ties into the transport topic.

Last issue is that West Melton consider the rules too onerous in relation to their site and are seeking a more permissive planning regime with special provisions tailored to their site which give greater flexibility – stark contrast to other issues identified.

Preferred option is option number 2 which is essentially continuing with the status quo but with amendment.

Approach will provide better management of effects than the current permissive approach and enable a consistent approach across the district. West Melton proposed to be treated the same as Springfield as no strong justification to treat West Melton any differently. The preferred option approach is supported by ECan and the New Zealand Transport Agency. Recommended approach surfaces provisions be retained in relation to West Melton, introduced in relation to Springfield (in consultation with the Canterbury Gliding Club) and removed in the Hororata Domain given it is no longer operational.

Ms Barker provided an overview of option 2 in terms of the impacts on the West Melton site. Ms Barker advised that the resource consent history for the club has not been an

issue to date, and there has only been one recent resource consent granted in recent times which was straightforward.

During engagement with the club when asked about their development plans, the club responded they want to replace the club house and allow for hangars to be constructed (leased for private use) which is not significant development. Therefore no strong justification for developing special provisions over the resource consent process. The club also indicated they would like a very permissive regime ideally not needing to comply with any noise control rules. No noise consideration is not considered appropriate and therefore there is a gap between what is considered appropriate and where the club is trying to head. The RPS does not recognise the club as part of the strategic transport network (unlike Rangiora Airport), but does acknowledge club has valuable emergency back-up value. However option 2 will still provide the club with ability to undertake developments in future and continue to be used in emergencies.

West Melton could take a strategic approach and apply for a resource consent for their proposed development and ask for a longer consent term than 5 years, or as an alternative West Melton could submit a package of provisions they want during the submission phase after the plan has been notified.

#### Response to Deputation:

In terms of surface approach provisions on balance Ms Barker recommends they be retained (as outlined in the preferred options report).

The RPS - covered that previously in terms of seeking ECan's input who agree with the assessment contained in both reports.

Approaches of neighbouring Councils – Ashburton is a scheduled site have own special provisions which are permissive. Rangiora is not designated as yet and relies on the rural zone and district-wide provisions at the moment.

*'Mr Matunga out 9.38am'*

Councillor Alexander questioned did Council consider approach of those specific activity zones for aerodromes like Council might for other activities so they are recognised and also protected?

Ms Barker responded that specific zoning was considered in the baseline report section 8.9 as well as a range of other options. Zoning not considered to be appropriate.

Councillor Watson raised his concern with what is happening in Prebbleton with helicopter base operating over there. He advised that realistically 24/7 monitoring of a helicopter facility is not feasible and is worried with the increase in helicopter activity. He advised that Council has to be sure that helicopter facilities are not permitted within our plan and have tighter noise control and aircraft movement rules.

Ms Barker responded that this has been considered under option 2, where she has recommended a permitted activity status subject to compliance with tighter noise and aircraft controls. Ms Barker advised that the option she has recommended is finding balance and that helicopter operations with frequent flight movements will likely trigger the need for consent.

The Mayor would like to see Council be a little stronger - if Council believe the aerodromes are important for the district, not only for airfield clubs but for anyone buying land that they clearly understand what limitations there are and if there are already existing use rights attached.

Councillor Hasson questioned agricultural use of planes and helicopters and if the independent ones are covered by the CAA?

Ms Baker responded that it is the intention as part of option 2 that helicopter operations will be specifically looked at. Council can draw from Christchurch plan and build on what they have. Next stage will involve further engagement with Christchurch City Council.

*'Mr Matunga in 9.42am'*

Councillor McEvedy stated he considers that West Melton is strategic to the district and he does not think it should be treated the same as Springfield. In his opinion it is for Council to decide what is important in the Selwyn district and would like Council to pursue other options other than option 2. This is a fast moving district. Councillor McEvedy does support the recommended helicopter provisions.

The Chair responded and suggested a middle ground that adopts the preferred option with exception of West Melton Airfield, which would be subject to a specific package to recognise and provide for its activities. The resolution is to be revised to reflect this position.

**Moved – Councillor McEvedy / Seconded – The Mayor**

*"That the Committee notes the report."*

*Resolution amended to:*

*"That the Committee endorses the Preferred Options for 'Airfields, Airstrips and Helicopter Landing Pads' for further development with the exception of the West Melton Airfield where further discussion with staff and Airfield representatives will occur to progress the development of specific provisions that will apply to the West Melton Airfield."*

*Councillor Watson voted against the recommended provisions relating to helicopter movements.*

**CARRIED**

**9(b) Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Airfields, Airstrips and Helicopter Landing Pads**

To inform the Committee of the communications and engagement activities to be undertaken in relation to the Airfields, Airstrips and Helicopter Landing Pads topic.  
(Noted by Committee).

**Moved – Councillor Alexander / Seconded – Councillor Watson**

*“That the Committee notes the summary plan.”*

**CARRIED**



## **6. Overview of RMA Legislative and Statutory Planning Context**

Ms Dawson spoke to her presentation to provide the Committee with an overview and update of the relevant Resource Management Act (RMA) legislative and statutory planning context, including how to apply the principles arising from the *King Salmon* case to the District Plan Review process.

Ms Dawson introduced herself as Planning Consultant and member of advisory panel for the District Plan Review advising District Plan project team on an on-demand basis.

Ms Dawson advised Committee that the District Plan Project team believed it was important to provide the Committee with an overall understanding of the RMA Legislation which will assist Committee in decisions for the District Plan Topics.

Ms Dawson advised that Council must be clear that there is a three tier management system within New Zealand's resource management system: national, regional and district, along with the hierarchy of planning documents:

- RMA (Part 2)
- National Policy Statements and Environmental Standards
- Regional Policy Statement
- District Plans and Regional Plans

Each document has the overarching purpose to achieve Part 2 - the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act.

*'Councillor Lyall in 9.54am'*

Ms Dawson discussed that the key is the RMA sets out tests for the relationship between each of the levels of the hierarchy.

Ms Dawson discussed key tests to be met for each document and terminology for each document as per her presentation.

*'Councillor Reid out 9.56am'*

There is a focus on 'King Salmon decision' which is important as this has forced planners to change the way that we make some judgements about what may be included in lower level documents.

Ms Dawson discussed that the first thing she took from the 'King Salmon decision' was that it reinforces the hierarchy that national documents are important, they are nationally set and not to be undermined by lower level documents.

Higher level documents have already been prepared in accordance with Part 2. While preparing a district plan like Council are doing, Council need to "give effect" to those higher level documents without going back to reconsider them in terms of the competing interest that might be seen in Part 2.

*'Councillor Reid in 10.00am'*

The second thing Ms Dawson took from the 'King Salmon decision' are that words and direction in the higher level documents are quite specific and they need to be interpreted in that way. Council need to look carefully at what the high level documents say in order to work out how to give effect to it. The decision showed that it is alright for the high level documents to have bottom lines or very strong directives.

When looking at documents look at words, at what is directive and what is more general as it says specific words or directive words trump general words.

As per her presentation slideshow Ms Dawson provided some relevant points for District Plan Review drafting:

- Words are very important. You need to be precise.
- Strong and directive policies in high level documents will need to be "given effect to".
- Does not mean there is no flexibility but this needs to be clear where, when and what circumstances at high level.
- It is important to reconcile recommendations for things that overlap and work out how potential conflicts can be resolved, likely that you will need a person or group that will assist you for consistency.

Mr Matunga questioned whether the decision made any reference to the Maori provisions in Part 2 at all?

Ms Dawson responded she was not aware of reference to Maori provisions as they were very focused on the landscape provisions which is where the conflict arose. Ms Dawson added there is no national policy statement in Maori provisions but we do have this at a regional level which the Committee can take guidance from.

Councillor Skelton added that the 'King Salmon case' was in the context of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and a very directive provision to outstanding landscapes. It did not consider Maori cultural issues that are identified in part 2.

Ms Dawson advised that there has been some case law since then such as the 'Turners and Growers case' that said where there is high level documents but not much direction it is still necessary to go back to part 2. Decision making is potentially flexible and requires an overall judgement but do not undermine strong directive in high level documents.

**Moved – Mr Matunga / Seconded – The Mayor**

"That the Committee notes the presentation."

**CARRIED**

## **7(a) Preferred Option Report – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes**

Mr Mactier introduced Stephanie Styles and James Bentley from Boffa Miskell. Boffa Miskell has been engaged by the Council for this topic and a number of other topics across the Natural Environment work stream.

Mr Mactier set the scene by explaining that Mr Bentley will start off by explaining the methodology, processes, criteria he has used to set out the Landscape Study which outlines why the outstanding natural landscapes (ONLs) are where they are, why they are important, what the values are and what are the threats to those landscape values.

Ms Styles will set out a brief summary the preferred option report, a bit about the statutory context, some of the issues with the current operational plan and recommended options to address those issues.

Mr Mactier discussed the current provisions relating to landscapes are fairly dated and have been around since about 2004. Plan Change 6 occurred around 2010 which amended the Port Hills ONLs and visual amenity landscapes (VALs) but only applied to that certain area. The rest of the district's provisions have not changed at all. A new Regional Policy Statement has come along since then and a fair body of case law has provided more guidance on how we should manage and protect our landscapes.

*‘Councillor Bland out 10.20am’*

Mr Bentley discussed that he was the author of the Landscape Study for Selwyn. Selwyn landscape is pretty special and the most diverse in the country. Mr Bentley spoke to his presentation providing the Committee with a range of visual photographs of the vast landscapes around the Selwyn district.

Mr Bentley advised he was tasked to undertake a comprehensive landscape study of the entire Selwyn District which has not been done before. The landscape study takes a comprehensive look at all landscapes in the Selwyn district, based on values and characteristics. Landscape definition taken from the NZ Institute of Landscape Architects: *cumulative expression of natural and cultural features, patterns and processes in a geographical area, including perceptions and associations.*

Understanding outstanding landscapes in the area meant that Boffa Miskell undertook a landscape characterisation process. The process involves analysing the landscape and identifying areas that broadly have consistent elements, patterns and processes that can be understood. Put simply, landscape character is what makes an area unique.

*‘Councillor Bland in 10.25am’*

Mr Bentley discussed the eight broad landscape character areas identified. Step 2 was to undertake evaluation of the district's different landscape values through attributes: Biophysical, Sensory and Associative and determining whether the landscape meets the threshold of being 'outstanding' or not.

ONLs were identified in relation to features or landscapes which scored at least high for biophysical, sensory and associative values and determined by a seven-point scale rated high to low. Boundaries identifying valued areas of landscape, do not necessarily coincide with landscape character areas. Boundaries were primarily based on broad geomorphical and geographical patterns.

Outstanding landscapes in Selwyn were considered landscapes rather than features due to their relative size in the district.

Mr Bentley discussed that it was important to look at existing landscape overlays in current plan (map provided in presentation) and also provided a map showing the landscape study recommended areas. Eight ONLs were identified and four VALs identified.

*‘Councillor McEvedy out 10.35am’*

Mr Bentley summarised that when compared against the current, broadly the mapped areas are similar, however, there is a greater proportion of the District now included. There are also less individual ONLs as many have been combined. Only two landscape classifications identified and mountainous areas are where the majority of the increases in mapped ONLs and VALs have come from.

*‘Councillor McEvedy in 10.37am’*

Ms Styles spoke to her presentation firstly advising that Mr Bentley is the technical specialist in regards to assessing why a landscape is outstanding or important and not outstanding and the reasons behind that. Ms Styles explained that next part of the puzzle is what we do with that in the context of s6 of the RMA pertaining to Matters of national importance.

Next level of the hierarchy which Ms Dawson mentioned in her presentation (very timely) is the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS or RPS) and Ms Styles discussed the relevant objectives of RPS. The RPS at a policy and method level has some very clear direction, Ms Styles covered the direction.

Ms Styles advised that the current district plan provisions are older than the RPS and older than what everyone has moved towards in terms of clear identification, consistent application and stronger rules. In addition things are done differently to what Boffa Miskell have experienced in other districts.

From this basis the proposal is to clearly identify the outstanding landscapes and visual amenity landscapes on planning maps, do a review of objectives and policies, refining those, and being very clear and directive, saying what you mean (clear language). There is a high emphasis on protection of areas and stating why it is outstanding. Ms Styles recommended that rules be drafted that are based on existing provisions, but more effectively manage the adverse effects of activities on the identified values of ONL and VAL areas. (Option 2 as per report which is endorsed by Environment Canterbury at a staff level).

Ms Styles provided a brief summary of the concept provisions and why these are only concepts at this stage, with the key things areas Council should be focused on being:

- Earthworks, and quarrying / mining
- Pastoral intensification and agricultural conversion
- Vineyards and orchards
- Woodlots, shelterbelts, and plantation forestry
- Buildings
- Signs

Councillor McEvedy questioned how Ms Styles would define pastoral intensification? Ms Styles responded that the terminology used is from current case law wording. Definitions will be worked through to define what level of change is appropriate.

Mr Bentley presented a number of maps to the Committee to demonstrate existing landscape overlays with the proposed overlays around the district.

Councillor Hasson commented that the consultants talked about Lake Ellesmere and surrounds almost separately to the district's Alpine lakes; and questioned are you looking at a protection zone around those high country lakes in regards to inappropriate development? Councillor Hasson advised she is trying to gauge what protection is there for our lakes?

Mr Bentley responded in terms of the mapping of ONLs a lot of it is about context and Lake Ellesmere is within a context that has been highly modified, and the values attributed to the lake are particularly to do with the water and the margins. The values associated with Lake Coleridge and other lakes are underpinned by the context in the environment and level of modifications that have been applied to that lake. Therefore, those high country lakes are within a broader outstanding landscape therefore might be different. For example Lake Ellesmere has a high cultural understanding and more values based, whereas other lakes might not have that high cultural understanding but are valued for other parts.

Councillor Hasson questioned the potential for development near / on ONLs and Mr Bentley responded that any development would be tested against the values of ONL's.

Councillor McEvedy questioned the line around the lakes and how it relates to the cultural landscape value management area under Plan Change 1 to the Land & Water Regional Plan (LWRP)?

Mr Mactier responded the cultural layer is part of the LWRP administrated by ECan so there is potential for some confusion. In terms of how they relate in terms of overlap or separation, he advised he will have to check but indicated that the cultural layer may be around 1 km from the margin compared to tens of metres for the ONL?

Councillor Skelton questioned whether Council are working with ECan in regards to identifying wetland areas in the Te Waihora context and are Council familiar with that work?

Mr Bentley answered yes that is something Council are looking at.

Councillor Lemon added that he is part of working group to help establish wetland areas. The difference between wet pasture and wetland meant that the definition is

quite important. Councillor Lemon shared a similar concern about differing boundaries and sending different messages to people. Councillor Lemon advised that Landowners are quite stressed about the definitions and to put another layer of stress on them by defining areas as ONLs or Outstanding Natural Features (ONFs) is not going to be particularly helpful.

Mr Mactier added as we go through the process one of the principles of the district plan review is that Council does not want to duplicate a regulation and are aware of these concerns.

Mr McEvedy raised his concern over existing landowners when the rules change, including not being able to build in VALs?

Mr Mactier responded that in general and overwhelmingly in in the Ports Hills area the VAL is increasing. In the current planning regime it is easier to build a house in a VAL compared to an ONL, however owners may still need a resource consent. VAL is encroaching into existing ONL where it is most difficult to build a house.

The Mayor commented continuing on how this may affect private land and also the cultivation of land? Where does this sit? Ms Styles responded that this concept will be explored in the next stage of the project.

The Chair queried whether it was envisaged that there will be a separate set of rules for each ONL? Ms Styles responded potentially yes because the values are distinctively different and also the effects of activities varied in each ONL.

The Chair questioned VALs as not being required in terms on the RPS. How important is it to have it in there to protect ONL above them? Mr Bentley responded VALs do afford some sort of buffer - example is VALs identified in the Malvern areas but only put provisions against two of those VALs.

The Chair questioned have they got VALs in Christchurch City and did they follow this approach? Mr Bentley answered yes they did so Council will be consistent across the board.

Mr Matunga stated that he noted in the report that there is a separate work stream that Mahaanui Kurataiao (MKT) are doing, how are the Council dealing with the intersection between the two? MKT are coming out with a report on cultural landscapes how are you reconciling the planning part of this process?

Ms Ashley responded we are awaiting that report ourselves, when report is available we will then integrate report with our other work streams, we understand it has been drafted and process awaiting Runanga feedback before sending to Council.

Mr Mactier added various work streams will be integrated.

Mr Matunga also questioned do you have a different set of rules for cultural landscapes?

Mr Mactier answered to a degree, noting that the National Planning Standards may assist, however this approach will need further work.

**Moved – Councillor Bland / Seconded – Councillor Hasson**

*“That the Committee notes the report.”*

*“That the Committee endorses the Preferred Option (Option 2) for Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes for further development.”*

**CARRIED**

## **7(b) Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes**

To inform the Committee of the communications and engagement activities to be undertaken in relation to the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes topic. (Noted by Committee).

**Moved – Councillor Alexander / Seconded – Councillor Lemon**

*“That the Committee notes the summary plan.”*

**CARRIED**

The Chair commented due to time constraints we will shift items 8(a) Preferred Option Report –Intensive Farming and 8(b) Communications and Engagement – Intensive Farming to April's District Plan Committee meeting.

*‘The meeting adjourned for a 15 minute break 11.15am’.*

*‘Meeting reconvened at 11.30am without Councillors P McEvedy, C Watson and M Lemon’.*



## **11. Alternate Chair of District Plan Committee**

Chair advised of the need to appoint an alternate chairperson for the District Plan Committee in the absence of the Environmental Services Manager and to update the District Plan Committee Terms of Reference accordingly.

The Chair asked for nominations.

Councillor Alexander questioned the definition of 'independent chair' as current chair is representing a non-political, independent person and there are very few around the table who are non-political. Councillor Alexander suggested someone like the Planning Manager. Otherwise Councillor Alexander's nomination would be the Mayor Sam Broughton.

The Chair responded in terms of the independence the chair, which was modelled on approach of the implementation committee for the 'Urban Development Strategy'. However, he considered that it is not necessary nor important for this committee. In many ways a political member may be beneficial and Chair is quite comfortable with a political person taking the chair.

Councillor Lyall agreed with nomination for the Mayor.

The Mayor questioned whether this change needs to go up in front of Council to be accepted? Mr Rhodes responded that the terms of reference for DPC allows for small change but will double check.

The chair added to remove the wording of independent chair from Terms of Reference and Councillor Reid asked to update the members 'Runanga representative' to plural in Terms of Reference.

### **Moved – Councillor Lyall Seconded – Councillor Mugford**

*"That the Committee notes the report."*

*"The District Plan Committee appoints Mayor Sam Broughton to be appointed as the alternate Chair for the District Plan Committee."*

*"The Terms of Reference be amended accordingly."*

**CARRIED**

## **10. Update on District Plan Review Financials**

To provide the Committee with an update on the District Plan Review budget and financials to 31 January 2018.

*‘Councillor Watson in 11.36am’*

Mr Burgess took the report as read and accepted, and noted the following points from the report:

Council are expecting expenditure to drop in the 2018-2019 financial year as Council start to move from the baseline and preferred options phases into the drafting and section 32 analysis, trying to bring a lot of the work back in-house.

Timings of this report in terms of the financial months - there is a slight disconnect between this financial report and audit risk report due to the agenda closing time.

Section 5, Ms Hodgkin has included in the report a year to date versus expenditure chart. Council are tracking below in regards to percentage spent therefore we are on track. Council are monitoring this very closely, internally negotiating with consultants and looking at best price moving forward. The process is heavily scrutinised as Council do not want to see any blow outs.

Ms Hodgkin added that the risk section remains the same as last month and will continue to add to this month by month if anything arises.

Another financial update and report will be brought to the Committee in April.

**Moved – Councillor Alexander / Seconded – Councillor Bland**

*“That the Committee notes the report.”*

**CARRIED**

## **11. Confirmation of Public Excluded Minutes**

No Discussion on the Public Excluded minutes therefore no need to move to Public Excluded.

**Moved – Councillor Watson / Seconded – Councillor Mugford**

*‘That the Committee accepts the public excluded minutes of the 28 February 2018 as being true and correct’.*

**CARRIED**

*Meeting Concluded at: 11.45am*

This day            of            2018

---

CHAIR PERSON