



**District Plan Committee meeting  
held on Wednesday 27 June 2018 at 9.00am at Selwyn  
District Council,  
Rolleston**

**Present:** Mayor S Broughton, Councillors M Alexander, M Lemon, D Hasson, N Reid, B Mugford, G Miller, M Lyall, J Bland, J Morten, D Ward (CEO SDC), T Wati (Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga), & Hirini Matunga (Te Taumutu Rūnanga).

**In attendance:** Chair T Harris (Environmental Services Manager), J Burgess (Planning Manager), J Ashley (District Plan Review Project Lead), A Mactier (Strategy and Policy Planner), B Baird (Strategy and Policy Planner), B Rhodes (Strategy and Policy Team Leader), R Love (Strategy and Policy Planner), J Lewes (Strategy and Policy Planner), H Riordan (Student Planner), G Wolfer (Urban Designer & Town Planner), S Hill (Communications Advisor), V Barker (Consultant Barker Planning), K Johnston (Communications Consultant), P Horgan & K Davis (Consultants Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd), A Jellie, K Bell & F Lojkin (Consultants Stantec), N Boyes (Consultant Planz Consultants), J Carter (Consultant GHD), N Brown (District Plan Administrator) and note taker T Van Der Velde (District Plan Administrator).

**Standing Items:**

**1. Apologies**

Cr P Skelton (Environment Canterbury)  
Cr C Watson  
Cr P McEvedy

Apologies for lateness:  
Cr D Hasson

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

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

**CARRIED**

**2. Declaration of Interest**

T Wati (Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga) – Items 8a and 8b

**3. Deputations by Appointment**

Nil.

**4. Confirmation of Minutes**

No minutes to confirm

**5. Outstanding Issues Register**

Nil.

## **Specific Reports**

### **6a. Preferred Option Report – Residential Character, Amenity, Density & Housing Typologies**

**AND**

### **6b. Preferred Option Report – Comprehensive Medium Density Development**

Ms Lewes provided a summary of the two residential preferred options reports to be presented to the Committee, being the residential package which is the nature of residential development in the district and the home based business activities and business activities report. These reports establish a framework for residential development in the District Plan.

Ms Lewes introduced Mr Jellie and Ms Bell from Stantec who would present recommendations on the first two agenda items.

Mr Jellie spoke to the report advising the baseline reports were prepared to inform the preferred options reports.

Mr Jellie provided a background of the baseline reports. The purpose of baseline report Character and Amenity was to provide a stocktake of living zones, undertake an on-the-ground assessment of character and amenity, assess the effectiveness of the District Plan provisions in contributing to or maintaining character and amenity, develop a set of principles to guide a new zoning framework and rationalise the living zones and provide a recommended way forward in terms of the residential provisions.

The purpose of baseline report Density and Typology was to undertake an assessment of residential density provisions in the District Plan and review on-the-ground results in terms of density and housing typologies.

The purpose of baseline report for Comprehensive Medium Density Development (CMDD) was to undertake an assessment of the CMDD provisions and review the on-the-ground results.

The purpose of baseline report Bulk and Location was to evaluate the extent to which the existing provisions achieve Council's objectives with respect to residential bulk and location, summarise the approaches undertaken by other councils, and provide initial recommendations as to the rules that could be removed, amended or introduced.

As part of the Character and Amenity baseline a stocktake of operative district plan provisions was undertaken. Analysis of living zones undertaken identified the main difference between zones are small variations in terms of allotment size. On the ground character and amenity assessments were carried out in 18 living zones and townships across the district.

In order to consistently capture results a template and set of criteria was developed, with criteria focused on elements controlled by the district plan and also focussing on the age of the dwelling, stewardship and streetscape.

DCM Urban Design who undertook the groundwork grouped the 18 areas into four categories based on similarities and amenity outcomes.

In summary, results of on ground assessments found that minor variations in allotment size are not achieving a noticeable difference in character and amenity outcomes.

As part of the Residential Density and Typology baseline report a review of resource and building consents were undertaken. Review found majority of dwellings across the district are single story detached dwellings. Building consents data showed predominantly they are three to four bedroom sized dwellings. It was noted that covenants imposed by developers influenced the size of the dwellings in some subdivisions however it is noted this was not reviewed as part of the baseline report process as covenants are not a district plan method.

The building consent review also showed there are a small number of duplex and semi-detached dwellings. Key finding from analysis is that there is little diversity in the housing typology across the district. Mr Jellie provided maps in the presentation identifying building consents issued in Rolleston, Lincoln, Leeston and Darfield. These maps demonstrate the majority of development is occurring on the periphery (towards the urban limits of larger townships e.g. Rolleston and Lincoln) of Greater Christchurch Area townships. The District Plan provides for development in these locations through the Living Z zone, and the use of outline development plan provisions as per the direction of higher order planning documents prepared in response to the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes.

In terms of allotment sizes, subdivision in those peripheral areas (towards the urban limits of larger townships) has resulted in smaller allotments than those in the established areas close to the Town Centre and/or business areas.

There is little evidence of infill development adjacent to the town centre/businesses. Infill in Rolleston has been of a limited nature and largely occurred on 1000m<sup>2</sup> allotments in the established areas of the township.

It is noted building consents lapse after two years of being issued and resource consents lapse after five years, therefore there can be a longer lag in resource consent being granted and development being realised.

Mr Jellie provided a summary of population projections for the Selwyn District. The population projection for the district is different in the context of New Zealand which is largely aging; Selwyn has seen migration of families over the past five years.

Rolleston is expected to experience a significant increase in population over the next 25 years, with a change in the age structure. It is projected that there will be an increase in the proportion of the population aged over 65. It is projected that Rolleston will have a relatively youthful population in 2043 and there will be little change in the composition (by percentage) of new households. Lincoln differs from other townships in the Selwyn District, with its disproportionately large university age population. No significant housing shortfalls were identified for any township over the next 10 years. Most townships have dwelling capacity out till 2028/2033. This changes beyond this

period, where additional dwellings will be required across the six townships analysed post 2033.

A Household Composition table was provided in presentation, this table along with demographic information discussed shows a need for a diverse set of housing typologies in the district plan.

As part of the Character and Amenity baseline report high level principles were developed to provide a framework. This is high level at this stage and the drafting and development of the zones is still to be completed. This includes the application of the new residential zones. Zones are to have descriptive names based on the possible National Planning Standards. It is noted that high density in Rolleston is not the same as high density in Auckland and variations will need to be made. Zones are to have distinct differences, minor variations are to be provided for by way of a precinct where warranted. Zones are to follow a hierarchy based on density and activities, e.g. Medium Density Residential Zone, General Residential Zone through to the Large Lot Zone. The application of zones will follow best planning practice where appropriate, i.e. higher densities adjacent to the Town Centre zones through to lower density on the periphery (tiered approach).

Ms Bell spoke to the presentation. Comprehensive Medium Density Development (CMDD) has a comprehensive definition in the District Plan. The key finding is that Council is achieving minimum density sought through Living Z and outline development plans with little use of CMDD provisions. The other part of it is that there is a type of development Council are not achieving which is a specific form of medium density development. There is a framework that is anticipating something but not being developed as the rules are not integrated well and there is confusion on when reading provisions on how they may apply.

Ms Bell provided imagery and explanation of small lot, medium density and CMDD. Overall CMDD is a large site that has been developed in comprehensive manner. CMDD can have a range of typologies and listed examples.

Mr Jellie advised of recommended typologies: Detached Dwelling, Semi-Detached / Duplex, Terraced houses and Low-rise apartments. The district plan would provide a framework in terms of types of typology and it would then be up to landowners to develop. Different typologies should be located in appropriate locations.

Mr Jellie provided a summary of preferred options for Residential Character, Amenity, Density and Housing Typologies as per report and whether each option is recommended or not, noting that the proposed Settlement Zone was also the subject to another scope of work.

Ms Bell provided a summary of preferred options for CMDD, noting key issue for CMDD is whether or not to progress to have provisions in some shape or form in plan. The provisions do not require this type of development, but rather enable it to occur.

Cr Alexander commented that he has trouble seeing how it will transition. What Council sees implemented on the ground is not what we expected. Mr Alexander gave an example in Faringdon, where there are smaller lots it was hoped there would be

smaller houses, but what we got were bigger houses. Cr Alexander would like to see a set of rules that will deliver on what is expected. How do we end up with a package for what the community wants as they age (smaller easy care dwellings on smaller lots), are we heading in the right direction to develop those outcomes?

Ms Bell responded that Cr Alexander has identified a challenge for the rest of the country. A lot of the housing being built are delivered by companies that benefit from scale of house. There are changes coming in regards to smaller houses but this is up to the development industry responding to that. The District Plan has an enabling set of provisions that does not limit the size of housing.

Cr Alexander added do Council need to be more directive to deliver smaller houses and smaller lots, most elderly do not want four bedroom, two bathrooms dwellings on big sections.

Mr Jellie responded that the point is noted, adding that they have looked at incentives of different typologies which may encourage developers to switch from current to more attractive packages through this baseline report.

Ms Wati commented about CMDD which is along the lines of Papakāinga / Kāinga Nohoanga, and spoke of aspiration of Tūāhuriri living together. Ms Wati supports changing of rules to stop barriers and encourage whānau aspirations of living together.

Cr Lyall commented definitely need for CMDD and supports report. Talked about large lot sizes in Prebbleton. Leaves Council in the centre with aging population but still provides for those that want a bigger lot size. Cr Lyall added balance of finding something smaller but nice for aging community such as low level apartment style.

Mr Matunga commented in support of the reports, and spoke of growing up in a CMDD like community. People tend to have to move out of community to live the lifestyles they want. Mr Matunga supports CMDD which is Kāinga Nohoanga at large. Mr Matunga questioned what does high density look like?

Mr Jellie responded high density is an apartment complex with over three-five stories.

Ms Bell added motivation for people to move out to suburbs is people want to have space. High density tends to be where there is public transport and provided example of Auckland central. Medium density could look like high density looking at the character of the district now. Low rise residential building could feel high density in the Selwyn context.

Mr Matunga commented about spatial distribution of typology, are you implying it will be quite discreet, or implying spatial distribution of different typologies will be quite discreet and will be quite geographically spread? Papakāinga development were seeking typologies that existed side by side as a community group, is there flexibility there?

*'Cr Morten out 9.52am'*

Mr Jellie responded yes and gave examples of typologies of terrace type buildings next to low rise apartments.

Ms Bell advised that different typologies can co-exist depending on the management enabling of different types of living.

The Mayor supports report. The Mayor would like to question what sort of districts do people want to live in? To look at beyond greenfield development and consultants signalling that intensification will be Selwyn's future. Some of the discussion at the moment for the Greater Christchurch Partnership is Christchurch looking to intensify and restrict any growth outside of Christchurch's boundaries. Committee discussions are saying there are lines already drawn in the ground of where we would like to get to but cannot continue to eat up farm land by putting housing on it and sprawling townships across Canterbury Plains. The Mayor commented he likes the support which sets a direction of the way our future should grow, setting some parameters for continued growth in Selwyn District.

Cr Lyall commented public think of medium density as high density, changing public perspective of what medium density is will be important.

Cr Reid supports the Mayors comments. We are not just looking at elderly and to look broader such as young families who want smaller housing. How does planning standards effect this?

*'Cr Morten in 9.55am'*

Ms Lewes discussed the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) draft National Planning Standards (NPS) and noted that these are largely structural at this stage with little content in them. There is direction in terms of structure and 27 zones are proposed which should capture most zones across the country. What zones look like is up to Council. Council has ability to shape what zone looks like but within the structure proposed in the draft NPS.

Cr Reid asked about stormwater treatment and how would this be factored into development densities.

Ms Lewes responded this is for the next stage to be included in the spatial framework.

Cr Lemon supports report. Cr Lemon commented on town centre visions and about masterplans for Lincoln and Rolleston and town centre plans. Outlined townships that have slightly different character as touched on in report and wants Council to be mindful that we capture townships such as Darfield, Leeston, Springfield townships in another report.

**Moved – Councillor Lyall / Seconded – Councillor Lemon**

**Recommendation:**

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Committee endorses the Preferred Option for Residential Character, Amenity, Density & Housing Typologies for further development and engagement.”

**CARRIED**

**AND**

**Moved – Councillor Lyall / Seconded – Councillor Lemon**

**Recommendation:**

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Committee endorses the Preferred Option for Comprehensive Medium Density Development for further development and engagement.”

**CARRIED**



**6c. Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Residential Character, Amenity, Density & Housing Typologies**

No discussion was held, summary plan taken as read and accepted

**Moved – Mr D Ward / Seconded – Councillor Mugford**

**Recommendation:**

‘Residential Character, Amenity, Density & Housing Typologies – communications and engagement summary plan’

**CARRIED**

#### **6d. Preferred Option Report – Home Based Business Activities in Living and Rural Zones and Business Activities (Not Home Based) in Living Zones**

Ms Lewes provided background to the report, advising Selwyn 2031 provided an overarching strategic framework for sustainable growth across the district to 2031.

A key feature of this strategy is a Township Network which assigns an Activity Centre category to each township. In so doing Selwyn 2031 has identified the role each township is to perform in providing for the social, cultural and economic needs of their communities and in the economy of the district.

The purpose of this piece of work was to review the provisions of the Operative District Plan and to provide advice and recommendations on the provision made for Home Based Occupations and the appropriateness or otherwise of providing for non-home based business activity in Living Zones.

This assessment is limited to Key, Service and Rural Activity Centres (as defined in Selwyn 2031) being Rolleston, Lincoln, West Melton, Prebbleton, Darfield, Leeston, Coalgate, Dunsandel, Southbridge and Castle Hill all of which have business zones. This Scope of Work is complementary to other scopes within other work streams – such as the Business Activities in Rural Zones and the Business work stream that will be coming to District Plan Committee next month.

Whilst commercial and industrial activities are intended to be provided for in Business Zones, district plans have always provided for home based business activity for small business enterprises in living zones and rural zones.

Ms Lewes summarised the issues identified through the baseline report. As part of the baseline assessment the approaches of a number of other districts were considered. All plans include a definition of home based business. The District Plan also recognised home based businesses in the objectives and policies and included specific rules to address the scale of the activity.

Ms Lewes provided a summary of the four options that were considered to manage home based business activities noting that option 3 is considered to provide the best balance of enabling home-based businesses, while focusing larger commercial activities into the Centres and towns (including commercial and industrial areas of towns) and summarised why this option is recommended as per report.

Cr Alexander commented that parking has been set to one side yet parking with a home based business can be one of the most immediate effect on neighbours with the extra parking it generates, if not onsite, on the roadside raising issues.

Ms Lewes responded parking would be one of the standards looked at to manage effect of a home based business. The current provisions for business activities requires car parking. The preferred option would establish a hierarchy where you could have a home based business of a lesser scale than a business, therefore a lesser scale in terms of floor area and intensity which would result in a lesser demand for car parking than a business. The recommended maximum floor area for home based business is 40 square metres in Living Zones, which is substantially less than the

existing 300 square meters. Parking is a consideration for a standard that may be imposed on a home based business. Ms Lewes added that issues will come to light with integration of workstreams. Council will pull together provisions about traffic movements and that report together with this report will make sure Council have alignment.

Cr Lemon commented about 'Air bnb' and visitor taxation, is that something Council should be thinking about in this workstream? Will these sorts of businesses create challenges for our District?

Ms Lewes responded that in the current district plan it is classed as a residential activity, and not specifically picked up in home based business. It is an issue bubbling out in the community but not one specifically addressed in the District Plan Review to date but staff are aware of it. Noted to follow up on.

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

**Recommendation:**

"That the Committee notes the report."

"That the Committee endorses the Preferred Option for 'Home Based Business Activities in Living and Rural Zones and Business Activities (Not Home Based) in Living Zones' for further development and engagement."

**CARRIED**

**6e. Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Home Based Business Activities in Living and Rural Zones and Business Activities (Not Home Based) in Living Zones**

No discussion was held, summary plan taken as read and accepted

**Moved – Councillor Lyall / Seconded – Councillor Mugford**

**Recommendation:**

“That the Committee notes the summary plan.”

**CARRIED**

## **7a. Supplementary Report to the Preferred Options Report – Rural Character and Amenity – Business Activities in Rural Zones**

Mr Love spoke to the supplementary report and provided context. Preferred options report was brought to District Plan Committee (DPC) in May, there was discussion and debate on how Council should structure businesses in rural zones, around discretionary activities and rural based businesses and rural activities. Supplementary report is to provide more detail to the discussion so Council can move forward.

Key issues are determining and defining what particular activities are and aren't appropriate for the rural areas, what scale of non-rural activities are appropriate in rural areas what the effects are of these activities and how they need to be managed.

The overall approach is to refine the existing situation to better reflect the expectation of the Regional Policy Statement and strongly support the protection of rural character and productivities as a priority in rural areas. Mr Love noted that the wording and rule structure and any figures used in report are open for discussion and may change as a result of further consultation. Some integration work has been done but will be looked at in depth at the Section 32 stage. Additionally National Planning Standards may influence what terms and definitions will be used.

Terms: Introduction of rural produce selling definition, consisting of small roadside activity. Larger produce retail outlets not covered. Would maintain the rural activity definition. Introduce rural business or rural service activity type term. Two key parts: clear association with rural activities and a need to be located close to those areas.

Rural industrial definition term inclusion. Current wording is reasonably appropriate but can be refined.

Mr Love gave a summary of rule structure as per report at 3.2.

Mr Love asked for DPC direction of the term's overall structure, Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL's), Visual Amenity Landscapes (VAL's) condition exclusion and potential increase of full time equivalents (FTE's).

Cr Alexander commented he is reluctant to see increase of FTE's and provided example of overflow of a business moving to own property and not what neighbours expected in lifestyle area. If there is an increase in FTE's the scale of business could get larger with intrusion on neighbours lifestyles. Councillor Alexander added he is happy with proposal but keeping the 2 x FTE's. Would like to be enabling but without disadvantaging neighbours.

Mr Love noted this.

The Mayor noted that the issues come down to who your neighbours are and he would not like to see Council become over restrictive, yet Council has to have framework for things that are particularly destructive for neighbours. The Mayor raised issues with Inner and Outer Plains. The Mayor would like to see something around primary produce selling and asked whether this needs to be captured.

Cr Lyall added that he feels some comfort from report. Noted Springfield Farm is now Harvest Fresh. Supports report. Retail should be appropriately zoned unless selling own produce, grown on own site.

*'Mr Ward in 10.31am'*

Mr Miller added one of the key considerations that has not been factored in is changes in technology and the way retail may change such as that online.

Mr Love noted this.

The Chair summarised discussion, noting issues with FTE's and potential differences in relation to Inner and Outer Plains zones. The Chair clarified this is a report for further development, engagement and consultation.

**Moved – Councillor Alexander / Seconded – Councillor Lyall**

**Recommendation:**

"That the Committee notes the report."

"That the Committee endorses the Supplementary Report to the Preferred Options Report – Character and Amenity – Business Activities in Rural Zones for further development and engagement."

**CARRIED**

**7b. Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Rural Character and Amenity – Business Activities in Rural Zones**

No discussion was held, summary plan taken as read and accepted

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

**Recommendation:**

“That the Committee notes the summary plan.”

**CARRIED**

*‘Meeting adjourned for a break at 10.27am’*

*‘Meeting reconvened at 10.37am’*

*‘Cr Hasson in 10.37am’*

## **8a. Preferred Option Report – Kāinga Nohoanga Zone**

The Chair introduced Mr Davis and Mr Horgan from Mahaanui. Mr Horgan spoke to the presentation. Ngāi Tahu does have a desire to advance Kāinga Nohoanga from a concept and a vision to a reality. It is considered Kāinga Nohoanga developments will play a role in meeting the future housing requirements of Ngāi Tahu whānau.

Purpose of the Mahaanui report is to review whether existing provisions in Selwyn District Plan are appropriate having regard to current practice, the provisions of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS), Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan and statutory obligations. Note the report has been prepared on behalf of Nga Rūnanga. The report expresses views and preferred outcomes of Nga Rūnanga but not to be confused as a Council preferred options report.

Mr Davis provided a history of Kāinga Nohoanga noting Māori reserve has its roots in Canterbury land purchase, where as part of deal, adequate land would be set aside for residents and other economic activities for native population in the area. It also serves to facilitate the purchase of ancestral land and facilitate European settlement into the area.

Key issue was essentially systematic alienation from these areas at the hands of various and successive parliamentary legislation and urbanisation of Māori population across the country. Emphasised zone is not solely for place of residents, but also economic activities and communal related concepts, business and horticulture. Expectation of use of areas were not realised by successive governments. Working with local governments to overturn and make those agreements and aspirations realised.

For many years the Māori land was zoned under the Town and Country Planning Act as rural.

Guiding CRPS policy is that government has to give effect to its policy 5.3.4 Papakāinga housing and Marae. RPS clearly anticipates regional council will include appropriate provisions in their District Plans that enable the establishment of Papakāinga / Kāinga Nohoanga housing. CRPS makes it clear ancestral land is not limited to land remaining in Māori ownership but must be a connection between the cultural and traditions and the land.

A map was provided of Māori reserve land & alienated Māori reserve land in the Selwyn District. Mr Davis provided an explanation of this.

Mr Horgan commented about climate change and provided data from NIWA which shows that sea level rise will impact Taumutu.

Mr Horgan discussed approach taken in the Christchurch City Plan which is ahead of the Selwyn District Plan. Processes followed by Māori Land Court meant the District Plan could have more relaxed rules. Kāinga Nohoanga zones should be reserved for Ngāi Tahu. Christchurch City Council had a broad list of permitted activities. The Rūnanga- Te Taumutu would like to see a similar list of activities in the Selwyn District Plan.



Mr Horgan provided a summary of the preferred Nga Rūnanga options as per report.

Cr Lemon commented is the parcel of land heading out to Leeston, Te Taumutu the preferred land?

Mr Horgan responded it is proposed that the land be zoned for Kāinga Nohoanga, noting long term prospects for that land are not good, that is why it is important the revised District Plan approves new Māori customary land to be rezoned for Māori developments.

Cr Lemon questioned if land is developed what site coverage anticipation is there, with a range of matters coming up such as infrastructure, how will these be managed?

Mr Horgan responded there will need to be provisions in the plan to make sure requirements are developed before zone is in place.

Cr Miller asked to clarify zone on map. There are descriptors in front of us of available businesses and commercial zones, developing a whole new township potentially, how do you see that working in regards to transfer of ownership, how will this be managed and do they have to have a linkage?

Mr Horgan confirmed that the intention of businesses that do establish within a Kāinga Nohoanga zone is that they will be operated by the whānau.

Mr Davis advised language of aspiration way to connect descendants to an area, by staying there and trading there. Process itself will flesh out issues.

Cr Miller commented about rezoning in township rather than in rural areas.

Mr Davis advised establishing a concept to enable that, aspirations around existing urban areas / township is certainly on the radar given population and demographics Iwi has moved.

The Mayor commented that he supports concept. Commented about detail, if Council rezone land at Te Taumutu than it becomes unviable but money has been spent, Council will end up spending more money trying to protect what is there, taking into account seas level rise, thinking of where the best location is. The Mayor noted he was not aware that sea level would affect the Marae so much. The Mayor added he would like to see things enabled but not rush into things. Rezone new land as Māori areas – without knowing where those areas are it is a bit difficult, as a group we decided we would not rezone any land across the district as part of this process. How would Council set up the ability to allow rezoning to happen from a Rūnanga perspective more easily then what there is now but without Council taking lead on it?

The Chair responded there are key points in how this zone will get placed in the District Plan. 1. The land could be included automatically if it meets a certain set of criteria 2. The land that met the set of criteria could go through a plan change process. Not a complete obstacle to this concept. The Chair noted concept is supported by Committee.

Mr Horgan added plan change process option is one that has been adopted in the Christchurch City plan.

The Chair clarified that this is not a preferred option report and clarified with speakers if they would like recommendation wording to remain as is.

Mr Horgan agreed to this.

Mr Matunga commented in support of report. Advised the Committee that this is quite a historical moment for Selwyn District Council to consider report. Commented about 1953 Town and Country Planning Act / Treaty of Waitangi and intentions of these. Mr Matunga added that the issue is how Council progress forward on concept with the flexibility that is required, he would like to see it broadened out a bit and keep it out there. Have an enabling future for communities. Next few months as developed further will be quite critical. Create self-sustaining Māori communities.

Mr Horgan responded that Mr Matunga made a good point moving forward and he will keep point in mind. Mr Horgan added there are lots of detail on nuts and bolts of how zone is going to be implemented but not to lose sight of bigger picture.

**Moved – Councillor Lyall / Seconded – Councillor Lemon**

**Recommendation:**

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Committee endorses the Preferred Option/Recommendations for ‘Kāinga Nohoanga’ for further development and engagement.”

**CARRIED**

**8b. Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Kāinga Nohoanga**

No discussion was held, summary plan taken as read and accepted

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

**Recommendation:**

“That the Committee notes the summary plan.”

**CARRIED**

**9a. Preferred Option Report – Managing Geotechnical Risk**

Ms Ashley introduced Ms Carter on behalf of Ms Carruthers who could not be here today.

Ms Carter spoke to her report. In terms of Selwyn District the District is vulnerable to a number of natural hazards.

Ms Carter provided a summary of baseline report and an overview of issues in respect to managing Geotechnical Risk. Included assessment of current provisions in District Plan and gaps and comparison to other surrounding Council District Plans and recommendations for best practice.

Baseline report also reviewed whether the current District Plan provisions on managing Geotechnical Risk are appropriate.

The baseline report illustrated that while SDC's current approach to managing geotechnical hazards is adequate, it is not robust or up to date with current expectations of natural hazard management in district plans. Currently, emphasis in the operative Selwyn District Plan is placed on the provision of geotechnical assessments at the subdivision and plan change stages.

While this is a common theme in the district plans of surrounding district councils, the council's with more recently reviewed district plans (Christchurch City and Hurunui) and noting Waimakariri District's Plan Change 27, take a more thorough and considered approach to managing geotechnical risk. These councils have had their natural hazard provisions driven by a desire to give effect to the NZCPS and the CRPS as well as the introduction of section 6(h) of the Resource Management Act (RMA), which now requires councils to recognise and provide for the management of significant risks from natural hazards as a matter of national importance.

There is no doubt that the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence 2010-2011 has also had an important impact on the attention natural hazards is now given in the CRPS and the district plans reviewed, or partially reviewed through plan changes, since then and nationally.

RPS Chapter 11 provides framework for managing natural hazards in Canterbury. Ms Carter provided a summary of the RPS and how it related to Natural Hazards management in Local Government. RPS manages geotechnical risk through objective, policies and plans.

The preferred option report recommends option 2, and Ms Carter provided a summary of this and provided a map and explanation for Greendale fault and extent of fault line and areas around fault lines that rules could apply to. Ms Carter also provided a map of Hanmer Springs Hazard zone and fault lines to show the work of Hurunui Council identifying Natural Hazards in their plan. A thorough approach to managing natural hazards.

Ms Carter summarised recommendations as per preferred options report. Recommending Selwyn adopt a similar approach as Hurunui to the Greendale fault. In terms of liquefaction an approach similar to Christchurch City Council is preferred.

Ms Carter summarised general recommendations as per report.

*‘Cr. Morten out 11.39am’*

Ms Carter noted Environment Canterbury are in support of recommendations of reports.

*‘Cr Lyall out 11.44am’*

Ms Wati asked will climate change effect liquefaction.

Ms Carter responded yes given a rise to groundwater, sediments consolidate and explained climate change has been considered within the report and something that needs to be taken into account when provisions are developed.

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

**Recommendation:**

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Committee endorses the Preferred Option for ‘Managing Geotechnical Risk’ for further development and engagement.”

**CARRIED**

**9b. Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Managing Geotechnical Risk**

No discussion was held, summary plan taken as read and accepted

**Moved – Councillor Bland / Seconded – Councillor Mugford**

**Recommendation:**

“That the Committee notes the summary plan.”

**CARRIED**

*‘Chair advised Committee that Council will proceed with 11a & 11b first and return to 10a & 10b thereafter.’*

### **11a. Supplementary Preferred Option Report – Lighting & Glare (Night Glow)**

Ms Lojkin spoke to her report, advising that the preferred option for Lighting and Glare was brought to the Committee back in April. The recommendation of the Committee was to do further work around the protection of the Selwyn night sky from night glow.

The further work included looking again at the approaches of the Ashburton and Waimakariri Plans that include night glow provisions and discussions with Waimakariri regarding any change in approach, reviewing another four district plans around New Zealand with night glow provisions, a meeting with Mahaanui Kurataio Ltd to discuss rūnanga issues, and a review of other initiatives to protect night skies (i.e. Mackenzie Basin). This information was considered in relation to the Selwyn District context.

Ms Lojkin provided a summary of the five potential options outlined in the supplementary preferred option report.

*‘Cr Lyall in 11.40am’*

The supplementary report recommends option 5 which is to engage with the public during the consultation phase to establish whether there are particular areas of the district that should be protected and what level of control should be established through the Proposed District Plan.

Cr Hasson asked whether feedback was provided by West Melton astrological society on this report?

Ms Lojkin responded that the Canterbury Astronomical Society (CAS) were engaged with during the baseline report stage and the preferred option and supplementary preferred option report stages. CAS did not respond in relation to the supplementary preferred option report. Ms Lojkin noted that no change is proposed to the existing Lighting Area in relation to the West Melton Observatory.

Cr Alexander commented in support of the recommended option. Cr Alexander added he was disappointed in Synlait’s response and described the effects of night light reflecting from the Synlait site and commented Selwyn District Council also have lighting in reserves which contribute to night glow. Cr Alexander also commented that such lighting can be a safety issue with respect to motorists. Cr Alexander would like Council to aim for and encourage as little night glow across district as possible and noted Council is taking a step toward this by replacing street lights with LED lights.

The Mayor agreed with Cr Alexander. The Mayor added through the consultation he would like to see the opening statement to be around the value of the night sky to protect that and have stronger rules around night glow.

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

**Recommendation:**

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Committee endorses the Preferred Option for Night Glow for further development and engagement.”

**CARRIED**

**11b. Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Lighting & Glare  
(Night Glow)**

No discussion was held, summary plan taken as read and accepted

**Moved – Mr D Ward / Seconded – The Mayor**

**Recommendation:**

“That the Committee notes the summary plan.”

**CARRIED**



## **10a. Preferred Option Report – Earthworks**

Mr Boyes spoke to the report and advised Mr Tapper was the writer of the report who could not make it this morning. In terms of scope the consultant who prepared report was looking at general earthworks. A lot fell out of this scope, such as mining, mineral exploration, quarrying, noise, earthworks in sensitive locations, natural features, visual amenity landscapes, versatile soils and so on. As a result of this will raise issue with integration of other earthwork provisions at later stage of district plan review.

Mr Boyes summarised the methodology advising of the different legislation documents that were reviewed and existing provisions.

Baseline report was reviewed by Golder Associates from an air discharge perspective, Mahaanui and other relevant topic leads, the baseline report informed the preferred options report.

Mr Boyes summarised the findings: RPS: a high order document very broad and strategic, leaves the District Plan framework to set the threshold through resource consent process. LWRP: Ecan reviewed baseline report made comments in regard to consistency and overlap with District Plan and LWRP provisions. Earthworks have specific amenity related issues best managed through District Plan. Iwi management plan noted lack of consistency in terms of the cultural significance of soils, needs to be more changes in plan framework in order to provide consistency with iwi management plan. National environment standards for managing contaminated land and soil is a change to the Resource Management Act that means there are no rules required in the district plan to manage contaminated land and soil. Christchurch City Plan is useful in that it contains objectives and policies but relies on National Environment Standards in terms of rules and no other provisions. Other district plans: Ashburton and Hurunui most relevant and appropriate to compare with Selwyn District Plan.

Summary of main findings: performance standards issues is it is defined as per project as opposed to per site and at the moment it is open to interpretation of what is termed a project and if it occurs over multiple sites or a single site. One effect missing is visual effects in rural zones. No limit on height of stock piles. Not controlled though district plan. Preparation for subdivision is an issue. List of exemptions is varied which needs to be looked at. Earthworks should be controlled in the District Plan.

Mr Boyes advised committee of recommended option two as preferred option.

Cr Alexander commented about dust issues and organic matter issue, do not want organic matter exposed and causing odour.

Mr Boyes responded dust is a jurisdictional issue depending on who it lies with regional or local council. Earthworks that give rise to odour means that something else has gone wrong triggering the need for consent with regional council.

Ms Wati sought clarification about cultural monitoring.

Mr Boyes responded earthworks in culturally sensitive location falls out of scope, subject to another report.

**Moved – Councillor Mugford / Seconded – Councillor Lyall**

**Recommendation:**

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Committee endorses the Preferred Option for ‘Earthworks’ for further development and engagement.”

**CARRIED**

**10b. Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Earthworks**

No discussion was held, summary plan taken as read and accepted

**Moved – Mr D Ward / Seconded – Councillor Bland**

**Recommendation:**

“That the Committee notes the summary plan.”

**CARRIED**

## **12. Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Land Engagement Update**

No discussion was held, engagement update taken as read and accepted

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

### **Recommendation:**

“That the Committee agrees for the Council to communicate directly about the endorsed draft changes to Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Land related rules in the District Plan, to industrial landowners (Business Zone 2) only.”

**CARRIED**

*‘Meeting closed at 12.04pm’*

Minutes confirmed:

This day            of            2018

---

CHAIR PERSON