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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 2 JULY 2019 at 1.00PM.

Sarah Nichols
GOVERNANCE MANAGER

Recommendations in reports are not to be construed as Council policy until adopted by the Council

BUSINESS

BLESSING OF ARTWORK IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER

Te Maire Tau will be present to perform a blessing on the new artwork in the Council Chambers. The artwork by Nathan Pohio, was gifted to the Council by Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.

The Council Waiata group will sing “Toia Mai Te Waka Nei”.

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Conflicts of interest (if any) to be reported for minuting.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 4 June 2019

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 4 June 2019.

(To be circulated separately)

4.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 18 June 2019

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(b) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 18 June 2019.

(To be circulated separately)
MATTERS ARISING

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

7. REGENERATION REPORTS
Nil

8. REPORTS

8.1 Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahangai O Te Horapa Nohoanga – Cameron Woods (Principal Policy Analyst – District Development)

RECOMMENDATION 10 - 313

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190613083249.

(b) Receives the Recommendations from the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee to:


ii. Adopt the final version of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga as recommended by the Hearings Panel as the joint future development strategy for Greater Christchurch for the purposes of meeting the Council’s obligation to produce a future development strategy under policies PC12 to PC14 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity; and

iii. Set and incorporate the territorial authority housing targets for the district as identified in Table 2 of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga within respective district plans, in accordance with policies PC9 and PC11 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity at the Council meeting that considers adopting Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga.


(d) Adopt the final version of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga as
recommended by the Hearings Panel on Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga and endorsed by the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee as the joint future development strategy for Greater Christchurch for the purposes of meeting the Council’s obligation to produce a future development strategy under policies PC12 to PC14 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.

(e) **Set and incorporate** the territorial authority housing targets for the district as identified in Table 2 of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga within the Operative Waimakariri District Plan, in accordance with policies PC9 and PC11, of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.

(f) **Delegate** to the Chief Executive to make changes of minor effect to the final version of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga following approval from the Independent Chair of the Greater Christchurch Partnership.

8.2. **Canterbury Museum Standing Committee Membership – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190618085379.

(b) **Appoints** Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead (Finance portfolio holder) to the Standing Committee being established by the Canterbury Museum Trust Board to discuss how the $3.7m funding shortfall can be achieved prior to the 2020/21 draft Annual Plan.

(c) **Appoints** Jeff Millward, Manager Finance & Business Support to the Standing Committee being established by the Canterbury Museum Trust Board to discuss how the $3.7m funding shortfall can be achieved prior to the 2020/21 draft Annual Plan.

(d) **Notes** the appointments are also being requested independently from the other contributing authorities, the Christchurch City Council, Hurunui District Council and Selwyn District Council.

8.3. **Renewal of the DVR and Rates Collection Agreement with Environment Canterbury – Maree Harris (Customer Services Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190619086630.

(b) **Agrees** to the extension of the DVR and Rates Collection Agreement with Environment Canterbury for a term of 10 years from 1 July 2019, and authorises the Manager Finance and Business Support to sign the agreement on behalf of the Waimakariri District Council.

8.4. **Pre-Election Report 2019 – Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:
Receives report No. 190618085424.

Notes and receives the 2019 Pre-Election Report (Trim 190620086739)

Notes the 2019 Pre-Election Report is required to be prepared and available for potential electoral candidates two weeks prior to nomination closure. It will be available from 8 July 2019, noting a Candidate Information Evening is being held on 9 July 2019.

8.5. Review of Register of Interests – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190618085401.

(b) Reviews the Register of Interests content, recording any amendments.

(c) Notes a Register of Interests will be republished in the August 2019 agenda and notes the Register of Interests is listed on the Council website.

(d) Notes the Register will be next reviewed by the new Council in December 2019.

(e) Notes a Register of Interests will be activated for the Community Boards in December 2019.

8.6. Submission to the Environment Select Committee on the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill – Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.190612082497.

(b) Approves the submission on the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill.

(c) Circulates the submission to Community Boards for their information.
9. HEALTH AND SAFETY


RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 190617085189.

(b) Notes that there are no significant Health and Safety issues at this time, and that WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the PCBU duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

10. MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES AND COMMUNITY BOARDS

10.1. Kaiapoi Town Centre – Request to Undertake Footpath Improvements on Williams Street at the Charles Street intersection – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)

(Refer to attached copy of report no. 190606080258 to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting of 17 June 2019, and minutes of that meeting, Item 12.4 in this agenda)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Approves the extension of the high amenity paving to tie in with the new Riverview development boundary;

(b) Approves $22,000 of budget for the extension of the high amenity footpaths outside Riverview Development from the Kaiapoi Town Centre budget;

(c) Notes that following this allocation there will be $572,000 unallocated in the Kaiapoi Town Centre Budget and that future projects have been identified to be carried out from this unallocated budget;

(d) Notes that the timing of the work will need to be carried out to prior to the opening of the new development on 1 September 2019;

(e) Circulates this report to the Utilities and Roading Committee for information.

10.2. Risk Assessment of arsenic in groundwater for the wider Kaiapoi area – Sophie Allen (Water Environment Advisor)

(Refer to attached copy of report no. 190527075121 to the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting of 18 June 2019)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190527075121.
(b) **Notes** the scope of the risk assessment, which aims to define an area(s) where any elevated risk of arsenic in groundwater exists, which includes testing for arsenic in 50 private wells and geochemical data interpretation for the wider Kaiapoi area.

(c) **Approves** an additional budget of $37,000 from the general rate to be allocated under the Environmental Health account, against the Environmental Surveys GL (10.571.829.2465), for a risk assessment of arsenic in groundwater for the wider Kaiapoi area.

(d) **Notes** that approximately $12,000 of the allocated budget will be for Water Unit sampling and laboratory analysis of 30 private wells. Approximately $15-20,000 of the allocated budget is for a consultant to undertake data analysis, existing geochemical data review, report writing and recommendations. The remaining $5,000 is for project contingency.

(e) **Notes** that specific communication will be undertaken by WDC staff with individual landowners and general communication with the wider community following obtaining test results and the risk assessment.

(f) **Notes** that a sole source supplier will be approached for the data analysis role, due to the limited market of suppliers for the service, and existing knowledge about arsenic within groundwater in the District.

11. REPORT FOR INFORMATION FROM KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD

11.1 Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – Update Report – Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager)

(report circulated separately)

(a) **THAT** report no. 190606079809 be received for information.

12. COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 30 April 2019

454 – 457

12.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 28 May 2019

458 – 460

12.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 21 May 2019

461 - 469

12.4 Minutes of meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on 21 May 2019

470 - 479

12.5 Minutes of meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 18 June 2019

480 - 483

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the information in items 12.1 to 12.5 be received.
13. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

13.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 6 June 2019 484 – 489

13.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 10 June 2019 490 – 497

13.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 12 June 2019 498 – 507

13.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 17 June 2019 508 - 519

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the information in items 13.1 to 13.4 be received.

14. CORRESPONDENCE

15. MAYOR’S DIARY

15.1 Mayor’s Diary 28 May – 24 June 2019 520 - 522

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report no. 190619086528.

16. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

16.1 Iwi Relationships – Mayor Ayers
16.2 Canterbury Water Management Strategy – Councillor Stewart
16.3 International Relationships – Deputy Mayor Felstead
16.4 Regeneration (Kaiapoi) – Councillor Blackie

17. QUESTIONS
(under Standing Orders)

18. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS
(under Standing Orders)
19. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>Deputation</td>
<td>Waikuku Beach Campground proposal</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>Report of Craig Sargison (Manager Special Projects)</td>
<td>Potential land purchase</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.1 – 19.2</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons. To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLOSED MEETING

See Public Excluded Agenda

OPEN MEETING

20. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled ordinary meeting of the Council is at 1.00pm on Tuesday 6 August 2019 in the Council Chambers.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Council to consider the recommendations within the Recommendations Report produced by the Hearings Panel for Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga (being a future development strategy under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity and Settlement Pattern update to the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS)).

Attachments:


2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190613083249.

(b) Receives the Recommendations from the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee to:


ii. Adopt the final version of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga as recommended by the Hearings Panel as the joint future development strategy for Greater Christchurch for the purposes of meeting the Council’s obligation to produce a future development strategy under policies PC12 to PC14 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity; and

iii. Set and incorporate the territorial authority housing targets for the district as identified in Table 2 of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga within respective district plans, in accordance with policies PC9 and PC11 of the National Policy Statement.
on Urban Development Capacity at the Council meeting that considers adopting
Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update
Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga.

c) **Adopt** the Recommendations Report of the Hearings Panel for Our Space 2018-2048:
Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga,
dated 5 June 2019.

d) **Adopt** the final version of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern
Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga as recommended by the Hearings Panel
on Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai
O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga and endorsed by the Greater Christchurch Partnership
Committee as the joint future development strategy for Greater Christchurch for the
purposes of meeting the Council’s obligation to produce a future development strategy
under policies PC12 to PC14 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development
Capacity.

(e) **Set and incorporate** the territorial authority housing targets for the district as identified in
Table 2 of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update
Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga within the Operative Waimakariri District Plan, in
accordance with policies PC9 and PC11, of the National Policy Statement on Urban
Development Capacity.

(f) **Delegate** to the Chief Executive to make changes of minor effect to the final version of
Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O
Te Hōrapa Nohoanga following approval from the Independent Chair of the Greater
Christchurch Partnership.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The Greater Christchurch Partnership (GCP) has been working collaboratively to
undertake a review of the Settlement Pattern for Greater Christchurch. This project has
been structured to ensure that it enables the partner councils (being the Canterbury
Regional Council, Waimakariri District Council, Christchurch City Council, and Selwyn
District Council) to meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban
Development Capacity (NPS-UDC), and reviews and advances the existing strategic
planning context outlined in the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS)
and Chapter 6 (Recovery and Rebuild of Greater Christchurch) of the Canterbury Regional
Policy Statement (CRPS).

3.2 A key of the project has been the preparation of a Future Development Strategy during
2018/19.

**Requirements of Future Development Strategy (Our Space)**

3.3 The NPS-UDC directs local authorities to provide sufficient, feasible development capacity
for housing and business growth to meet demand in the short (1 to 3 years), medium (3 to
10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years).

3.4 A Future Development Strategy is required to:¹

- demonstrate that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the
  medium and long term;
- set out how minimum housing targets will be met;

¹ Refer to NPS-UDC Policies PC12, PC13, and PC14.
• identify the broad location, timing and sequencing of future development capacity in new urban environments and intensification opportunities within existing urban environments;

• balance the certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development;

• be informed by a Capacity Assessment, the relevant Long Term Plans and Infrastructure Strategies required under the Local Government Act 2002, and any other relevant strategies, plans and documents; and

• have particular regard to NPS-UDC Policy PA1 requiring that local authorities ensure that at any one time there is sufficient housing and business land development capacity.

3.5 NPS-UDC Policy PD3 strongly encourages local authorities that share jurisdiction over an urban area to collaborate and cooperate on the development of a joint future development strategy and the associated specification of minimum housing targets.

3.6 National guidance on producing a Future Development Strategy (herein referred to as Our Space), in reference to existing growth strategies, also encourages “amending, refreshing, and building on existing strategies to meet the particular NPS-UDC requirements rather than developing an entirely new strategy”.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Our Space Hearing Process and Report

4.1. The GCP Committee had previously, at its meeting on 13 July 2018, established a sub-committee to act as the Hearings Panel for this consultation, to be undertaken in accordance with Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002. The Hearings Panel was delegated responsibility to make recommendations to the GCP Committee on any changes considered necessary to the draft.

4.2. Further to a public consultation period from 1 November to 30 November 2018, the Hearings Panel convened to hear from submitters wishing to be heard, review the content of all submissions and make recommendations on changes to the consultation draft.

4.3. Hearings and deliberations were held between 25 February and 1 March, 11 March to 12 March, and 29 April 2019. The hearings and deliberations were open to the public to attend.

4.4. Following the consideration of submissions, hearing from submitters and receiving the Officers’ Reports, the Hearings Panel’s role was to hold deliberations and make recommendations to the GCP Committee on any changes considered necessary to the draft document.

4.5. The Recommendations Report produced by the Hearings Panel is included as an attachment to this report. The Recommendations Report includes an addendum to address some clarifications on its recommendations in relation to four matters, as requested by the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee at its meeting on 31 May 2019.

4.6. The Recommendations Report includes some recommendations to the partner councils that relate to the issues covered by Our Space but are not considered to necessitate specific changes to the draft document. These are:

4.6.1. As part of future Capacity Assessments, consider the impact of different ownership and development models as part of industrial land sufficiency in future capacity assessments.
4.6.2. As part of future Capacity Assessments, consider freight trends and demand in specific locations where there is a need to integrate land use and infrastructure.

4.6.3. Explore options for funding the social and affordable housing action plan set out in Section 6.2 of Our Space.

4.6.4. Christchurch City Council considers whether there are any options or alternatives available to facilitate, fund or enable infrastructure development at Cranford Basin that was the subject of the Cranford Basin Regeneration Plan.

4.7. The GCP Committee received and endorsed the Recommendations Report from the Hearings Panel at its meeting on 14 June 2019.

4.8. The NPS-UDC requirement to produce a future development strategy is a responsibility of partner local authorities (Environment Canterbury, Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council and Waimakariri District Council). The Greater Christchurch Partnership has developed a joint future development strategy for Greater Christchurch. In accordance with its terms of reference, the GCP Committee has endorsed the final version of Our Space. However, each partner Council is also required to make a separate decision to adopt Our Space for the purposes of their requirement to produce a future development strategy under the NPS-UDC.

Main points from Our Space

4.9. Our Space addresses various aspects of the UDS as it:

4.9.1. Focuses on the critical role of how our urban areas accommodate growth and how efficient infrastructure planning can support and guide development decisions;

4.9.2. Reaffirms and builds on existing plans that show we are already well-placed for future development over the next 30 years;

4.9.3. Balances the projected future demands of housing and business markets with the urban form that will best enable sustainable growth;

4.9.4. Recognises that how we live today will be quite different to 30 years from now, so we need to be responsive to these changes, grasping the opportunities afforded by Government policy and emerging technologies to make this transition.

4.10. In doing so, Our Space demonstrates that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term (except for Waimakariri which has a housing shortfall in both the medium and long term) while maintaining an urban form that helps achieve the UDS vision and strategic goals.

4.11. In particular, Our Space:

4.11.1. Sets out how targets for housing for the next 30 years will be met, accommodating an additional 150,000 people;

4.11.2. Identifies locations for housing growth, encouraging Central City and suburban centre living while providing for township growth in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi;

4.11.3. Reinforces the role of key centres in providing additional retail and office floorspace as required, in particular the Central City and, if needed, a transition of its surrounding light industrial zones;

4.11.4. Promotes a compact urban form, which provides for efficient transport and locates development in a manner that takes into account climate change and sea level rise;
4.11.5. Recognises the existing industrial land provision as sufficient to cater for industrial growth for some time yet;

4.11.6. Outlines a series of implementation actions and further work required to give effect to Our Space.

4.12. The key findings on the evidence presented to the Hearing Panel were:

4.12.1. The methodology for undertaking the capacity assessment to determine sufficient feasible development capacity for housing and business is adequate for the present purpose. Future changes to the methodology (including a common agreed methodology between local authorities) can be undertaken for future capacity assessments.

4.12.2. Monitoring, future capacity assessments, and analysis of population projections provide for a responsible planning framework.

4.12.3. A targeted change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement to be promulgated in 2019 will be limited to those areas identified in Our Space for future residential development. This will enable Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to provide for short to medium term capacity in their district plans.

4.12.4. No additional development areas are proposed to be added to those identified in the areas notified. The merits of any further additional areas will be considered as part of the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. This will include consideration of the vision and principles of the UDS.

4.12.5. New development in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts is expected to achieve a minimum net density of 12 households per hectare. Further work on minimum densities will be undertaken as part of the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

4.12.6. Further emphasis is required to recognise sustainability in Our Space, including recognition of the effects of climate change and seal-level rise, and the contribution of a compact urban form to transport efficiency and public transport.

**Housing Targets**

4.13. The Canterbury Regional Council, Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council and Waimakariri District Council are also required by NPS-UDC Policies PC5 to PC9 to set minimum targets for sufficient, feasible development capacity for housing and incorporate these minimum targets into their respective regional policy statement or district plans in accordance with section 55(2A) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) without using the process in Schedule 1 of the RMA.

4.14. The minimum housing targets have been consulted on as part of Our Space because the NPS-UDC requires a future development strategy to set out how the minimum targets set in accordance with policies PC5 and PC9 will be met. The targets are set out in Table 2 of Our Space.

4.15. It is recommended that this Council resolves to set its minimum housing targets in accordance with the targets contained in Table 2 in Our Space and incorporate its housing targets within the Waimakariri District Plan in addition to the resolution adopting Our Space.
4.16. The following will be the minimum housing targets for the urban areas of the Waimakariri District (within Greater Christchurch):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medium Term 2018-2028 (Households Required)</th>
<th>Long Term 2028-2048 (Households Required)</th>
<th>Total 30 Year Period (Households Required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>7,060</td>
<td>13,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.17. Table 3, page 22 of the *Our Space* document identifies that after considering the remaining housing capacity, there is a shortfall of 1,600 households in the medium term, and a further 7,060 households in the long term. Figure 15, page 37 of *Our Space* identifies the location of where the housing shortfall will be addressed (shown below in yellow). These locations are subject to a structure planning process which Council is currently developing (for East / West Rangiora and Kaiapoi) and will be completed in time to be included into the notified version of the proposed District Plan (mid 2020).

Next Steps

Change to CRPS Chapter 6

4.18. Once *Our Space* is adopted by partner councils, Environment Canterbury will coordinate the collaborative preparation of a change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS as outlined in *Our Space*.

Capacity Assessment 2020

4.19. Important elements in the schedule of further work outlined in Section 6.2 of *Our Space* include actions to improve the tools and evidence base that inform decision with regard to land use and transport integration.

4.20. The NPS-UDC requires the preparation of capacity assessment at least every three years, and so during 2019, the Chief Executive Advisory Group (CEAG) will be considering partner staff advice to ensure a consistent and robust approach is in place to undertake the next capacity assessment, due in 2020.

---

2 This urban area contains the townships of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus and Ravenswood and Rural Residential (Residential 4a and 4b) zoned land (eg Mandeville and Ohoka)
Further Work

4.21. Other key immediate actions in Our Space include developing a social and affordable housing action plan (Action 2) and undertake an evaluation of the appropriateness of existing minimum residential densities specified in the CRPS. CEAG will oversee the timely scheduling and resourcing of these actions.

4.22. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations / Wider Community
Consultation on Our Space has been undertaken in accordance with Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002.

5.2 The GCP Committee resolved at its meeting on 12 October 2018 that a draft Our Space document be released for public consultation throughout November 2018.

5.3 The following consultation process was used during 1 November to 30 November:

- Our Space was published on the Greater Christchurch Partnership’s website, and hard copies were available at the Christchurch City Council Civic Offices, Selwyn District Council Offices, Waimakariri District Council Offices, Environment Canterbury Offices, libraries and other service centres in Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri.

- Supporting material, including the draft Capacity Assessment, an options assessment, an independent peer review of Our Space, and updated feasibility assessments for Selwyn and Waimakariri, were also published on the Partnership’s website and made available in hard copy on request.

- Submissions were invited in written, electronic and audio format. An online submission form was provided that included nine consultation questions, as set out in the following table, seeking views on the key issues arising in Our Space.

- A public notice setting out details of the consultation was placed in the following publications:
  - The Press (on Wednesday 31 October and Saturday 3 November),
  - The Star (on Thursday 1 November),
  - Selwyn Times (on Tuesday 6 November),
  - The News (formerly Hurunui News/North Canterbury News) (on Thursday 8 November)

- A media release was prepared and distributed to the above local media on Wednesday 31 October. The Press also published an article that featured the consultation on Our Space on Friday 23 November.

- On 1 and 23 November, emails were sent to over 550 key stakeholders informing them of the consultation. Such stakeholders included government departments, iwi authorities, property developers, social housing providers, requiring authorities, infrastructure providers, significant landowners, residents’ associations and business associations.
• Partner councils were able to forward these communications to further stakeholders. Waimakariri District Council also separately notified landowners within their proposed future development areas by letter.

• The following four public information drop-in sessions were held during the consultation period:
  o Rangiora Town Hall, Monday 12 November, 5.00-7.00pm
  o Kaiapoi Service Centre, Tuesday 13 November, 5.00-7.00pm
  o Selwyn District Council Offices, Wednesday 14 November, 3.30-6.30pm
  o Christchurch City Council Civic Offices, Thursday 22 November, 5.30-7.30pm

• A series of targeted stakeholder engagement sessions were held on Our Space throughout November.

• A cross-sector stakeholder review workshop, facilitated by Community Public Health (CPH), was held on 26 November.

• An overview of Our Space and the consultation was presented at the following meetings:
  o Healthy Greater Christchurch Advisory Group (on Wednesday 24 October)
  o Canterbury Government Leaders Group (on Friday 2 November)
  o Waipounamu Community Housing Providers Network (on Thursday 22 November)
  o Youth Councils and Youth Voice Canterbury (on Tuesday 27 November)

• Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu appointed Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited to contribute to Our Space, ensure mana whenua cultural values are reflected and considered as part of Greater Christchurch’s settlement planning, and liaise with rūnanga kaitiaki throughout the process.

5.4 92 submissions were received, with around half of the submissions using an online submission form that included nine consultation questions to help structure responses.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

There are no financial implications directly associated with the finalisation of Our Space. Our Space does however provide a framework for additional actions, such as informing the 2019 Regional Policy Statement change and the Waimakariri District Plan Review. Existing budgets will apply to the implementation of Our Space.

6.2. Community Implications

Significant opportunities for community engagement have occurred to date. Further opportunities will be associated with the actions identified in Section 6 of Our Space. The overall implication for the community by adopting Our Space is the setting in place of an overarching strategy to guide decision make in Greater Christchurch, including spatial planning directions and informing the Regional Policy Statement change required for Waimakariri Council to address the housing shortage via the District Plan Review.
6.3. **Risk Management**

No risks are identified in relation to the recommendations.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

Not applicable.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2. **Legislation**


7.3. **Community Outcomes**

- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District.
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.
- There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna.
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.
- The distinctive character of our takiwā – towns, villages and rural areas is maintained.

7.4. **Delegations**

Council has delegated authority to adopt Our Space to meet our requirements under Policy PC12 of the NPS-UDC.
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Executive Summary

[1] This is a recommendations report on Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update (Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga). The ‘Strategy’, or ‘Our Space’ is a strategy prepared under the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA). The Strategy has been prepared by the local authorities of Greater Christchurch in conjunction with the Greater Christchurch Partnership.

[2] The purpose of Our Space is to fulfil the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) by developing a future development strategy for Greater Christchurch in accordance with Policies PC12-14 of the NPS-UDC. Our Space builds on, and is in addition to, the existing Urban Development Strategy for Greater Christchurch 2007 and the 2016 update (UDS).

[3] The settlement pattern and actions identified in Our Space provide sufficient, feasible capacity for the minimum area required to provide for short (0-3 years), medium (0-10 years) and long term (10-30 years) projections for growth.

[4] The key findings on the evidence presented to us are:

a. The methodology for undertaking the capacity assessment to determine sufficient, feasible capacity for housing and business is adequate for the present purpose. Future changes to the methodology (including a common agreed methodology between local authorities) can be undertaken for future capacity assessments.

b. Monitoring, future capacity assessments, and analysis of population projections provide for a responsive planning framework.

c. A targeted change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement to be promulgated in 2019 will be limited to those areas identified in Our Space for future residential development. This will enable Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to provide for short to medium term capacity in their district plans.

d. No additional development areas are proposed to be added to those identified in the areas notified. The merits of any further additional areas will be considered as part of the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. This will include consideration of the vision and principles of the UDS.
e. New development in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts is expected to achieve a minimum net density of 12 households per hectare. Further work on minimum densities will be undertaken as part of the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

f. Further emphasis is required to recognise sustainability in Our Space, including recognition of the effects of climate change and sea-level rise, and the contribution of a compact urban form to transport efficiency and public transport.

[5] We are satisfied that Our Space appropriately implements the provisions of the NPS-UDC.

INTRODUCTION

[6] The Greater Christchurch Partnership has produced a draft Our Space for consultation under Part 6 of the LGA.

[7] As part of this consultation, the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee established a Future Development Strategy Hearings Panel Subcommittee (the Hearings Panel) comprising the following representatives:

a. Bill Wasley, Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee Independent Chair (Chair)

b. Councillor Peter Skelton, Canterbury Regional Council

c. Councillor Sara Templeton, Christchurch City Council

d. Deputy Mayor Malcolm Lyall, Selwyn District Council

e. Councillor Neville Atkinson, Waimakariri District Council

f. Gail Gordon, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu

g. Tā Mark Solomon, Canterbury District Health Board

h. Jim Harland, New Zealand Transport Agency (non-voting representative)

[8] In accordance with our Terms of Reference, our role is to consider the content of all submissions, allowing an opportunity for submitters wishing to be heard to present
submission points to us and receive an Officers’ Report in response to the matters raised through submissions. Following the consideration of submissions, hearing from submitters and receiving of an Officers’ Report, our role is to hold deliberations and make recommendations to the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee on any changes considered necessary to the draft Our Space document.

[9] This is the recommendations report of the Hearings Panel on changes considered necessary to Our Space.

WHAT IS OUR SPACE?

[10] Our Space is a non-statutory document prepared under Part 6 of the LGA to meet the requirements of the NPS-UDC for local authorities in high growth areas to produce a future development strategy.

[11] A future development strategy is required to demonstrate that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term and set out how the minimum targets for sufficient, feasible development capacity for housing will be met. It is informed by the Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment (Capacity Assessment), and the relevant Long Term Plans and Infrastructure Strategies required under the LGA. It shall identify future urban environments and intensification opportunities and balance the certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development. Local authorities are encouraged to amend, refresh and build on existing strategies to meet the NPS-UDC requirements rather than developing an entirely new strategy.

[12] The Greater Christchurch Partnership (previously the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy Committee) has worked collaboratively over more than a decade on planning and managing urban growth and development in Greater

---

1 Tā Mark Solomon was appointed to hear submissions on behalf of the Christchurch District Health Board but was unable to attend and was excused. He did not take part in the Hearings Panel’s deliberations.

2 NPS-UDC, Policy PC12.

3 NPS-UDC, Policies PC13 and PC14. Local authorities are also required to have particular regard to Policy PA1 of the NPS-UDC.

4 NPS-UDC, Policies PC13 and PC14.

Christchurch to support the long term needs of people and communities, including through the development of the UDS and subsequent updates. Given the work that has already been done, the Partnership has been able to address the requirements of the NPS-UDC in the context of a review of the strategic land use framework provided by the UDS (Settlement Pattern Review Update).

The Settlement Pattern Review Update has focussed on the key strategic planning directions that need to be undertaken collaboratively through the Greater Christchurch Partnership to address the land use and infrastructure issues identified in the Capacity Assessment. It recognises that providing development capacity is not just about land supply and therefore also considers other more detailed planning and policy actions that will need to be implemented to realise the broader growth aspirations for Greater Christchurch.

In summary, Our Space:

a. Focuses on how urban areas accommodate growth and how efficient infrastructure planning can support and guide development decisions;

b. Builds on existing plans that show that Greater Christchurch is already well-placed for future development over the next 30 years;

c. Balances the projected future demands of housing and business markets with the urban form that will best enable sustainable growth whilst acknowledging the effects that the Canterbury earthquakes have had on the demand for, and distribution of, housing and businesses in Greater Christchurch; and

d. Recognises that how we live today will be quite different 30 years from now, so we need to be responsive to change.

Specifically, Our Space:

a. Sets out how Greater Christchurch and territorial authority targets for housing for the next 30 years will be met, accommodating an additional 150,000 people;

b. Identifies locations for housing growth through to 2048, encouraging central city and suburban centre living while providing for township growth in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi;
c. Reinforces the role of key centres in providing additional retail and office floorspace, in particular the central city and the potential for surrounding industrial zones to transition to commercial uses over time, if needed;

d. Recognises the existing industrial land provision as sufficient to cater for anticipated industrial growth; and

e. Outlines a series of implementation actions and further work required by partners, recognising that although the long term is addressed in Our Space, additional work is required to ensure that planning directions for the longer term are appropriately investigated and implemented, and effectively respond to emerging drivers of change for Greater Christchurch.

[16] The Strategy is set out in six parts which can be summarised as follows:

a. The place and context of Greater Christchurch and explanation of the NPS-UDC

b. Business and residential growth needs for Greater Christchurch

c. The key challenges facing Greater Christchurch when providing for growth

d. The plan for growth, including locations, how sequencing is to be provided for, and transport and infrastructure

e. Future actions and monitoring

[17] The Strategy is part of a policy cycle of ongoing monitoring and a frequently updated evidence base. The NPS-UDC requires local authorities to carry out a housing and business development capacity assessment on a three-yearly basis and monitor a range of indicators on a quarterly basis. When this evidence or monitoring indicates that development capacity is not sufficient in any of the short, medium or long term, local authorities are required to respond by providing further development capacity and enabling development. We set out below the legal framework for the Strategy and its development under the NPS-UDC.

[18] As indicated in the Ministry for the Environment Guidance material, as a future development strategy, Our Space will guide and inform future planning and decision-making about future urban growth, potential constraints to urban growth and
opportunities and solutions to respond to growth over the next 30 years. Our Space will be a relevant strategy for decision-makers to have regard to on any change to, or review of, the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) and district plans.

**LEGAL FRAMEWORK**

[19] The legal framework for Our Space is summarised in the Officers’ Report, and we adopt that as set out below. We have slightly re-ordered these to recognise up front the NPS requirements to prepare a future development strategy.

[20] The NPS-UDC came into effect in 2016. It directs local authorities to provide sufficient development capacity in their resource management plans, supported by infrastructure, to meet demand for housing and business land. This capacity can be provided outwards (on greenfield sites) and/or upwards (by intensifying existing urban environments).

[21] Policies PC12 to PC14 of the NPS-UDC relate to the production of a future development strategy, as set out in the following table. A key requirement of a future development strategy is that it demonstrates there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity for housing and business in the medium and long term. Our Space is the future development strategy for Greater Christchurch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC12</td>
<td>Local authorities shall produce a future development strategy which demonstrates that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term. This strategy will also set out how the minimum targets set in accordance with policies PC5 and PC9 will be met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PC13   | The future development strategy shall:  
  a) identify the broad location, timing and sequencing of future development capacity over the long term in future urban environments and intensification opportunities within existing urban environments;  
  b) balance the certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development; and  
  c) be informed by the relevant Long Term Plans and Infrastructure Strategies required under the Local Government Act 2002, and any other relevant strategies, plans and documents. |
| PC14   | The future development strategy can be incorporated into a non-statutory document that is not prepared under the Act, including documents and strategies prepared under other legislation. In developing this strategy, local authorities shall: |

---

a) Undertake a consultation process that complies with:
   o Part 6 of the Local Government Act; or
   o Schedule 1 of the Act;

b) be informed by the assessment under policy PB1; and

c) have particular regard to policy PA1.

[22] Policy PA1 is a central policy of the NPS-UDC, stating that local authorities shall ensure that at any one time there is sufficient, feasible development capacity, according to the table below, in the short (three years), medium (ten years) and long term (thirty years).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Policy PA1 Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Development capacity must be feasible, zoned and serviced with development infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0-3 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>Development capacity must be feasible, zoned and either:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-10 years)</td>
<td>• serviced with development infrastructure, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the funding for the development infrastructure required to service that development capacity must be identified in a Long Term Plan required under the Local Government Act 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Development capacity must be feasible, identified in relevant plans and strategies, and the development infrastructure required to service it must be identified in the relevant Infrastructure Strategy required under the Local Government Act 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10-30 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[23] We received legal advice from Wynn Williams as part of the Officers’ Reply Report on the requirements of the NPS-UDC for assessing sufficiency and feasibility. Development capacity, sufficient, feasible and demand are all separately defined in the NPS-UDC.

[24] Policies PA2, PA3 and PA4 also direct local authority decision making. These policies recognise the importance of infrastructure to support urban development and that in providing development capacity, local authorities need to provide for the wellbeing of people, communities and future generations, but not without considering the effects of development.

---

7 Memorandum from Wynn Williams, Legal advice to accompany any Officers’ Response to Panel questions in relation to sufficiency and feasibility dated 8 March 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA2</td>
<td>Local authorities shall satisfy themselves that other infrastructure required to support urban development are likely to be available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PA3    | When making planning decisions that affect the way and the rate at which development capacity is provided, decision-makers shall provide for the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of people and communities and future generations, whilst having particular regard to:  
  a) providing for choices that will meet the needs of people and communities and future generations for a range of dwelling types and locations, working environments and places to locate businesses;  
  b) promoting the efficient use of urban land and development infrastructure and other infrastructure; and  
  c) limiting as much as possible adverse impacts on the competitive operation of land and development markets. |
| PA4    | When considering the effects of urban development, decision-makers shall take into account:  
  a) the benefits that urban development will provide with respect to the ability for people and communities and future generations to provide for their social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing; and  
  b) the benefits and costs of urban development at a national, inter-regional, regional and district scale, as well as the local effects. |

[25] Policies PA3 and PA4 impose obligations on a decision-maker, which is defined in the NPS-UDC as any person exercising functions and powers under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

[26] While the objectives and high level policies of the NPS-UDC apply to all local authorities, some policies apply only to local authorities that have part, or all, of either a medium growth urban area or high growth urban area within their district or region.

[27] In 2016, the Christchurch urban area (which includes the towns of Prebbleton in the Selwyn District and Kaiapoi in the Waimakariri District) was defined by Statistics NZ as a high growth urban area.

[28] Given the strategic planning arrangements that already exist between Greater Christchurch councils through the Greater Christchurch Partnership, it was agreed that the urban area covered by the UDS would be the more appropriate geographic focus for the purposes of meeting the NPS-UDC requirements. This area is defined in Map A of Chapter 6 of the CRPS.

[29] The key additional NPS-UDC requirements for local authorities with high growth urban areas are:  
  a. commence quarterly monitoring of market indicators (PB6)
b. complete a housing and business development capacity assessment (PB1 to PB5)
c. produce a future development strategy (PC12 to PC14)
d. set minimum housing targets in regional policy statements and district plans (PC5 to PC11).

[30] Recognising the importance of coordinated planning and decision making, policies PD1 and PD3 strongly encourage local authorities that share jurisdiction over an urban area to collaborate and cooperate to reach agreement on the content of a capacity assessment, the specification of the minimum targets and the production of a joint future development strategy.

[31] Policies PB1 to PB7 of the NPS-UDC relate to the preparation of a comprehensive evidence base to support planning decisions. Key requirements of these policies include monitoring market indicators and completing a housing and business development capacity assessment (Capacity Assessment). The Greater Christchurch Partnership has met these two requirements, with links to the relevant outputs provided in the following table.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPS-UDC Output</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[32] The NPS-UDC requires high growth area local authorities to prepare a capacity assessment every three years and monitor market indicators on a quarterly basis. This ensures that local authorities have a robust and up-to-date base of information on which to make decisions that impact development capacity and, ultimately, the supply and price of housing and business space. When the evidence base or

---

8 The Greater Christchurch Partnership’s housing and business development capacity assessment has been held in draft form at this stage so that it may be informed by additional information provided through consultation on the draft future development strategy (Our Space 2018-2048; Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update).
monitoring indicates that development capacity is not sufficient in any of the short, medium or long term, local authorities shall respond by providing further development capacity and enabling development in accordance with policies PA1, PC1 or PC2, and PC4.

[33] Policies PC5 to PC11 relate to the setting of minimum targets for sufficient, feasible development capacity for housing. The targets should reflect the overall quantity of demand for housing identified in the capacity assessment and include the additional margins required under policies PC1 or PC2. Minimum targets must be set for the medium and long term, and be reviewed every three years.

[34] The NPS-UDC directs regional councils to incorporate minimum targets for sufficient, feasible development capacity for housing into their regional policy statements and territorial authorities to incorporate minimum targets, as a proportion of the regional minimum target, into a relevant resource management plan.9

PREPARATION OF OUR SPACE – BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

[35] When the NPS-UDC was introduced in 2016, the Greater Christchurch Partnership was well placed to respond to the requirement to produce a future development strategy given the work it had undertaken for more than a decade on planning and managing urban growth and development in Greater Christchurch to support the long term needs of people and communities. As set out in the Harrison Grierson Report, a collaborative approach to spatial planning underpinned by a robust-evidence base as required by the NPS-UDC is not a new concept for the Greater Christchurch Partnership.10

[36] The vision, principles and strategic goals of the UDS recognise the importance of leadership, partnership and collaboration and integrating environmental, land use, infrastructure, social, cultural, economic and governance goals, working with the environment, and using the best available information and evidence in decision making, policies, plans and activities.

[37] The UDS was developed with significant community consultation and set out an approach to managing growth and providing for community wellbeing in Greater Christchurch to 2041. The UDS and the Greater Christchurch Partnership played a

---

9 NPS-UDC, Policies PC5-PC11.
crucial role in coordinating and facilitating rebuild and recovery activities after the earthquakes. This included implementation of a land use framework inserted into the CRPS by the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP).

[38] Prior to the NPS-UDC taking effect in 2016, the Greater Christchurch Partnership had endorsed an update to the UDS to respond to the significant events and changes that had occurred in Greater Christchurch, particularly in relation to the Canterbury earthquakes. This did not attempt to revise the land use framework outlined for Greater Christchurch in the LURP and in Chapter 6 of the CRPS. Instead it contained a priority action relating to a comprehensive review of the UDS.

[39] Following the NPS-UDC taking effect, the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee endorsed a review of the UDS to focus on the settlement pattern aspects needed to meet the requirements of the NPS-UDC. The main objective of the Settlement Pattern Review Update was to enable the local authorities across Greater Christchurch to collaboratively review the existing settlement pattern arrangements and ensure they fulfil their statutory obligations under the NPS-UDC.

[40] A further objective seeks to ensure appropriate alignment with other planning and strategy processes, including:

a. The District Plan review underway in the Selwyn District
b. The District Development Strategy and District Plan review underway in the Waimakariri District
c. The Christchurch District Plan
d. The Greater Christchurch Transport Statement, Canterbury Regional Land Transport Plan and Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan
e. The development by councils of 2018-2028 Long Term Plans and 30 Year Infrastructure Strategies.

[41] In May 2018, the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee endorsed a scoping paper that outlined how a future development strategy for Greater Christchurch would be produced. It stated that it would be guided by the vision, principles and strategic goals of the UDS, and would represent the integrated land use and infrastructure planning response to the findings of the Capacity Assessment.

[42] It stated the principles that would shape the approach of the future development strategy as being that it:

a. Helps deliver and aligns with the vision for Greater Christchurch
b. Demonstrates a collaborative approach through leadership and partnership
c. Integrates, supports and builds on existing strategies and initiatives through an efficient, fit-for-purpose and holistic process

d. Enables a responsive approach that can address any changes to Government policy, changes arising from the drivers and disruptions that may influence urban development, and further long term spatial planning following the adoption of the future development strategy

e. Achieves the NPS-UDC requirements

f. Is informed by a robust evidence base and feedback from stakeholder and community engagement.

CONSULTATION AND THE HEARING PROCESS

[43] The Greater Christchurch Partnership prepared a draft Our Space document for consultation under Part 6 of the LGA. The Officers’ Report\textsuperscript{11} sets out the comprehensive consultation process undertaken as part of the development strategy. This included formal public consultation from 1 to 30 November 2018, stakeholder mailouts, public notices and press releases, targeted engagement and workshops, presentations and seminars and public drop in sessions.

[44] A total of 92 submissions were received on Our Space. The public hearings occupied 5 days commencing 25 February 2019. The hearings were held at the offices of the Canterbury Regional Council (CRC or Environment Canterbury), and the Christchurch City Council (CCC) in Christchurch City, as well as the Waimakariri District Council (WDC) in Rangiora and the Selwyn District Council (SDC) in Rolleston. The hearing process enabled submitters who wanted to be heard to present their submissions to us in a public forum. Where we had questions of submitters, we asked these, and also provided opportunities for clarification from the submitters.

[45] As part of our proceedings, we issued three Minutes. The first Minute\textsuperscript{12} issued on 8 February 2019 discussed potential for conflicts of interest and disclosure relating to those, with provision for any party to raise issues. No issues were raised by submitters in relation to those matters.

[46] We issued a second Minute\textsuperscript{13} on 7 March 2019 outlining matters which we considered relevant to our consideration of the Strategy, and arising from the content

\textsuperscript{11} At Section 3, pages 9-12.
\textsuperscript{12} Minute 1 of the Hearing Panel dated 8 February 2019.
\textsuperscript{13} Minute 2 of the Hearing Panel dated 7 March 2019.
of the submissions and evidence presented to us. We provided Officers with the opportunity to respond to those questions, and commenced our deliberations in public on 11 March 2019.

[47] In a third Minute issued on 11 March 2019, we invited the Chief Executives of the Partner Councils to address us in relation to outstanding matters between the Partner Councils, which they did on Wednesday 13 March 2019.

[48] At its meeting on 31 May 2019, the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee received our Recommendations Report dated 3 May 2019. At the meeting the Committee requested that we provide clarification on our recommendations in relation to four matters. The Hearings Panel met on 31 May and 5 June 2019 to deliberate on these matters. We have addressed the Committee’s request as an Addendum to our Recommendations Report and for ease of reference have incorporated our further recommended amendments to Our Space in Appendix 2.

[49] We are grateful for the assistance of both the Officers and submitters in the hearing process for providing thoughtful, informed and useful information to us. We address what we consider to be the key issues raised in submissions later in this report.

[50] We are satisfied that no party has raised with us any procedural matters in relation to the process and hearings that are not addressed in this report.

[51] This report encompasses our recommendations to the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee on Our Space. Appendix 1 sets out our recommendations and reasons in response to every submission (whether heard or not) lodged on Our Space. A copy of Our Space 2018-2048 incorporating our recommendations is attached as Appendix 2. Copies of the Minutes issued by the Hearings Panel are included as Appendix 3. The Addendum to the Report and Recommendations of the Hearings Panel dated 5 June 2019 is attached as Appendix 4.

RECOMMENDATION AND REASONS

[52] In the sections below we address the key issues raised in submissions on Our Space. In making our recommendations we have considered all material provided to us and presented during the course of the hearings. In setting out our reasons for our recommendations in this report we have not discussed all individual comments in detail, but have grouped these according to the issues raised. We have in some
cases referred to individual comments made, where doing so assists in explaining our reasoning and recommendations.

[53] In Appendix 1 to this report we have set out our recommendations in response to each of the individual submissions lodged on Our Space. Again, in setting out our reasons for the recommendations we have not discussed all individual comments in detail.

[54] The Panel adopts the recommendations in the Officers' Report unless otherwise stated.

Role and scope of Our Space considering the requirements of the NPS-UDC

[55] We asked Officers about the role and scope of Our Space considering the requirements of the NPS-UDC.

[56] They told us that the principal objective of Our Space is that the councils in Greater Christchurch meet their obligations under policies PC12 to PC14 of the NPS-UDC to produce a future development strategy, and that this is achieved through a collaborative approach guided by the comprehensive strategic planning framework that already exists for Greater Christchurch.

[57] In this context, they said, Section 1 of Our Space outlines the purpose and scope of the document. This includes “to address the need for housing and business development capacity in Greater Christchurch”, and in doing so, that “it will satisfy the requirement of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity for high growth councils to produce a ‘future development strategy’”.

[58] Officers recommended strengthening the wording in Section 1 to make it clear that Our Space has principally been prepared to satisfy the requirements to produce a future development strategy.

[59] During discussion between the Hearings Panel and Mr Matthew Bonis, a planning consultant and an expert witness for the Lyttelton Port Company (LPC), Mr Bonis mentioned that perhaps a good way of bringing clarity to the purpose of the Our Space document, which he considered was lacking, might be to strip back the content of it so that it just responded to the capacity requirements under policies PC12 to PC14 of the NPS-UDC.

---

Officers told us that they acknowledge that there are elements in Our Space that do not directly contribute to meeting the statutory requirements under policies PC12 to PC14 of the NPS-UDC to produce a future development strategy. Such sections mostly cover context and trends, cultural values and aspirations, strategic and policy background, growth challenges, and integrated land use and transport planning.

They said that while the main objective of Our Space is to ensure that the councils in Greater Christchurch meet their obligations under the NPS-UDC, sections covering wider considerations, beyond those required by the NPS-UDC, are still important for providing the bigger picture for how Our Space proposes to accommodate future housing and business needs across Greater Christchurch. These matters are considered to be complementary to, and not conflicting with, the NPS-UDC objectives and requirements. Such elements have also been included in recognition of Our Space’s broader audience, which includes a mix of stakeholders, businesses, community groups and residents that are likely to expect some consideration of such elements as part of this growth planning exercise for Greater Christchurch.

We are satisfied that the overall content and specificity of Our Space is appropriate and accept the Officers’ recommendation as set out in their reply.

Accuracy and uncertainties of projected future demand

Our Space adopts population projections that reflect recent growth trends in Greater Christchurch. The rationale for the adopted projections is set out in the Capacity Assessment. However, in short, the Capacity Assessment is based on the adoption of medium population projections for Christchurch City and medium-high projections for both Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts. This approach in the Capacity Assessment sought to “balance a desire to be ‘ahead of the curve’ when planning for growth, with ensuring that the financing and provision of new infrastructure is timely to support future growth needs.” A report published by the Ministry for the Environment and the Ministry for Innovation Business and Enterprise in July 2018 considered the demand assessment for Greater Christchurch to be best practice amongst high growth areas.

As summarised in the Officers’ Report, submitters have questioned the ability to accurately determine projected demand, particularly over a thirty year period, and

---

15 Our Space, Section 3.1, page 20.
how this might alter with changes in migration, working practices, uptake of new technologies and the impacts of affordability constraints. Submitters also questioned the veracity of the data used given Greater Christchurch’s unique circumstances following the earthquakes.

[65] Some submitters disagreed with the projected demand for specific needs and/or locations. For example, projected demand for industrial land in Rolleston and household growth in Waimakariri were considered to be under projected by some submitters. Submitters also questioned the appropriateness of the approach taken to set housing targets.

[66] During the course of the hearings, we heard from a number of submitters who were critical of the Capacity Assessment methodology. Officers have accepted that there are significant uncertainties in determining future demand. This is reflected in the NPS-UDC requirements for ongoing monitoring and review of projections and targets as part of the periodic capacity assessments. Officers stated that subsequent capacity assessments will benefit from new data and information, for example, the results of the 2018 Census and the anticipated release of new sub-regional and territorial authority household projections by Statistics NZ in 2020.

[67] Officers have not recommended any changes to the adopted projections and targets set out in Section 3 of Our Space.

[68] We address some of the specific issues raised further below. However, in general we are satisfied that the uncertainties of projecting future demand can be appropriately dealt with through the ongoing monitoring and review requirements of the NPS-UDC and the Schedule of Future Work identified in Section 6.2 of Our Space to improve the tools and evidence base underpinning Our Space. As the Capacity Assessment is updated, assumptions and projections can be amended should monitoring indicate that this is appropriate. In our view this is consistent with the requirements of the NPS-UDC which anticipates a frequently updated evidence base.

Appropriateness of methodology for determining commercial and industrial land capacity

[69] Policy PC12 of the NPS-UDC requires a future development strategy to demonstrate that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term.

[70] We heard from a number of submitters challenging the appropriateness of the Capacity Assessment in relation to commercial and industrial land and whether Our Space provides sufficient feasible development capacity for business.17

[71] In accordance with Policy PB1 of the NPS-UDC, the Capacity Assessment, in so far as it relates to business, is required to:

(b) Estimate[s] the demand for the different types and locations of business land and floor area for business, and the supply of development capacity to meet that demand, in the short, medium and long-terms; and

(c) Assess[es] interactions between housing and business activities, and their impacts on each other.

[72] When carrying out the Capacity Assessment, local authorities are required to seek and use the input of iwi authorities, the property development sector, significant land owners, social housing providers, requiring authorities, and the provisions of development infrastructure and other infrastructure.18

[73] We understand from the Officers’ Reply that engagement and consultation was clearly undertaken with stakeholders, and evidence was provided of this, including specifically, approaches to Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL) and LPC. Not only does this appear to be adequate, we consider it was comprehensive. We do note that it is unfortunate that opportunities to provide input were not fully taken up by some stakeholders.

[74] The Capacity Assessment shows a large surplus of industrial land in the Greater Christchurch area, both in the medium and long term and small localised shortfalls in commercial land that are not forecast to occur until near the end of the longer term planning horizon (2044).

[75] In the course of the hearings, while we heard from a number of submitters who were critical of the Capacity Assessment methodology, we were not given any specific

17 Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited (#73), Woolworth NZ Limited (#52), Cockburn Family Trust (#53), Christchurch International Airport Limited (#39).
18 NPS-UDC, Policy PB5.
changes to improve it. We did not receive any assessment as to the relationship of existing business with those ports and freight hubs, or information as to how land is allocated in those areas by developers, based on need. No suggestions were made for specific changes to the Capacity Assessment methodology or how that should be undertaken.

[76] Some of the concerns raised with the Capacity Assessment related to having industrial land in the right place, particularly as it related to the ability to move freight to other freight hubs such as the Christchurch International Airport, Lyttelton Port, City depot (Lyttelton Port) and the inland ports located at Rolleston.

[77] Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited asserted that the Capacity Assessment and recommendations flowing from it are fundamentally flawed as they do not allow for potential growth at and around the inland port. Ms Lauren Semple, counsel for this company, submitted at the hearing that the Officers’ Report did not adequately address the submitter’s concerns as it showed a fundamental misunderstanding of the drivers of demand. By utilising employee to floorspace/land area ratios, the demand for industrial land is underestimated as it relates to activities at i-Zone and i-Port. Mr Michael Copeland’s expert economic evidence was that having the inland port at Rolleston means that industrial land demand will be driven by freight volume growth and trends in freight handling logistics rather than population or employment growth.19

[78] In Minute 2, we asked Officers to address us further on this matter as part of their reply. They referred to the Economic Future Model (EFM) used to determine future demand for business land, that has been peer reviewed and found to be robust and appropriate in informing the evidence base that is integral to Our Space. Officers consider that the EFM approach does include a broad assessment of the anticipated drivers of growth for industry sectors relating to the inland ports at Rolleston and the Christchurch International Airport and incorporates appropriate consideration of their larger land requirements per employee. Officers also addressed existing industrial development capacity at Rolleston and the Christchurch International Airport in their Reply Report.

[79] We are satisfied with this response and note the Officers’ support for undertaking a collaborative and transparent piece of work (involving LPC, KiwiRail and CIAL) to ensure future freight needs are refined and further integrated with growth and

19 Statement of Evidence of Mr Michael Copeland at [14].
transport models operating in Greater Christchurch. This is provided for in Section 6.2 of Our Space in Items 3 and 4 of the Schedule of Future Work.

[80] We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from Officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the business land capacity and feasibility work done by the Greater Christchurch Partnership to be an example of ‘best practice’.20

[81] We accept that the Capacity Assessment is adequate for the present purpose and has been appropriately consulted on. However, as there will be improvements with any assessment model over time, we do consider it appropriate to recommend that as part of future Capacity Assessments, regard is had to demand and location of industrial and business land in close proximity to freight hubs. This will contribute to the consideration of overall capacity and sufficiency of industrial and business zoned land and may identify opportunities for consideration of specific areas feeding into the review of the CRPS.

Requests for additional land to be included for future commercial and industrial development

[82] A number of requests were received for additional land to be provided for commercial and industrial use.21 The consideration of greenfield business and industrial land is slightly different from that of residential land, as it does not have the same potential impact on intensification targets. Submitters placed emphasis on the supply of additional land keeping land prices low, and the addition of more sellers in the industrial land market increasing competition in a market that is dominated by a relatively small number of existing industrial land owners. Submitters also noted the existence of locational constraints (close to strategic freight networks) as well as the impact of ownership and development models, resulting in a lack of bare zoned land of different sizes.

[83] We received a number of submissions that opposed general greenfield expansion, however none with a particular focus on the expansion of industrial or business land. Notwithstanding that, there are effects that are created by the expansion of greenfield

---


21 Foddercube Products Limited (#47), Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited (#73), Woolworths (NZ) Limited (#52), Cockburn Family Trust (#53), Mrs Sally and Mr Ben Tothill (#40), R J Civil Construction (#35), Christchurch International Airport Limited (#39), Lyttelton Port Company (#67), Carter Group Limited (#76), Mr John Law (#92).
land for business purposes that are similar to those identified for greenfield residential land. That includes the contribution of it to urban sprawl, impacts on versatile and high quality soils, impacts on existing zoned industrial land, contribution of trip distances and private vehicle use on contribution to climate change, and impacts on the amenity of the rural land resource.

The Capacity Assessment shows a large surplus of industrial land in the Greater Christchurch Area, in both the medium and medium to long term. There are potential shortfalls in commercial space over the longer term. Officers advised that shortfalls in the long term will be met by transitioning industrial land over time and that future monitoring will identify the extent of any shortfalls. Mr Dean Chrystal, planning expert for Woolworths NZ Ltd expressed his concern with the Officers’ approach to any shortfall of commercial land in the northern quadrant of Christchurch City, being that there is sufficient inner-city industrial land available to transition to commercial use to meet longer term needs; that future monitoring will identify the extent of any shortfalls; and that other methods available to meet more localised demands in the northern quadrant without needing to expand the urban boundary would be explored as part of subsequent capacity assessments and district plan reviews. Rather, Mr Dean Chrystal noted that other methods are not available to locate a supermarket and that a supermarket would not have distributional effects on surrounding key activity centres or the central city. We agree with the Officers that changes to the urban area need to be supported by wider analysis of business development in the north. We accept the Officers’ position that opportunity needs to be provided for development of the Key Activity Centre at Northwood/Belfast, and that the proper opportunity to address this further is as part of the review of the CRPS.

Land in close proximity to freight hubs

We are, however, cognisant of the request from a number of property owners at Rolleston requesting additional land that has the ability to access a rail siding, for access to the Port of Lyttelton or the wider rail network. As noted above, we recommend that further work is done in the next Capacity Assessment in relation to demand and location of industrial and business land in close proximity to freight hubs. The next Capacity Assessment will inform the full review of the CRPS. In addition to this work, given the evidence that we have received from the Cockburn Family Trust22 and Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited23 we consider it appropriate

22 Cockburn Family Trust (#53).
that Environment Canterbury engages with these parties prior to the notification of the review of the CRPS in relation to the appropriateness of including their land within Map A of Chapter 6, in light of the results of the next Capacity Assessment.

[86] Having regard to the evaluation and reasons given above, and the responses provided to individual submissions, we are satisfied that Our Space appropriately implements the provisions of the NPS-UDC as it relates to business land capacity. We note that additional refinement of the methodology as part of the next Capacity Assessment may inform additional changes as part of the review of the CRPS.

Port of Lyttelton

[87] LPC was particularly concerned that it may have difficulty consenting development on future reclaimed land adjacent to the existing Port area, in Te Awaparahi Bay (future reclamation site). This is due to concerns that LPC’s activities on its future reclamation site will be constrained by Objective 6.2.1 and Policy 6.3.1 of the operative CRPS if the future reclamation site is not identified in Our Space such that it can be identified in Map A when the CRPS is reviewed.

[88] The geographic extent of Greater Christchurch, for the purposes of Chapter 6 of the CRPS and Our Space, is the area shown on Map A. The reclamation area facilitated by the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan is not located within the Greater Christchurch Area shown on Map A. This is because the boundary of the Greater Christchurch Area shown on Map A represents the territorial authority boundaries at the time that Map A was inserted into the CRPS. As the reclamation area was not ‘land’ at that time it did not fall within the territorial authority boundaries. Therefore, the reclamation area is not within the Greater Christchurch Area shown on Map A and the provisions of Chapter 6 of the CRPS do not apply. Likewise, the reclamation area sits outside the geographic area of focus for Our Space. On that basis, we do not consider Our Space or Chapter 6 of the CRPS to be an impediment to activities on the future reclamation site and do not consider it necessary, or appropriate, to identify the future reclamation site in Our Space.

Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the 10-Minute neighbourhood and 8-80 concept

[89] One of the key approaches in terms of developing Our Space is consideration of the strategic growth directions of the UDS and CRPS, which support development

23 Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited (#73).
around Key Activity Centres, addressed in section 5.7 of Our Space. Consolidated growth enables towns and centres to more easily provide the local facilities and services that communities need and maximises the efficiency of key transport routes and other infrastructure services. Supporting the growth and vitality of Key Activity Centres is engrained in the UDS and Chapter 6 of the CRPS which provides direction that the Central City and Key Activity Centres are the focus for commercial activity (office and retail), not just shopping malls, but also other public and community facilities such as education, health and leisure services. These centres integrate high quality public realm spaces and are well-connected by public transport services and safe cycle networks. Medium density housing in and around such centres supports their vitality and viability.

Figure 19 of Our Space encapsulates this approach through use of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’ conceptual diagram. The fundamental concept behind this is the ability for a resident to meet most of their everyday needs locally within a 10-minute journey from home, by either walking, cycling, or by public transport. The purpose behind it is to provide opportunities for modal shift away from private vehicle usage.

In the course of the hearing, we heard from several submitters supporting the 10-minute neighbourhood concept,\(^\text{24}\) as well as comments from others seeking that priorities for centres should be revisited\(^\text{25}\) or there should be identification of new centres such as a Key Transport and Economic Node (KTEN) at the Christchurch International Airport.\(^\text{26}\)

We explored with officers the concept of the 10-minute neighbourhood, as well as the 8-80 cities model, that is, making city’s accessible for those between the ages of 8 and 80 as described in the submission of Mr Hawke.\(^\text{27}\)

Officers recommended amended wording in Section 5 to provide a better explanation of Key Activity Centres and the connection with the 10-minute neighbourhood concept shown in Figure 19. We agree that the recommended amendments are appropriate.

Officers said that many aspects of the 10-minute neighbourhood are consistent with the 8-80 concept, including walkability, safe streets and places, and safe cycling

\(^{24}\) Ms Suzanne Vallance (#18), Spokes Canterbury (#41), Canterbury District Health Board (#58).

\(^{25}\) Woolworths NZ Limited (#52).

\(^{26}\) Christchurch International Airport Limited (#39).

\(^{27}\) Mr David Hawke (#10).
networks. However, they noted that whereas the 10-minute neighbourhood concept promotes accessibility as it relates to proximity, the 8-80 concept emphasises principles of accessibility as it relates to mobility and the need to provide inclusive, well-designed environments for all ages. It was the Officers’ position that these more detailed urban design principles are supported and already captured by the NZ Urban Design Protocol 20051 referenced in CRPS Policy 6.3.2, so are more appropriately addressed in local design guides produced by territorial authorities.

[95] We accept the Officers’ response to this and that no further changes are required to Our Space.

[96] We consider that the centres-based approach to providing for commercial land and floorspace remains the most appropriate to achieve NPS-UDC requirements and achieve the UDS vision and strategic goals. We note our discussion above that the refinement of data and methodologies relating to commercial and industrial land needs can be considered as part of subsequent capacity assessments and inform the monitoring and review aspects of the NPS-UDC requirements and the broader review of Chapter 6 of the CRPS.

**Sufficient feasible development capacity for housing**

[97] PC12 of the NPS-UDC requires the future development strategy to demonstrate two key outcomes in relation to housing:

a. That there will be sufficient feasible development capacity available to meet housing demands in the medium and long term.

b. Set out how the minimum targets for housing will be met.

[98] Our Space identifies the demand for housing and the associated minimum housing targets. The housing targets are being consulted on through Our Space and will be set by the Greater Christchurch local authorities and inserted into the CRPS and district plans in accordance with section 55(2A) of the RMA.

[99] In relation to demand, a comprehensive report on the demand profile for housing in Greater Christchurch was commissioned as part of the Capacity Assessment.²⁸ The report projects demand for:

a. Housing in different groups within the population (age, household composition, income);

²⁸ Housing Demand in Greater Christchurch (November 2017) prepared by Livingston Associates.
b. Different household groups translates into demand for different housing typologies (stand-alone homes; multi-unit dwellings; and apartments);
c. Private owner occupier dwellings, private rented dwellings, and social housing (rented); and
d. Housing typologies as distributed across broad locations and price points.

The report revealed common trends likely for Christchurch City, Selwyn District and Waimakariri District over the next 30 years. Officers addressed these trends in the Officers’ Report. They advised that while there is still strong demand for standalone, single storey dwellings in greenfield areas that must be supported, the Capacity Assessment clearly shows that there will be an increasing demand for smaller, more affordable dwellings that are more likely to be, although not exclusively, delivered through redevelopment and intensification of existing urban areas.

In response to these trends, Officers advised that Our Space seeks to provide a balanced approach that provides for current market demands and reflects the anticipated changes in these demands over the next thirty years. In doing so, it identifies a range of greenfield and redevelopment opportunities to support new housing and adopts an approach to housing targets that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term than would be anticipated based on the current projections.

We understand that the housing targets for Greater Christchurch over the medium and long term, together with the territorial authority apportionment of the targets over the medium term, are based on projected demands for housing identified in the Capacity Assessment. It is only the territorial apportionment of the targets over the medium term that represents a transitional approach.

Officers advised that this approach to targets seeks to respond to projected changes over the long term, rather than constraining growth in the districts to benefit development prospects and outcomes in Christchurch City.

We also understand that in accordance with the requirements of PC1 of the NPS-UDC, margins of 20% in the short and medium term and 15% in the long term have been included to provide flexibility to allow for situations when developments are not brought to the market.

As a Panel we must be satisfied that Our Space demonstrates that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in Greater Christchurch to meet demand over the medium and long term. A number of submitters do not consider that Our Space demonstrates this. Key reasons include:
a. Concerns in relation to the feasible development capacity underpinning Our Space, including the feasibility of developing geotechnically constrained land and more generally in relation to the feasibility analysis;

b. Housing choices are not sufficiently provided for and more land should be provided to increase supply and improve affordability;

c. The broad location, timing and sequencing of development is not sufficiently identified; and

d. Our Space will preclude the consideration of future changes to Chapter 6 of the CRPS and the rezoning of land.

We also had submitters concerned about urban sprawl and its associated effects. We address these matters in the following sections of our report.

Our Space identifies that the overall amount of feasible housing development capacity in Greater Christchurch is sufficient to meet demand over the medium term. However, there is insufficient development capacity in certain locations within Greater Christchurch in the medium term and overall when we consider the long term housing demand. At the territorial authority level, Our Space records that given the range of reported feasibility, capacity in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts may not be sufficient to meet demand over the medium term, while the significant capacity in Christchurch City is expected to be sufficient over the next 30 years, even with a higher share of growth apportioned to the City over the long term period.

These projected shortfalls are proposed to be met through:

a. Redevelopment of existing urban areas in Christchurch City;

b. Existing greenfield areas in Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts; and

c. New greenfield and redevelopment areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts.

A change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS is proposed to be progressed at the earliest opportunity to enable the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts the flexibility to respond to identified housing need. Details of this change are set out in the Schedule of Future Work in Section 6.2 of Our Space.

Additional capacity is to be directed in the first instance to the key towns of Rolleston, Kaiapoi and Rangiora in support of the public enhancement opportunities mentioned in Our Space. This is proposed to occur in the future development areas identified in Figures 15 and 16 of Our Space. **It is important to note that these areas are**
located within the projected infrastructure boundaries identified on Map A of Chapter 6 of the CRPS and are totally consistent with the long term growth strategy in the UDS. We understand that these new areas will provide much of the capacity required over both the medium and long term. A 2019 change to the CRPS would ensure that land can be rezoned to meet medium term capacity needs, and the longer term will be further considered as part of a comprehensive review of the CRPS. We note for completeness that Policy PA1 does not require development capacity over the long term to be zoned, it need only be identified.

Feasibility analysis

[111] We received evidence from a number of submitters in relation to feasibility. Mr Adam Thompson, an urban economist, undertook a feasibility analysis for GFR Rhodes Estate & Larson Group and Suburban Estates, Doncaster Developments and Sovereign Palms. Mr Thompson assessed the feasibility of capacity in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts. He concluded that there is an immediate need for additional land in Prebbleton and Rolleston and that for the long term there is insufficient capacity to meet the housing targets within Prebbleton, Rolleston and Lincoln. He considered that there is an immediate need for additional land in Rangiora and Kaiapoi and for the long term, out to 2048, there is insufficient capacity to meet the housing targets.

[112] CCC also raised concern in its submission that there was a misalignment in Our Space between the figures used for housing development capacity over the medium term and the need for intervention. This particularly relates to the figures included in Table 3 of Our Space for the Selwyn District. Officers addressed feasibility in the Officers’ Report and further in their Reply Report in response to questions from the Hearings Panel.

[113] Officers noted that the text associated with Table 3 highlights that the feasibility assessments undertaken for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts produced a wide range of results, and that further work to improve modelling tools was underway. Updated feasibility assessments were completed for the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts prior to the Our Space consultation, but too late to be incorporated into the Our Space document, so were included in the consultation as supporting material. Officers considered that to ensure alignment between the

29 GFR Rhodes Estate & Larson Group (#60).
30 Suburban Estates Ltd, Doncaster Developments and Sovereign Palms Ltd (#51).
assessments of sufficient, feasible development capacity and any related proposals in Our Space, it is necessary for a final Our Space document to be based on the best available information.

[114] Officers noted that further and ongoing refinement of the feasibility tools for Greater Christchurch, as well as discussions with landowners and developers, is considered to be critical to supporting a sound understanding of feasible development capacity and should be incorporated as part of the next Capacity Assessment due in 2020.

[115] The Officers also noted the timing of the next Capacity Assessment and the potential opportunity for it to inform any changes to district plans to address shortfalls in development capacity. It is recommended that the proposed change to the CRPS should proceed to provide the policy mechanism to respond to any identified needs in the District Plan reviews. The findings of the next Capacity Assessment will inform the review of the CRPS and any subsequent changes to the district plans.

[116] In summary, Officers recommended the following changes:

a. Amended wording for Section 3.2, paragraph 3, p. 13 to identify the range of feasible development capacity figures produced for Selwyn and Waimakariri, as well as for Christchurch City, and the rationale for adopting a specific feasible development capacity figure for each territorial authority as the basis for determining sufficiency.

b. Retain the current proposal to change the CRPS to enable additional development capacity in Selwyn and Waimakariri to help address the identified capacity shortfalls over the medium term.

c. Additional wording in Section 3.2 that highlights that further and ongoing refinement of the feasibility tools will be undertaken by constituent partner councils and incorporated as part of the next capacity assessment due in 2020, and that this next capacity assessment should be used as the basis for making any zoning changes to address capacity shortfalls as part of the District Plan reviews for Selwyn and Waimakariri.

[117] Officers advised that while the findings from Mr Thompson’s evidence differ from that reported in the Capacity Assessment and Our Space, the detailed methodology and assumptions included as part of Mr Thompson’s assessment were not provided. This has limited the ability for the Officers, and the Panel, to test the veracity of the findings.
Conversely, an economic expert engaged by the NPS-UDC team in the Ministry for the Environment when developing the NPS-UDC and associated guidance, has extensively reviewed the methodology, costings and assumptions that form part of the Capacity Assessment and considered the work robust and appropriate in informing the evidence base that is integral to Our Space. Like the Officers, we have weighed the evidence provided by submitters against the Capacity Assessment and findings of the peer review, and are satisfied that no further changes are required to Our Space.

We also note the legal advice provided to the Hearings Panel on the requirements of the NPS-UDC for assessing sufficiency and feasibility. We note from that advice that whilst the NPS-UDC lists matters that must be addressed when assessing demand, the weight to be given to each matter is at the discretion of the local authority.

Likewise, when assessing what is feasible, in order to assess whether or not something is commercially viable, a decision maker has the discretion to give the factors listed whatever weight it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

When assessing sufficiency, Policy PB3 of the NPS-UDC requires the consideration of relevant plans and proposed and operative regional policy statements, and Long Term Plans and Infrastructure Strategies prepared under the Local Government Act 2002 as a minimum requirement, but goes on to list a number of other matters for consideration. Again, the list is not exhaustive and local authorities are able to determine whether other factors would assist in the estimate of sufficiency. The matters that are listed in Policy PB3 are illustrative not exclusive and although those matters should be considered by the local authority, the weight to be attributed to those matters is at the discretion of the local authority, as is the ability to consider other matters perceived to be relevant.

We agree that the decision as to the appropriate balance between the matters in Policy PB3 rests with the local authority. We also reiterate that the NPS-UDC anticipates that the evidence base used to inform planning decisions will be frequently updated.

---


32 NPS-UDC, Objective OB1 seeks a robustly developed, comprehensive and frequently updated evidence base to inform planning decisions in urban environments.
We also note that Mr Thompson’s assessments were narrow, based solely on supply within specific townships and did not consider a broader scale recognising the interconnected nature of the Greater Christchurch environment. We do not consider that the NPS-UDC anticipates such a narrow approach. We were encouraged and have chosen to take a broader, and more strategic view, and consider that it is appropriate to look wider across all of Greater Christchurch, noting that the policies in the NPS-UDC are not restricted to the boundaries of the Urban Area. It is only the Officers who have provided an analysis of the entire area.

We consider that it is appropriate to consider Greater Christchurch as a whole housing market, albeit that there might be higher demand in some areas than others that will lead to price differences whether they are within the bounds of Christchurch City, or within the townships of the Waimakariri and Selwyn Districts. This properly reflects the co-ordinated approach that is strongly encouraged by the NPS-UDC. We do not agree with Mr Adam Thompson’s proposition that growth must be catered for in every location where there is demand, particularly when the demand for housing can be met by supply elsewhere. The NPS-UDC does not prescribe the level of detail at which ‘different locations’ is to be assessed. Nor does it direct where or how shortfalls of development capacity are to be met.

We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from Officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the housing demand assessment undertaken by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’. The report recognises that more could be done regarding setting out assumptions around feasible development, but throughout the document, this appears as a recommendation for future capacity assessment reports.

**Geotechnical constraints**

A number of submitters raised the issue of feasible development not taking into account the geotechnical constraints on land. Another submitter addressed a requirement to improve land that was currently considered TC3 following the Canterbury earthquakes as part of subdivision and the costs associated with it.

---


34 Mr Lloyd Bathurst (#1), Inovo Projects (#29), and Suburban Estates Ltd, Sovereign Palms Ltd and Doncaster Developments (#51).
meaning that some development was not economically feasible. Mr Lloyd Bathurst, a submitter on Our Space, further noted that matters relating to liquefaction had not been adequately identified on the hazard constraint maps.

The Officers’ position was that geotechnical constraints on land had already been taken into account as part of the Capacity Assessment. They noted that this was outlined in the technical appendices of that assessment, for housing development capacity, and modelling incorporated high-level subdivision costs specific to Greater Christchurch and for each Greenfield Priority Area. The costs were provided by Harrison Grierson, an engineering company with significant local experience. The Harrison Grierson assessment included:

- Overall land preparation costs including excavation, filling and other ground preparation. The costs associated with site preparation recognised the variable nature of soils, the assumed TC rating, risk of contaminated soils and effects of (high) groundwater.
- The cost, per linear meter, for roads, waste water, local stormwater and water connections.
- The costs associated with any larger scale stormwater mitigation, such as retention basins and treatment reserves. Where appropriate this would be calculated as a Development Contribution discount (i.e. the cost would be captured).
- Costs and fees associated with connections to trunk infrastructure and the provision of other non-Council infrastructure and services (e.g. power and telecommunications).
- Costs and fees associated with consenting, including final sub-division consent, adjusted for the approach adopted by each Council to charging for such services.
- An estimate of lot yield which will be used to calculate likely development contributions payable (less discounts for infrastructure works).
- Costs associated with marketing and advertising of new subdivisions.
- Other professional fees and costs not captured elsewhere.

35 Gillman Wheelans (#19).
The Officers advised that geotechnical considerations were also factored into the feasibility modelling for redevelopment capacity in existing urban areas of Christchurch City. That assessment was undertaken by quantity surveyors WT Partnership who, Officers advised, have extensive experience of advising on property redevelopment costs in the Christchurch market.

We accept that the question of feasible development is appropriately assessed in relation to geotechnical constraints, and what is determined as ‘feasible’, and that the Capacity Assessment is fit for our purpose. In addition, we note that the economics relating to the ability to remediate or rehabilitate land will change over time, and could well depend on land market fluctuations, remediation techniques, the original purchase price of bare land, and holding costs. Monitoring undertaken by the Greater Christchurch Partnership will be able to better flesh this out over time, which will inform future Capacity Assessments and provide historical information as to uptake.

In relation to the impact of geotechnical constraints on yield, we observe that net density for Greater Christchurch, as defined in the CRPS, specifically excludes areas that are geotechnically constrained from the requirements of net density policies as follows:

Net density means the number of lots or household units per hectare (whichever is the greater). The area (ha) includes land for:

- Residential purposes, including all open space and on-site parking associated with residential development;
- Local roads and roading corridors, including pedestrian and cycle ways, but excluding State Highways and major arterial roads;
- Local (neighbourhood) reserves.

The area (ha) excludes land that is:

- Stormwater retention and treatment areas;
- Geotechnically constrained (such as land subject to subsidence or inundation); [our emphasis]
- Set aside to protect significant ecological, cultural, historic heritage or landscape values;
- Set aside for esplanade reserves or access strips that form part of a larger regional or sub-regional reserve network;
- For local community services and retail facilities, or for schools, hospitals or other district, regional or sub-regional facilities.
Given the requirements to meet certain densities, this information will be included with any future rezoning proposals and outline development plans, so it is easily monitored.

We are satisfied that the issue of geotechnically constrained land is adequately addressed in the assumptions behind the capacity assessment and CRPS, and no changes are recommended to Our Space in relation to these matters. We are satisfied that continued monitoring will help to develop a better picture of the impact of residential yield in greenfield priority areas and future development areas.

Management of densities in greenfield priority and future development areas

We had a range of submissions, seeking higher densities, particularly in relation to the settlements of Rolleston, Kaiapoi and Rangiora while other submissions sought greater flexibility in the density requirements.

Officers reconfirmed their view that the evidence base to support any change is not yet sufficient and that a specific and timely piece of work is required to establish a robust and agreed position on this matter. They noted that Policy 6.3.7 of Chapter 6 of the CRPS sets minimum net densities and does not foreclose the opportunity for higher densities in greenfield areas through collaborative discussions between councils and landowners/developers to reflect specific market conditions or other relevant circumstances. They told us that this approach is encouraged by Officers in the interim ahead of resolution of this matter.

We have considered a wide range of submitter views and evidence on this matter, and carefully considered that in relation to Future Development Areas, there is the possibility of a policy ‘gap’ in terms of minimum densities. Christchurch City Council considered that a minimum of 15 households per hectare in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi would be appropriate. We heard from a number of developers who, in response to questions from the Hearings Panel, considered that 12 households per hectare was reasonably achievable, while others considered 10 households per hectare provided flexibility. We heard from others again who considered that lower densities might be required because of the presence of TC3 land.

36 Mr David Hawke (#10), Mr Andrew Long (#13), Mr Michael Steadman (#014), Spokes Canterbury (#41), Mr Brendon Harre (#70), Christchurch City Council (#74).
37 Mr Ivan Robertson, Mr Lindsay Blackmore and Mr Malcolm Main (#23), Gillman Wheelans (#19), Cathedral City Developments (#38), Mr David Tipple and Mr Barry Gallagher (#25), Inovo Projects (#29), Malc Dartnell (#81), Scarborough Hills Properties (#65).
Officers recommended amendments to the Schedule of Future Work in Section 6.2 to signal a commitment to undertake an evaluation of minimum greenfield area densities and amendments in Section 5.3.

In response to our request in Minute 3, the Chief Executives of the local authorities presented to us in relation to the density provisions that should apply to the future urban development areas in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts. The Chief Executives of Environment Canterbury, Selwyn District Council and Waimakariri Council recommended that Our Space direct an increase to the minimum density provisions in the Future Urban Development Areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri by 20 percent to 12 households per hectare as the basis for structure planning now being undertaken by those Councils and to be reflected in their respective District Plan Reviews due for notification in 2020. The Chief Executive for Christchurch City Council reiterated her Council’s position regarding the Christchurch City Council’s preference for 15 households per hectare.

The Chief Executives recommended that the Greater Christchurch Partnership work collaboratively over the next year to review and agree appropriate future density settings across Greater Christchurch to inform not just the District Plan reviews, but to also provide guidance on how density matters should be progressed as part of the full CRPS review comparable to transition paths to higher densities evident in other high growth council contexts. This would include the Greater Christchurch Partnership agreeing to a consistent methodology being used by all Greater Christchurch local authorities when completing required capacity assessments. The Chief Executives provided proposed replacement actions to achieve this in Our Space.
We also requested from Officers additional tables that would show scenarios should
density be managed differently in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts. This is
included below:

Selwyn: Long term shortfall: 5,475

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical additional capacity enabled in existing urban areas*</th>
<th>Density scenarios and anticipated yields from FDAs^</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Density 10 hh/ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Waimakariri: Long term shortfall: 7,675

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical additional capacity enabled in existing urban areas*</th>
<th>Density scenarios and anticipated yields from FDAs^</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Density 10 hh/ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Subject to enabling this additional capacity via the District Plan Review and using other
mechanisms outside of the District Plan to encourage infill/intensification development. Whilst
more theoretical capacity may be enabled through District Plan Reviews, robustly calculating
feasibility is also limited by a lack of comparable development that provides data (e.g. house
sales) within zoned areas.

^ This is derived from a total ‘gross’ hectare and does not take into account infrastructure
requirements and structure planning that may reduce the developable area and total dwelling
count.

The figures are dependent on additional capacity being made available within
existing urban areas via intensification. That might include up-zoning, provision of
minor units, retirement village development, elderly persons housing, and
subdivision.

We are conscious that there is a potential for a policy gap for future development
areas, as the current provisions of the CRPS only apply to greenfield priority areas,
and that it is appropriate that we signal a minimum net density of 12 households per
hectare for residually zoned land in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts falling
within the Greater Christchurch area. This is intended to be determinative until such
time as further evaluation and evidence is prepared as part of the full review of the
CRPS. We are comforted by the Chief Executives’ commitment to addressing these
issues and are satisfied that in the mix of evidence received during the hearing, such
a statement in Our Space, together with amendments to items in the Schedule of
Future Work are both necessary and appropriate.

[142] We also consider that the figures provided to us by Officers are useful, and that they
are included in Our Space at the end of Section 5, with an additional note that it is
expected that a minimum density of 12 households per hectare will be achieved for
new greenfield priority areas and future development areas as part of the district plan
reviews, until such time as the CRPS is reviewed.

[143] We recommend that along with the reference to minimum net densities in the areas
indicated above, the definition of net density in the CRPS is also referenced in Our
Space.

**Monitoring and review and how this relates to feasibility and uptake**

[144] We asked Officers to address monitoring and review, and how this impacts on
feasibility and uptake. They re-iterated that Section 6 of Our Space identifies the
preparation of a new Capacity Assessment and regular monitoring of urban
development indicators in the future work of the Greater Christchurch Partnership.
They advised that this is a specific obligation on local authorities as set out in the
objectives and policies of the NPS-UDC.

[145] Importantly, they noted that there are other existing monitoring processes already
committed to and undertaken by the Greater Christchurch Partnership and partner
agencies that will complement the specific NPS-UDC requirements. For example, a
comprehensive outcomes monitoring framework already exists for the UDS. That
framework reports progress towards strategic goals and outcomes tracked using a
series of urban, environmental, community and economic indicators. They noted
further examples such as the Canterbury Wellbeing Index, which brings together
information about community wellbeing in Christchurch, Selwyn and Waimakariri, and
the monitoring and review requirements of the CRPS and District Plans relevant to
aspects of Our Space.

[146] Officers recommended an amendment to Our Space section 6.4 Research and
monitoring, as follows:
The Partnership publishes quarterly monitoring reports to track a series of core urban development indicators for Greater Christchurch. To improve our understanding of local market trends, the scope of these monitoring reports will be reviewed and expanded where appropriate to incorporate additional indicators. Monitoring trends in Greater Christchurch’s residential, commercial and industrial markets are particularly important given the disruptions caused by the earthquakes, and the new normal that is being established as the recovery and regeneration effort progresses. It is important that this monitoring integrates with other monitoring processes at local and regional levels that will collectively help assess the achievement of the strategic goals of the UDS.

[147] We consider that this is an important aspect of addressing a number of submitters’ concerns regarding how feasibility and uptake is addressed through the implementation of Our Space. As time progresses, there will be continual improvement of Capacity Assessment methodology, which will increase the accuracy of forecasting and determining sufficiency of zoning/identification for future urban activities. We accept the Officers’ recommendations in relation to this.

**Housing choices - Location and type of housing**

[148] A number of submitters have raised concerns that Our Space does not sufficiently provide for choices that will meet the needs of people and on that basis Our Space does not meet the requirements of Policy PA3 of the NPS-UDC.

[149] Submitters have provided evidence that demand is not being met in particular locations, particularly in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts, and that large lot and rural residential choices are not being provided for. We have addressed the appropriateness of the Capacity Assessment methodology in relation to demand above and turn now to consider Policy PA3.

[150] It is necessary to consider Policy PA3 of the NPS-UDC as a whole. Policy PA3 provides:

> When making planning decisions that affect the way and the rate at which development capacity is provided, decision-makers shall provide for the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of people and communities and future generations, whilst having particular regard to:

- a) Providing for choices that will meet the needs of people and communities and future generations for a range of dwelling types and locations, working environments and places to locate business;

- b) Promoting the efficient use of urban land and development infrastructure and other infrastructure; and
c) Limiting as much as possible adverse impacts on the competitive operation of land and development markets.

[151] As a non-statutory document prepared under the LGA, Our Space will be a relevant consideration for decision makers on RMA documents including the CRPS and district plans and therefore will have some influence on the way and the rate at which development capacity is provided in those documents.

[152] First and foremost, Policy PA3 requires decision-makers to provide for the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of people and communities and future generations. In doing so, decision-makers are required to have particular regard to the matters listed in clauses (a) to (c) of Policy PA3.

[153] We consider that Our Space seeks to ensure that housing needs and preferences for current and future residents are met. This is clearly set out in the approach to housing demand and minimum housing targets in the Capacity Assessment, Our Space and the Officers’ Report.

[154] Our Space also recognises that there are other key growth issues for Greater Christchurch, including recognising post-earthquake trends and anticipating future drivers, integrating land use and transport planning and promoting a sustainable urban form that protects the natural environment, rural character and versatile soils. These contribute to the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of people and communities and future generations.

[155] In addition to the number of submitters seeking the identification in Our Space of additional greenfield priority areas or future development areas, rural residential and large lot development, we also received a number of submissions opposing further greenfield development. The reasons for not wanting greenfield development included the contribution it can make to urban sprawl, impacts on versatile and high quality soils, impacts on intensification in the central city, contribution of trip distances and private vehicle use to climate change, and lower densities encouraging private vehicle usage rather than transport modal shifts to cycling.

[156] We consider that the Our Space approach strikes an appropriate balance between the matters listed in clauses (a) to (c) of Policy PA3 in order to achieve the overall wellbeing outcomes.

[157] Submitters have also referred us to the requirements of Policy PA4 which provides matters that decision-makers shall take into account when considering the effects of urban development. To the extent that this policy is relevant to our considerations as
part of Our Space, we consider that the costs and benefits of urban development as set out in Policy PA4 have been taken into account.

**Provision of social and affordable housing (Social and affordable housing action plan)**

Social and affordable housing was an issue for a number of submitters we heard, as well as other submitters that were not heard. We address the individual submissions on these matters in Appendix 1, however we asked Officers about the social and affordable housing action plan, particularly in relation to the submission of Te Waipounamu Community Housing Network. We considered that more information and action around this matter would provide some relief to those submitters.

Officers advised us that the action plan relates to Item 2 in the Schedule of Future Work outlined in Section 6.2 of Our Space. This states that the timeframe for developing the social and affordable housing action plan as being 2019-2020. Officers said the detail of the social and affordable housing action plan would become clear by implementing this action. However, should the Panel wish to provide additional clarity on this matter the following process steps and timeframes could be included as bullet points in Item 2:

- an MOU with the Greater Christchurch Partnership and the Network - July 2019
- A project plan and project lead resource - August 2019
- A good practice and/or barriers research component - October 2019
- A forum and or consultation component - December 2019
- A draft action plan - February 2020
- Integration and alignment with District Plan Reviews - April 2020
- Integration and alignment with Annual Plans - June 2020

They noted that the development of this social and affordable housing action plan is not currently included in the 2019/20 Annual Plans of Partner Councils so the necessary staff and financial resources to undertake this work would need to be

---

38 Mr Lloyd Bathurst (#1), Druclilla Kingi-Patterson (#5), Mr David Hawke (#10), Te Waipounamu Community Housing Network (#16), Grassmere Residents (#54), Canterbury District Health Board (#58), GFR Rhodes Estate & Larson Group (#60), Martin Pinkham (#61), Brendon Harre (#70).

39 Peter Wells (#7), Pat McIntosh (#12), Andrew Long (#13), Christchurch City Council (#74), Wayne Phillips (#90).
confirmed as soon as possible. They said that given the subject matter Community Housing Aotearoa (CHA) could be approached to assist with resourcing and/or delivery of the development of the action plan.

[161] We agree that the wording submitted to us is appropriate for inclusion in Our Space.

**Identification of broad location, timing and sequencing of development**

[162] Our Space is required to identify the broad location, timing and sequencing of future development capacity over the long term in future urban environments and intensification opportunities within existing urban environments. It needs to balance certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development.

[163] Some submitters considered that future development capacity is not sufficiently identified, suggesting that further areas should be mapped within Our Space.

[164] Figure 12 of Our Space sets out that housing demand will be met through redevelopment and greenfield areas. Figure 16 in Our Space identifies the Existing Urban Area together with existing Greenfield Priority Areas and Special Housing Areas. It also identifies the proposed locations of future development areas in Greater Christchurch.

[165] We asked Officers about the mapping notations under Figure 16 and for their opinion on the potential for confusion of this figure with Map A in the CRPS. We heard from a number of submitters who were concerned that Figure 16 would become Map A, with no flexibility for due consideration of merits for additional land as part of future RMA processes such as the review of the CRPS.

[166] Officers responded that they heard the concerns raised by submitters regarding the potential for confusion and misinterpretation due to similarities between Figure 16 and Map A.

[167] They told us that Figure 16 was intended to show the location of the future development areas identified in Our Space to help address projected housing capacity shortfalls for the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts, for the purposes of meeting the ‘broad location’ requirements of the NPS-UDC.

---

40 NPS-UDC, Policy PC13(a).
41 NPS-UDC, Policy PC13(b).
They said it was not intended that Figure 16 would ‘set in stone’ the extent of changes to Map A in the future or preclude the consideration of minor boundary adjustments and/or other changes to Map A through separate RMA processes. Our Space would be a relevant consideration for decision makers in subsequent RMA processes as a strategy prepared under other Acts (Sections 66(2)(c)(i) and 74(2)(b)(i) of the RMA respectively). Whilst it is intended that Our Space provides some direction to inform such processes, Figure 16 would not be determinative. In the light of concerns raised by submitters, Officers recommended amending the title of Figure 16 and the wording in Section 5.3 to clarify this. We agree with the intent of the Officers’ recommendation and consider that Figure 16 should be identified as being ‘indicative only’ and that corresponding amendments are made in Section 5.3.

As discussed above, the areas identified in Figure 16 are likely to address medium and long term shortfalls in capacity. The location of any additional areas required is to be considered as part of the full review of the CRPS and through district plans and structure planning. This is provided for in the Schedule of Future Work in Section 6.2.

We also heard from a number of submitters concerned with staging and release of their land for development. Some submitters considered that Our Space does not sufficiently identifying the timing and sequencing of development. In addition, several submitters sought that their land be released at the earliest opportunity or brought forward in time, including that land identified as proposed future development areas in Figures 15 and 16 of Our Space be included instead as Greenfield Priority Areas.

Officers addressed the sequencing and staging of development in the Officers’ Report. They set out that Our Space does provide some high-level sequencing for the quantum of development capacity over the medium and long term by stating that the housing targets represent the development capacity that each council will seek to enable over the medium and long term. Officers considered that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use if enabled to do so through a change to the CRPS. This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas.

______________________________

Officer Reply Report, Question 12, page 17.
[172] Officers recommended a number of amendments to Our Space to further clarify how sequencing is to be addressed:\(^\text{43}\)

*Amended wording for Section 5.5, p26*

Future growth areas identified in Figure 15 and 16 will require more detailed planning, technical assessments and consultation with landowners to determine more specific staging of development. *Existing policies in Chapter 6 of the CRPS already provide clear direction which these detailed planning processes must give effect to, particularly Policies 6.3.2 to 6.3.7. They ensure the staging of development considers how to support good urban design, align with infrastructure needs and integrate with existing urban areas.*

*Amended wording for Section 5.5, paragraph 3, p26*

Associated policy wording is proposed to complement a change to the CRPS Map A. *This will enable District Plan Reviews for Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts to, over the medium term, zone and otherwise enable development capacity in accordance with meeting the medium term housing targets incorporated in the CRPS. Reviews of targets and the sufficiency of development capacity are part of periodic capacity assessments and enable the CRPS and district plans to remain responsive to demonstrated need.*

We consider these amendments to be appropriate to meet the requirements of the NPS-UDC.

[173] Officers also provided further explanation to address what they considered to be some confusion amongst submitters and the view that future development areas in Our Space are only identified for the long term period. They confirmed that the term ‘Greenfield Priority Area’ is a product of the recovery timeframes associated with the Land Use Recovery Plan. Most Greenfield Priority Areas have already been zoned in district plans and it is intended that the change to the CRPS in 2019 will enable the Partner Councils to zone and otherwise enable a portion of future development area land necessary to address any sufficiency shortfall for the relevant medium term period identified through periodic collaboratively prepared Capacity Assessments.

[174] We are satisfied that this explanation appropriately addresses submitters concerns regarding the identification of their land as Greenfield Priority Areas.

\(^{43}\) Officers’ Report dated 8 February 2019 at page 28.
Requests for additional land to be included for future residential development

Many submissions sought to have additional areas identified for future residential development. These must be balanced against a number of submissions requesting that we limit expanding into new or additional greenfield areas.

The key reason for suggesting additional greenfield priority areas or future development areas was that the methodology for determining capacity through the Capacity Assessment undertaken in 2018 was flawed and that it did not provide a suitable evidential base for our decisions. We have addressed the appropriateness of the Capacity Assessment earlier in this report.

In addition to that, submitters considered that their individual circumstances had merit, given that their developments were serviceable, proposed on suitable land, could be master-planned because their sites were under single ownership or owned by a few, were contiguous with existing urban areas, that the targets in the NPS-UDC should not be considered minimums, and that non-inclusion of their land was an error. In addition, they said that provision of their land would increase supply, and therefore improve affordability. Ms Helen Broughton, a submitter on Our Space, also said that her preference was to provide greenfield development rather than intensification, as intensification would have an adverse impact on the character of her immediate area on the northern side of Riccarton Road.

As set out above, the reasons for not wanting greenfield development included the contribution it makes to urban sprawl, impacts on versatile and high quality soils, impacts on intensification in the central city, contribution of trip distances and private vehicle use to climate change, and lower densities encouraging private vehicle usage rather than transport modal shifts to cycling.

44 Mr Lionel Green (#21), Mr David Tipple and Mr Barry Gallagher (#25), Cathedral City Developments (#38), Mr Ernst Frei (#59), Cashmere Park Trust (#15), Dalkeith Holdings Limited (#20), Scarborough Hills Properties (#65), Mrs Sue and Mr Grant Poulney (#50), Spark Family (#6), Bellgrove Family Trust (#9), Oderings Nursery (#30), Mr Kevin Williams and Ms Bonnie Williams (#72), CJFA Holdings Limited (#24), Ellis Darussette Limited (#26), GFR Rhodes Estate and Larson Group (#60), Suburban Estates Limited, Doncaster Developments Limited and Sovereign Palms Limited (#51), Gillman Wheelans (#19), Ms Sharon Jones (#22), Mr Ivan Robertson, Mr Lindsay Blackmore and Mr Malcolm Main (#23), Ms Victoria Foxton (#27), M Springer (#28), Red Spur Limited (#43), Mr Graeme Alan and Ms Joy Yvonne McVicar (#56), B. Welsh, S. McArthur, T. Kain (#57), Lincoln Developments Limited (#69).

45 Spokes Canterbury (#41), Mr Chris Morahan (#89), Mr David Hawke (#10), Mr Don Babe (#46), Mrs Cherry and Mr Lawrence McCallum (#36), Cashmere Park Trust (#15), Pat McIntosh (#12), Mr Olly Powell (#48), Mr Robert Fleming (#80), Mr Kieran Williamson (#86).

46 By way of note, the Independent Hearing Panel’s full decision is made at para [128] of Decision 10. It noted that given all these factors, they did not consider it appropriate to revisit the election the Council has made against further intensification in this locality at this time. If, and when, this should occur ought to be left to the Council to determine and initiate.
[179] What we need to be satisfied about, is that in terms of the NPS-UDC, Our Space demonstrates that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term. This includes intensification opportunities, as well as greenfield development.

[180] We agree with the Officers’ recommendations that additional land proposed by submitters is not necessary to demonstrate sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term for Greater Christchurch.

[181] In addition, based on the evidence available to us, we do not consider that the additional land proposed by submitters is preferable to that identified in Our Space which has previously been considered by the Greater Christchurch Partnership and is consistent with the strategic directions of the UDS and CRPS to promote a consolidated urban form in Greater Christchurch, and aligns with infrastructure servicing arrangements outlined in Long Term Plans and infrastructure strategies.

[182] We agree with Officers that additional land is best considered as part of subsequent RMA planning processes, including reviews of the CRPS and district plans, and relevant LGA processes, including structure planning. As set out earlier in our report, we have recommended amendments to ensure that Our Space does not preclude the consideration of further land that may be appropriate for future housing and business. We also agree that the key process steps in the review of Chapter 6 of the CRPS should be added to the Schedule of Future Work in Section 6.2.

[183] We also recognise that there are a number of proposals for extension to residential areas that may warrant closer inspection as part of the CRPS review. We consider this should be acknowledged by including a requirement in Section 6.2 that Environment Canterbury engages with those submitters on Our Space who have sought that their land be included, prior to the notification of the review of the CRPS, in relation to the appropriateness of including their land within Map A of Chapter 6, in light of the results of the next Capacity Assessment.

[184] We consider that these recommended amendments will ensure that the merits of the inclusion of additional land will be appropriately considered as part of the CRPS review.

[185] We consider that the approach in Our Space, including the actions identified in the further schedule of work, balances certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand.
In the light of the evaluation and reasons given above, and the responses provided to individual submissions, we are satisfied that Our Space appropriately implements the provisions of the NPS-UDC as it relates to development capacity for housing.

Rural residential and large lot development

We heard from a number of submitters who were interested in the matter of large lot development and rural residential development both inside and outside of the existing and proposed future urban development areas. They presented evidence noting the demand for such lots, and that such opportunities provided for better living opportunities and wellbeing.

Officers told us that the CRPS Chapter 6 defines rural residential activities as “residential units outside the identified Greenfield Priority Areas at an average density of between 1 and 2 households per hectare.” They said Policy 6.3.9(3) of the CRPS requires that rural residential subdivision and development “must be located so that it can be economically provided with a reticulated sewer and water supply integrated with a publicly owned system, and appropriate stormwater treatment and disposal”. They said that this requirement suggests a close link to the urban area and its associated urban infrastructure. They referred to rural activities being defined in the CRPS as including residential activity on lots of 4 hectares or more.

They said that irrespective of how Our Space incorporates rural residential living, the geographical area of focus and the relevant urban environment pertaining to Our Space are both considered to be the Greater Christchurch area, as shown in Figure 1 of Our Space. This area includes a portion of rural land significantly influenced by its proximity to nearby urban areas and although Our Space focuses predominantly on the urban aspects of Greater Christchurch it has considered rural residential and to a lesser extent rural living in its analyses.

We agree with the Officers’ position that it is appropriate to take into account rural residential land in terms of calculations on capacity, and they contribute to Greater Christchurch’s ability to cater for residents, as does rural land. We note the existing CRPS direction in Policy 6.3.9 that in the case of Christchurch City, no further rural residential development is to be provided for. Any further rural residential development in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts will be considered as part of the Council’s scheduled reviews of their respective rural residential development.
strategies. These reviews will inform District Plan reviews scheduled for notification in 2020.

[191] In relation to large lot sections, we agree with the Officers’ response in their Reply Report and accept that no further changes are required to Our Space.

**Provision and protection of key infrastructure and integration with development**

[192] We heard from a number of submitters on the sufficiency of commercial and industrial land in specific high demand areas, in particular as they related to the rail and freight network. As part of this, we heard evidence on the increase in travel times across the City from the west to the Port of Lyttelton, and the impacts of removing heavy vehicles from strategic freight routes. We heard about the importance of straight rail sidings at Rolleston and the potential for these, both within the existing urban and future development areas, as well as potential for extensions to those areas. We also heard about the future need for industrial land in appropriate locations adjacent to Christchurch International Airport.

[193] Officers told us that while the effective and efficient functioning of the transport network is not the main focus of Our Space, it does recognise in Section 5.6 that projected housing and business growth will result in more trips on the network, leading to more congestion and longer journey times if travel behaviours do not change.

[194] They said that a priority for Our Space is to ensure that future development is appropriately aligned to and informs long term transport planning and investment in Greater Christchurch, primarily considered as part of other processes, to ensure that more people can reside in areas accessible to a mix of transport modes. Of particular importance is alignment with the directions in the Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan, which set out a vision for Greater Christchurch’s public transport system.

[195] Our Space already recognises in Section 5.6 that an “important part of managing the transport network is to ensure that freight can be moved efficiently to and through Greater Christchurch and this will require effective management of congestion on the main freight routes”. Officers noted that there are a number of other processes currently underway that will contribute to the effective and efficient operation of freight routes, including:
• future public transport business cases
• travel demand management business cases
• completion of the Christchurch Northern Corridor and Christchurch Southern Motorway
• business cases for the Brougham Street and Moorhouse Avenue area.

[196] In response to concerns from those submitters, Officers did make some suggestions for amendments by inclusion of additional wording as set out in the Officers’ Reply on pages 11 and 12. In addition to the text changes recommended, Officers also agreed with the submitters to better identify strategic infrastructure and networks in Greater Christchurch by way of amendments to Figure 18.

[197] To that extent, we accept the submitters concerns, and accept the changes proposed by Officers. We are satisfied that those changes are appropriate and accord with appropriate recognition of infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure, in the Our Space document. In addition to the changes recommended by Officers, we also include changes to section 5.7 which provide context and recognise the need for significant investment for the funding of transport infrastructure.

Management of natural hazards
[198] We received a number of submissions generally in relation to Our Space on the potential for natural hazards to impact on land development. We asked Officers to provide a response in relation to the extent to which natural hazards information is covered in Our Space and included as part of assessing the proposed directions outlined within it.

[199] They responded that there are constraints on where new greenfield development can and should occur. Officers said that such constraints include coastal and flood hazard areas, groundwater aquifers, outstanding natural landscapes, versatile soils and airport noise contours. The extent of these constraints is shown in Figure 10 (p. 17) of Our Space, while wording proposed by Officers in the track changed version of Our Space seeks to further clarify the scope and purpose of that figure.

---

48 Christchurch International Airport Limited (#39), Cockburn Family Trust (#53), Lyttelton Port Company (#67), Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited (#73), KiwiRail Holdings Limited (#79).
In this context, they said that the future development areas proposed in Our Space have been subject to structure planning exercises by the Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils as part of considering future development within the projected infrastructure boundary. The appropriateness of these greenfield areas for development would be further assessed as part of any change to the CRPS, including that any hazard risks are sufficiently addressed.

The possible impact of ground conditions on the feasibility of existing development capacity across Greater Christchurch was also considered as part of the Capacity Assessment, including the potentially higher costs of development within flood hazard areas where there is a requirement for higher finished floor levels and larger foundations. Where such costs resulted in development being deemed unfeasible, these areas were discounted from the equation of supply and demand. Officers said that this methodology is fully documented in the Capacity Assessment methodology technical document provided as part of the Our Space consultation.

Our Space also recognises in Section 6.1 the need to respond to key drivers of change at the local, national and global level as part of future planning processes, including the:

“Growing need to manage and adapt to the natural hazard risk facing our coastal communities given the anticipated sea level rise, and related coastal inundation and groundwater level effects, over the next 30 years and beyond.”

Officers said that subsequent Capacity Assessments and any future revisions to Our Space will need to reflect any changes to policy directions related to managing and adapting to the natural hazard risks facing coastal communities. No changes to Our Space were recommended.

We did not receive any additional closing response in relation to recognition of bird strike as a natural hazard as posed by CIAL. In relation to that matter, we are satisfied with the Officers’ recommendation in their report that bird strike hazard can be managed by appropriate location and design of some land uses and is not an absolute constraint on development. Officers consider that district plans are the appropriate planning document for managing bird strike hazard, noting that an appropriate set of rules is included in the Christchurch District Plan.

We accept the Officers’ position on these matters, and in particular, do not consider that the matter of bird strike is such that it would limit future urban use and is relevant to decision-making in relation to Our Space.
Signalling matters needing to be addressed prior to full Canterbury Regional Policy Statement review

[206] We asked Officers how matters that have been addressed by us but not provided for specifically in Our Space will be approached and further detailed in any further investigation and resolution prior to the full review of the CRPS.

[207] They said that while the scope of the proposed change to the CRPS in 2019 detailed in the Schedule of Future Work in Section 6.2 of Our Space is specific to giving effect to the NPS-UDC, the review of Chapter 6 as part of the full review of the CRPS would provide an opportunity for the merits of any wider policy changes to Chapter 6 or additional amendments to Map A to be considered.

[208] Officers provided a potential list of steps and indicative timescales for the scheduled review of the CRPS. The review process would be initiated by Environment Canterbury in 2019/20 with the development of a project plan and agreed scope. Pre-notification engagement with the public and stakeholders would provide an opportunity for relevant matters that fall outside the scope of Our Space to be identified and further detailed.

[209] They noted that in order to provide greater clarity within Our Space, key process steps in the review of Chapter 6 as part of the CRPS full review could be added to the Schedule of Future Work in Section 6.2.

[210] Some submitters raised concerns that the proposals set out in Our Space would or could preclude the consideration of future changes to Chapter 6 Map A, in particular to provide for development in areas outside identified future development areas. As addressed above, while Our Space would provide some direction to inform future RMA processes, it is not intended to prevent the merits of such matters being considered through the full review of the CRPS.

[211] We have recommended that Figure 16 is identified as being indicative only, and consider that while it will not address the concerns of some submitters seeking that their individual developments be brought forward or fast-tracked, it does provide some opportunity for consideration of the merits of particular proposals without being precluded by Our Space.

Addressing climate change and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals

[212] We heard from a number of submitters who considered that the effects of climate change, and the achievement of sustainability and zero carbon goals, were not
sufficiently addressed by Our Space and that any proposed settlement pattern was integral to considering such matters.50

[213] Officers considered that the proposals in Our Space reflect the UDS principles of consolidating urban development and integrating land use and transport planning. This supports the development of a more sustainable urban form, especially in terms of providing a larger share of the population with good access to a range of transport modes and reducing the reliance on private vehicles.

[214] They acknowledged that the coverage of climate change and sustainability and the implications of urban growth on these matters is limited in our Space and recommended that additional wording be included in Sections 4 and 5 to highlight these issues.

[215] We generally accept the Officers’ response. However, we consider that a further response with regard to addressing climate change, achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals is required. We consider this issue merits its own new section under Section 4 in our Space, elevated to a higher priority, and amendments to section 5 of Our Space, with clearer and more aspirational wording.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

[216] We consider it appropriate to conclude with a response to the key questions posed to us by Officers in the Officers’ Report51 in light of our recommendations above. In summary:

a. We are satisfied that Our Space demonstrates that there will be sufficient feasible development capacity for housing in the medium and long term and that it sets out how the minimum targets will be met. The strategy sets out how the Partnership will respond to the shortfalls through future actions in Section 6, including through a change to the CRPS to enable the rezoning of future development areas identified in Figure 16 and the full review of the CRPS. We are satisfied, based on the evidence received, that those areas identified in Figure 16 are in the correct locations, on the basis of the current

50 Mr Dirk de Lu on behalf of Spokes Canterbury (#41), Mr Chris Morahan (#69), Mr Lawrence McCallum and Mrs Cherry McCallum (#36), Dr Anna Stevenson on behalf of Canterbury District Health Board (#58), Mr Don Babe (#46) and Mr John Peet on behalf of Sustainable Otautahi (#37).

51 Officers’ Report, Section 1, page 1.
planning framework. That includes a mixture of greenfield development and intensification.

b. In relation to industrial and commercial land, we are satisfied that the Strategy demonstrates that there will be sufficient feasible development capacity for business activity, noting the surplus industrial land can potentially absorb some of the predicted shortfall of commercial land in the medium to long terms. Further work around supply and monitoring around freight networks will inform whether or not there might be some locations where additional industrial land may be required. This can be undertaken to inform the full review of the CRPS.

c. We are satisfied that the proposed areas to be identified for future urban activities are appropriately within the projected infrastructure boundaries, which are reflected in the relevant Council Infrastructure Strategies. Councils will be able to determine the timing and funding of that infrastructure in accordance with the sequencing to be determined as part of their District Plan review processes.

d. We accept that under current planning frameworks, the methodology around feasibility is fit for our purposes, and gives effect to the NPS-UDC. We note this in the context of the ability to review and get consistent agreed methodologies between the Partner Councils so that this is incorporated into the next capacity assessment, as well as gathering and monitoring data to determine uptake, both through intensification as well as greenfield development. All of this will assist with informing capacity for the full review of the CRPS.

e. We are satisfied that the broad location, timing and sequencing of future development capacity is identified at an appropriate scale in Our Space and that it is appropriate that this is addressed further as part of district plan processes, and in accordance with the policies and methods prescribed by the CRPS. That includes through the development of Outline Development Plans and structure planning processes.

f. We are satisfied that Our Space is appropriately informed by the relevant Long Term Plans and Infrastructure strategies, and other relevant strategies, plans and documents. Our space is consistent with and builds on the vision and principles of the UDS and the direction of the CRPS by planning for
apportioned greenfield development and intensification, while maintaining a consolidated urban form, and integrating land use with infrastructure.

g. We accept that the methodology and evidence base is sufficiently robust, recognising that monitoring of markets, yield and uptake will continuously improve the ability to respond to changing circumstances including higher or lower growth scenarios.

h. In response to submitter concerns that Our Space will preclude the consideration of land for development in future RMA processes, we have made amendments to the strategy to note that Figure 16 is indicative only and that Environment Canterbury will engage with submitters requesting identification of additional land in Our Space prior to the notification of the CRPS review, in relation to the appropriateness of including that land in Map A and in light of the results of the next Capacity Assessment. This will ensure that the merits of those individual proposals can be legitimately considered as part of the CRPS review.

i. In addition, we have identified in response to individual submissions where we consider there is another appropriate avenue to address a submitter concerns, such as through transport plans or through annual plan and long term planning funding processes.

[217] We are satisfied that the Strategy as set out in Appendix 2 meets the requirements of the NPS-UDC and has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the LGA and those objectives and policies of the NPS-UDC that are relevant to the production of a future development strategy.

[218] We set out our further reasons and recommendations in response to individual submissions in Appendix 1.

[219] We recommend that the GCP Committee adopts our recommendations report and recommend to the individual Partners that they adopt, endorse, or otherwise support Our Space, being the joint future development strategy for Greater Christchurch.

[220] In addition to our recommendations on the Strategy, we make the following suggestions to the Partner Councils for actions outside of the Strategy process:
a. As part of future Capacity Assessments, consider the impact of different ownership and development models as part of industrial land sufficiency in future capacity assessments

b. As part of future Capacity Assessments, consider freight trends and demand in specific locations where there is a need to integrate land use and infrastructure

c. Explore options for funding the social and affordable housing action plan set out in Section 6.2 of Our Space

d. Christchurch City Council considers whether there are any options or alternatives available to facilitate, fund or enable infrastructure development at Cranford Basin, that was the subject of the Cranford Basin Regeneration Plan.

For the Hearing Panel:

Bill Wasley  
Chair  

Gail Gordon  
Panel member

Cr Sara Templeton  
Panel member  

Deputy Mayor Malcom Lyall  
Panel member

Cr Peter Skelton  
Panel member  

Cr Neville Atkinson  
Panel member
Jim Harland
Panel member (non-voting)

Jim Harland is a non-voting member of the Hearing panel. His signature acknowledges that he has participated in deliberations as a non-voting member of the Panel and supports the recommendations set out in this Report.

5 June 2019

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Hearing Panel recommendations on submissions


Appendix 3: Hearing Panel Minutes 1, 2 and 3.

APPENDIX 1 - Hearing Panel recommendations on submissions
This section provides the Hearing Panel’s recommendations on each of the 92 individual submissions received on Our Space.

We have adopted the summary of the officers’ submission points for ease of use but advise that each submission has been read by the Hearing Panel. Our recommendations on submission points below should be read in conjunction with our recommendations report.

Where we have accepted the recommendations of officers we have agreed with and adopted the reasoning of officers, unless otherwise expressly stated.

**Lloyd Bathurst (001)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>There is significant housing development capacity available in Rolleston and would prefer a projections-led approach to housing targets to allow people to live where they want to live.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>We are satisfied that the officers’ explanation in Section 4 of the report in relation to Themes 1 (accuracy and uncertainty of projected demands) and 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites in each district) addresses this matter. We note that Table 3 sets out the sufficiency of housing development capacity in Greater Christchurch in each of the territorial authority areas. We consider it is appropriate to enable the territorial authorities to determine appropriate locations for development depending on their ability to provide and plan for infrastructure. This provides certainty for developers as to which land will be released, providing a clear signal as to where to allocate resources to provide for development. The ongoing capacity analysis cycle (undertaking capacity assessments every three years) provides for monitoring of uptake and development, and the ability to adjust capacity assessments and improve the capacity assessment methodology to ensure demand and uptake is understood. We considered Mr Bathurst’s submission and presentation to us, in particular with reference to not identifying areas of land subject to earthquake hazard risk (such as liquefaction), which we address below. We recognise that the development of some types of land in the region will have an impact on insurance premiums, however we also acknowledge that in the development of vacant land, ground and foundation design can ameliorate the impacts of earthquakes and reduce risk. We do not consider that, at this stage, substantial additional land needs to be released to address a shortfall in greenfield land at Rolleston. In relation to rural residential land, the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement sets out a framework for consideration of these areas, and requires them to be included in a rural residential strategy in the case of Waimakariri or Selwyn District, or in the case of Christchurch City, no provision is made for further new rural residential land. In summary, along with the matters we note above, we accept the officers’ position on this submission and no changes are recommended in relation to the submission for the reasons set out above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td>Liquefaction and earthquake risk factors are not shown on the Natural Hazards map (Figure 10, p.17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>Officers addressed the extent to which natural hazards information is covered in Our Space in their Reply Report and recommend amendments to section 4.1 to clarify the scope and purpose of Figure 10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No expert evidence was provided to us by the submitter regarding the constraints that land has in terms of its development or what the economic costs of that may be, apart from anecdotal evidence regarding the cost of insurance excesses for commercial property. As such, we do not consider that the presence of geotechnical constraints necessarily prevents land from being developed. We accept the officers’ position that only hazards that significantly influence decisions on where new urban development should locate are included. In particular, we note that the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement does not seek to avoid development in areas that may be subject to liquefaction, which is the case for new urban development in High Hazard Areas, for example.

We accept the officers’ recommendation to amend Section 4.1 to clarify the purpose and scope of the hazard constraints map.

Floyd Rudolph (002)

Promotes industrial hemp farming, particularly for Christchurch red zone areas, and community blockchain.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We accept the officers’ comment that such matters are outside the scope of Our Space, and that the use of the Residential Red Zone is the subject of another planning process.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Supports bus lanes, and subsidised e-bikes, scooters and longboards that can go on buses for last kilometre travel.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We note the submitters point. Officers responded that the operation of the public transport network is outside the scope of Our Space, and we accept this response.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Scott Boyce (003)

Unsure of the information available for the timing of the future development areas in Selwyn.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to the recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers’ report. In relation to this they recommend that sequencing is identified as part of structure planning processes and infrastructure servicing, which is best determined by the relevant territorial authorities. They noted that such processes would need to have regard to existing Canterbury Regional Policy Statement policy provisions, and recommended wording amendments to clarify this.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on these matters, and accept the submission in part to the extent that the changes outlined in Theme 5 of the officers’ report are made clarifying that sequencing will be addressed in the manner described.

John Dryden (004)

Queries why there is no discussion of the cultural aspirations of the majority of people who live in Christchurch.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the vision, principles and strategic goals of the Urban Development Strategy for Greater Christchurch which is still relevant, and are reflected in section 2.3 of Our Space.

We accept the officers' position that no changes are necessary. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers that the intensification of residential areas will fail unless good urban design principles are enforced.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 7 (*Poor intensification outcomes and preferences to focus intensification in the Central City*) in the officers' report. This notes that Christchurch has many examples of high-quality residential intensification, and that these matters are best dealt with at a territorial authority level. We accept this and further note that Christchurch has recently been through a district plan review which addresses design matters comprehensively, and that Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils are about to embark on their reviews.

We accept the officers' position that no changes are necessary. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Drucilla Kingi-Patterson (005)**

Identifies upcoming and proposed events across New Zealand and considers that hosting such major events could affect how Greater Christchurch should develop.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Ms Kingi-Patterson on these matters.

We accept the officers' position that such matters are outside the scope of Our Space, the purpose of which is to ensure there is sufficient land available to support future housing and business demand, and that this demand is supported in a way that aligns with the strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy. We accept the NPS-UDC does not require local authorities to consider the implications of major events on the approach to urban development.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Concerned that new development will affect civil defence zones and food producing farmland.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the recommendations in the officers' report in Section 4 in relation to Theme 3 (*Protecting productive, agricultural and high quality soils from urban expansion*). They note that the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans may need to consider the implications of a new National Policy Statement on Versatile Soils, which is being planned. There will be some existing areas that are already identified for development on versatile soils in the Greenfield Priority Areas of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

In relation to evacuation zones in Greater Christchurch, officers noted that specific civil defence matters are the responsibility of the Canterbury Civil Defence Emergency Management Group and are therefore out of scope for Our Space.

We accept the officers' position that no changes are necessary, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Highlights the need for elderly care developments and suitable accommodation for people with disabilities, as well as affordable housing for people affected by shifting employment and workforce dynamics.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (*Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types*) of the officers’ report. They noted that Our Space highlights how changing demographics and affordability will likely impact the range of housing types demanded. They said that Our Space does not limit the potential for appropriate innovative housing options, and that these matters can be addressed through district plan reviews.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are necessary, and no changes are recommended as in response to this submission point.

Notes the need for light rail between Amberley and Ashburton, and Lincoln and the Central City.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to the recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (*Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport*) in the officers’ report. They note that the option of rail services in Greater Christchurch is being considered as part of the Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Robert and Margaret Spark, and Richard and Dawn Spark, Spark Bros Ltd (006)**

Landowner supports the inclusion of land (within the PIB) in Rangiora for future development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from Mr Geoff Spark in relation to this submission. He noted some features of the additional land he was seeking to have included as a greenfield priority area, including that it was close to proposed light rail, the town centre, the Southbrook Industrial Area and road links to Christchurch. Officers referred to their recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (*Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district*) in the officers’ report. Officers concluded that they do not consider that additional land proposed by submitters is preferable to that identified in Our Space or necessary to demonstrate sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term for Greater Christchurch.

We note that in relation to other submissions seeking extensions to the urban area, the officers considered that the land is best considered as part of subsequent RMA planning processes, including review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans, and relevant LGA process, including structure planning. We consider this is an appropriate consideration in respect of this submission.

We acknowledge support for the existing identified Greenfield Priority Areas on the land, but make no changes to those other areas identified by the submitter.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Peter Wells (007)**

Concerned about the impacts of greenfield development on arable and ecologically valuable land, the cost of extending infrastructure, the increased social isolation and the ability to achieve zero carbon goals.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (*Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts*), 3 (*Protecting productive, agricultural and high quality soils from urban expansion*), 10 (*Provision and protection of key infrastructure, and integration with development*) and 11 (*Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals*) in the officers’ reports.
We generally accept the officers' position on those matters, however we consider a further response addressing climate change, achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals is required. We consider this issue merits its own new section under Section 4 in Our Space, elevated to a higher priority, and amendments to Section 5 of Our Space, with tighter, clearer and more aspirational wording. We accept the submission in part to the extent that changes to those sections are made.

Supports new forms of housing that help build closer communities and introduce more sustainable solutions.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types) and 11 (Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals) of the officers’ report. As above, we recommend changes to give a greater focus on sustainability in Sections 4 and 5 of Our Space.

Considers that commercial developments should be focused in existing centres and should help to create quality, adaptable and liveable urban environments.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types) and 11 (Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals) of the officers’ report. As above, we recommend changes to give a greater focus on sustainability in Sections 4 and 5 of Our Space.

We accept the officers' recommendation on this and to that extent, accept the submission point in part.

Notes support for rail services, and the opportunities this would offer for urban regeneration and revitalisation.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport).

The submission point is noted. The option of rail services in Greater Christchurch is being considered as part of the Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers that the existing three waters systems is already at capacity and susceptible to disruption, especially in the face of climate change, and that new innovative infrastructure systems could be explored.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 10 (Provision and protection of key infrastructure, and integration with development) and 11 (Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals). They noted that while Our Space does not preclude opportunities to explore the use of innovative infrastructure systems, this is most appropriately considered by councils at the individual territorial authority level.

We accept the officers' position, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**John Ascroft (008)**

Supports more emphasis on cycling and walking, and less on cars and buses, especially in the Central City.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport). They noted that Our Space is principally
focussed on the land use component of settlement planning, and that transport matters are addressed in other plans such as the Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Public Transport Plan.

We accept the officers’ position, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Bellgrove Family Trust (009)**

Landowner supports the inclusion of land (within the PIB) in Rangiora for future development and seeks expedited plan changes to enable timely development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from Ms Rachel Murdoch, counsel for Bellgrove Family Trust, in relation to this submission. The trustees support the identification of their land as a Future Development Area in Our Space (considered to be the logical next step for development of the land) which is located east of Rangiora High School and is land that could be serviced. The trustees also seek identification as a Greenfield Priority Area as it can be reasonably anticipated that the medium term, through to 2028, will have well progressed before any zoning is determined. It was submitted that if the Panel determined that the land remain as a Future Development Area, amendments are required to the wording of Section 9 Action 8 which relates to changes proposed for the CRPS. In response to questions, Ms Murdoch recognised that the streamlined process, having not identified any particular issues or likely opposition to the zoning of the land, could potentially happen quite quickly.

The trustees also seek a change to the Projected Infrastructure Boundary to follow cadastral boundaries on the site.

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) of the officers report. Officers concluded that they do not consider additional land proposed by the submitter is preferable to that identified in Our Space or necessary to demonstrate sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term for Greater Christchurch.

Officers have generally recommended that additional land is best considered as part of subsequent RMA planning processes, including review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans, and relevant LGA process, including structure planning. It is proposed that a change to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement be progressed using the streamlined planning process under the RMA, to ensure that future development areas necessary to meet development capacity needs can be rezoned as part of the upcoming district plan reviews.

We note that only those areas that are already identified in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement as Greenfield Priority Areas are identified as such in the Our Space document. Officers provided an explanation on this as party of their Reply. We accept those reasons and agree that it is not appropriate to change areas that are identified as Future Development Areas to Greenfield Priority Areas in Our Space.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers that deferring decisions on when the identified future development areas may be developed until the District Plan Review stage could risk adding delays and uncertainties.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) of the officers’ report. We accept the officers’ position and again note that the proposed change to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement will enable future development areas necessary to meet development capacity needs, to be rezoned.
No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers that a high growth projection scenario could be more appropriate for Waimakariri given recent trends.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) of the officers’ report. At present, they consider there are significant uncertainties regarding future demand, which is why monitoring and refinement of Capacity Assessments will take place over time.

We accept the officers’ positions that the projections and targets are appropriate, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**David Hawke (010)**

Supports the focus on redevelopment in Christchurch and highlights the negative externalities of recent greenfield expansion in Halswell, including the loss of versatile soils, diminished liveability and increased traffic congestion.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Mr David Hawke in relation to his comprehensive submission.

Mr Hawke told us he bikes to work, and has appreciated some of the changes the Accessible City has brought, and is an example of some of the sustainability outcomes that Our Space is intended to bring. He said the default is endless spreading, increasing costs, and social inequality. He strongly supports central city development, a tightly controlled outer limit, and a focus on versatile soils.

He asked the Panel to stay strong in relation to requests to extend the urban boundary. The reason for this is related to his experience in Halswell, where development has spread on to high quality land. The layout in Halswell relies on cars to get around, with difficulties get buses through the suburb. Even so, Halswell still probably meets the ‘10 minute neighbourhood’ concept. He noted that Knight’s Stream has a higher density than would normally take place, and that it is working with a steady building of community.

He said that Our Space is a good opportunity to include guidelines to fulfil the vision of the strategy. He reiterated how the 10-minute neighbourhood is not necessarily a pleasant experience and accessible to all, and that this needs to be fleshed out. He discussed the idea of being 8-80 accessible, and that this would also achieve transport outcomes. He considered exemplars would also be beneficial.

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) of the officers’ report.

In relation to Mr Hawke’s submission and presentation, we note the submitter’s references to the negative externalities of recent greenfield development. We consider that with the amendments recommended by officers, Our Space addresses these concerns.

No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Supports the focus on greenfield development in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi, but considers that this land should be developed at a significantly higher density than currently achieved.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Mr Hawke said that that provision of greenfield land around Rolleston and Rangiora rather than Christchurch was acceptable, but that more guidance was needed on how that development should take place. In relation to the new bits of Rolleston, it is his view that it looked like urban sprawl again.

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) and 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) of the officers' report. Officers did not support referencing a new minimum density for these areas in Our Space, but did consider that further work should be signalled regarding minimum densities for the 2022 Canterbury Regional Policy Statement review.

We have considered a wide range of submitter views on this matter, and carefully considered that in relation to Future Development Areas, there is the possibility of a policy ‘gap’ in terms of minimum densities. Christchurch City Council considered that a minimum of 15 households per hectare in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi would be appropriate. We heard from a number of developers who considered that 12 households per hectare was reasonably achievable, while others considered 10 households per hectare provided flexibility. We heard from others again who considered that lower densities might be required because of the presence of TC3 land.

We consider that it is appropriate that we signal a minimum net density of 12 households per hectare for residentially zoned land in those parts of the Selwyn and Waimakariri districts falling within the Greater Christchurch area, noting that further evaluation will occur as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. We are satisfied that given the mix of evidence received during the hearing, such a statement is both necessary and appropriate.

To this extent, the submission is accepted.

Notes the need for mixed developments that provide a range of social, affordable and market housing types.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types) of the officers’ report.

The submitters point is noted; no changes are recommended in response to the submission point.

Considers that commercial developments need to be aligned with sustainable transport options and that there is sufficient industrial land, particularly in Hornby and Rolleston, to support future growth.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport) and 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’) of the officers’ report. This was also addressed in the reporting officers’ reply report (question 9). They noted the Capacity Assessment identified a significant over-supply of industrial land in Greater Christchurch to meet long term demand. Section 3.3 of Our Space outlines these findings.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Randal Inch (011)**

Landowner supports the inclusion of land (within the PIB) in Rangiora for future development and seeks expedited plan changes to enable timely development.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) of the officers’ report. Officers concluded that they do not consider that additional land proposed by submitters is preferable to that
identified in Our Space or necessary to demonstrate sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term for Greater Christchurch.

We accept the officers' position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers that deferring decisions on when the identified future development areas may be developed until the District Plan Review stage could risk adding delays and uncertainties.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers have generally recommended that additional land is best considered as part of subsequent RMA planning processes, including review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans, and relevant LGA process, including structure planning. We note that the proposed change to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement will enable future development areas necessary to meet development capacity needs to be rezoned.

We accept the officers' position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers that a high growth projection scenario would be more appropriate for Waimakariri given recent trends.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands). In summary, they said that there are significant uncertainties in determining future demand. This is reflected in the NPS-UDC requirements for ongoing monitoring and review of projections and targets as part of periodic capacity assessments. Officers said that subsequent capacity assessments will benefit from new data and information, for example, the results of the 2018 Census and the anticipated release of new sub-regional and territorial authority household projections by Statistics NZ in 2020.

We accept the officers' position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Pat McIntosh (012)**

Highlights the need to plan for sustainability and improved environments, and not allowing urban sprawl that encroaches on productive farmland, creates higher travel costs and reduces the sense of community.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts), 3 (Protecting productive, agricultural and high quality soils from urban expansion), 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport) and 11 (Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals) in the officers’ report.

Officers noted that the role of Our Space is to ensure there is sufficient land available to support future housing and business demand, and that this demand is supported in a way that aligns with the wider strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy. Section 2.3 of Our Space highlights these strategic directions, and the theme of ‘integrated and managed urban development’ for the purposes of this document.

While some areas within Future Development Areas contained versatile soils, additional guidance is required at a national level before this matter is addressed. This may be a matter which impacts on net density as a result of the 2022 review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, if such soils are to be protected at a national level.
We accept the officers’ position on these matters, which includes additional wording in Sections 4 and 5 to highlight the implications of urban growth on sustainability, and to this extent, we accept the submission in part.

Identifies rent-to-buy schemes, shared equity and building higher density housing on brownfield sites as potential elements of a social and affordable housing action plan.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to these matters, which includes additional wording in Sections 4 and 5 to highlight the implications of urban growth on sustainability, and to this extent, we accept the submission in part.

Identifies rent-to-buy schemes, shared equity and building higher density housing on brownfield sites as potential elements of a social and affordable housing action plan.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to theme 9 (*Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types*) of the officers’ report.

They did not recommend additional changes in the officers’ report, but as part of their reply, they included a timeframe for the development of the action plan. The matters addressed above will explore a number of different options in terms of providing for social and affordable housing.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point, however noting the officers’ recommendations to include a timeframe for an action plan in Action 2 of Section 2.6

**Considers that the projected growth is mostly related to immigration, which is politically controlled and unlikely to continue at the current rate, and that this approach is responsive rather than value-led.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (*Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands*).

They noted that Statistics NZ incorporate immigration forecasts in the population projections and this remains the most robust information available to predict future population changes. The NPS-UDC requires a new capacity assessment every three years to ensure planning is responsive to such changing trends. Officers said that the approach to setting housing targets in Our Space, as outlined in Section 3.2 is also considered to represent a principles-based approach rather than following a purely projections-led approach.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Andrew Long (013)**

Disagrees with housing growth in the towns as they have an insufficient business and employment base to support such populations, meaning growth will lead to more commuter car trips and reduced sustainability outcomes.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (*Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts*), 6 (*Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport*) and 11 (*Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals*).

The Capacity Assessment identifies sufficient provision in the Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plans to meet the demand for industrial land over the long term, and for the most part, commercial space over the medium term. Section 3.3 of Our Space outlines these findings. Whilst acknowledging there will always be commuting between the towns and major employment areas in Christchurch City, Section 5.3 and Section 6.4 notes that improving the self-sufficiency of relevant towns is a key consideration of the district councils.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.
Considers that social and affordable housing should be located close to shops and services, and spread across Greater Christchurch.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (*Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types*) of the officers’ report.

The purpose of a social and affordable housing action plan would be to enable social and affordable housing across Greater Christchurch. This action plan is covered in Section 5.1 and Section 6.2 of Our Space.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers that office space at the airport should be capped to encourage development in the Central City.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (*Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ’10-minute neighbourhood’*). In addition, we note that this is a matter that could be addressed as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. The Christchurch District Plan gives effect to Policy 6.3.8 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement which aims to limit impacts on Key Activity Centres and the Central City.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Concerned that the costs associated with delivering rapid transit would disproportionately fall on Christchurch City Council ratepayers and that the phasing of traffic signals in Christchurch disrupts and slows traffic.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers told us that such matters are out of scope for Our Space. The Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case will investigate the opportunity for rapid transit corridors in Greater Christchurch, including any appropriate delivery and funding arrangements. Traffic management issues in Christchurch City are the responsibility of the Christchurch City Council, and addressed through other processes and mechanisms.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Notes that few hazards are identified in Selwyn and Waimakariri on the Natural Hazards map (Figure 10, p. 17).

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers acknowledged that the purpose and scope of this map, as well as other constraints maps in Figure 10, could be clarified in Our Space. We accept the officers’ recommendation to amend Section 4.1 to address the submission to clarify the purpose and the scope of the natural hazard mapping.

Michael Steadman (014)

Highlights the need to protect high quality soils to retain the ability for low-carbon, self-sustaining food production.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 3 (*Protecting productive, agricultural and high quality soils from urban expansion*) and 11 (*Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals*) in the officers’ report.
While some areas within Future Development Areas contained versatile soils, additional guidance is required at a national level before this matter is addressed. This may be a matter which impacts on net density as a result of the 2022 review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, if such soils are to be protected at a national level.

We accept the officers' position on these matters, which includes additional wording in Sections 4 and 5 to highlight the implications of urban growth on sustainability, and to this extent, we accept the submission in part.

Supports higher density housing developments along transport corridors and considers that growth in the towns should only occur once rapid transit is in place.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) and 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport). They said that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but considers that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to Map A of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2019 as a result of Our Space).

We accept officers' recommendations to include wording in Our Space (Section 5.5 and Section 6 Action) to make it clear that detailed structure planning to determine the sequencing of future development areas will need to have regard to existing Canterbury Regional Policy Statement provisions to ensure a consolidated urban form, proximity to key activity centres, efficient infrastructure, and cohesion of new development with existing communities.

We also accept officers' recommendations to include wording in Our Space (Section 5.5 and Section 6 Action) to outline the intent of draft policy provisions to be considered in the 2022 review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement to demonstrate how future development areas are sequenced by territorial authorities in accordance with housing targets incorporated in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and sufficiency conclusions agreed as part of periodic capacity assessments.

---

**Cashmere Park Trust (015)**

Landowner seeks the inclusion of land (within the PIB) on Leistrella Rd, Christchurch for future development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Mr Warren Lewis, an engineer, but appear on his own behalf, presented to us in relation to the submission of Cashmere Park Trust\(^1\), for whom he is a trustee. Mr Lewis described the land as the closest rural land to the city centre, surrounded by zoned land which provides for 15 households per hectare, however the Trust’s land is constrained to 4 hectare sites. The land forms part of the Henderson’s Basin. Mr Lewis advised that only 20% of the land has ever been flooded, and that which was flooded was due to a blocked culvert. He described the Trust’s desire to subdivide the land, through compensatory storage within Henderson’s Basin. Mr Lewis was concerned that flood modelling by the CCC after the earthquake did not align with the changes in ground levels post-earthquake. He emphasised the presence of infrastructure, and that the site was not affected by climate change due to its elevation.

Officers do not support the inclusion of additional development in the Hendersons Basin area, on the basis that there is sufficient land available within the existing Christchurch area to cater for greenfield growth. We have considered the submitters request, and note that in relation to the land, we have not received expert evidence on the matter of flooding and flood heights, either from the submitter, or the Christchurch City Council. We do note that the Christchurch City Council, in the additional information it provided to us, did not consider that the site sought to be included by the submitter fulfilled its criteria for small, site

---

\(^1\) Cashmere Park Trust (#15)
specific additions to future development areas. We were not able to discuss or test the conclusions with the authors of that report. We must take a precautionary approach to that information, but it is relevant information for us to take it into account.

However, we do consider that the conclusion of the reporting officers in this situation is sound. That is, they do not consider that additional land proposed by submitters is preferable to that identified in Our Space or necessary to demonstrate sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term for Greater Christchurch. The land is best considered as part of subsequent RMA planning processes, including review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans, and relevant LGA process, including structure planning.

We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

Considers that restricting the supply of new housing sections in Christchurch will push up prices and force people out to the towns, and that the limited demand for intensive developments won’t change as fast as anticipated.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We have addressed the matter of supply of greenfield land above, noting that there is significant supply in the Christchurch area. When responding to this submission, officers referred also to Theme 9 of the officers’ report regarding provision of social and affordable housing and having a range of housing types. They noted that Section 3.2 of Our Space highlights how changing demographics and affordability will likely impact the range of housing types demanded, increasing the need for smaller and multi-unit dwellings over time to complement the existing housing stock dominated by larger standalone houses.

We accept the officers' position on this. Monitoring and ongoing capacity assessments will continue to refine the predicted demand for housing types.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Notes that commercial developments in suburban locations should not be forgotten or disadvantaged by the planning framework.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to Theme 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’) in the officers’ report, and the reporting officers’ reply report (question 9) with respect to the 10-minute neighbourhood concept. Officers did consider that better linkages could be made in Our Space as to the policy intent behind Key Activity Centres and the relationship with 10-minute neighbourhoods, and recommended changes to Section 5 of the Strategy. We did not hear from Mr Lewis in relation to this submission point at the hearing.

To that extent, we accept the changes recommended to us by officers, which address some of the submitter’s concerns, by way of amendment. As a consequence, we accept the submission in part.

Considers that there is insufficient industrial land available as much of the land is owned by a few people who restrict development to maintain higher industrial land prices.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We did not hear from Mr Lewis in relation to this submission point at the hearing. We are satisfied with officers’ response that there is a significant over-supply of industrial land across Christchurch to meet demand over the long term.

---

2 Appendix E, Supplementary technical advice in support of the Christchurch City Council’s submission, dated 15 February 2019, by Mr David Falconer, Ms Sarah Oliver and Ms Adele Radburn
No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Highlights factors that cause land shortages and development delays, including planning processes, delays from zoning, subdivision approvals and consenting, and limiting infrastructure through a rigid planning approach.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Mr Lewis did not present to us specifically on this submission point. Officers referred us to comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 10 (*Provision and protection of key infrastructure, and integration with development*). They noted that the Capacity Assessment identified sufficient development capacity in Christchurch City to meet long term housing demand, even after adding margins to the projected demand to allow for situations when developments are either delayed or not brought to the market at all. Section 3.2 of Our Space outlines these findings. We accept the officers’ response in relation to this matter.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Notes that little account has been given to the future with autonomous vehicles and changing work practices.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We did not hear from Mr Lewis on this submission point. Officers recommended that regular monitoring of market indicators and trends will inform subsequent capacity assessments, which the NPS-UDC requires to be undertaken every three years. They advised that such assessments will enable councils to respond to any changing travel and workplace behaviours.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Notes that there is reference to Map A in Section 5.7 (p. 31) but that no map is provided.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers have recommended amending Section 5.7 in relation to this submission point, and consequential references are also amended.

We recommend that this submission point is accepted and corrections made.

**Te Waipounamu Community Housing Network (016)**

Supports the commitment to develop a social and affordable housing action plan and considers that the provision of community facilities and infrastructure should also be considered as part of such a plan.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Ms Jill Hawkey and Mr Peter Taylor for Te Waipounamu Community Housing Network. They expanded on their submission, providing examples of inclusionary housing in Queenstown, and wanting more definite information around the timing for the social and affordable housing action plan. They described concerns that affordable housing needs to be in reach of public transport, and advocated access to community facilities so that density is provided where there are services.

We sought further information in relation to this from officers in Minute 2. They amended their response and provided greater detail around the timing for the action plan. We accept the officers’ recommendation that this information is included in Our Space. It is noted that the action plan is not currently identified in Annual Plans, and so we also recommended that this is considered as an action outside of the Our Space document.

**Steve Holland (017)**
Considers that social housing should be spread across Greater Christchurch and not grouped into any one area.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (*Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types*) in the officers’ report.

The purpose of a social and affordable housing action plan would be to enable social and affordable housing across Greater Christchurch. This action plan is covered in Section 5.1 and Section 6.2 of Our Space (as recommended to be revised above in the body of our report).

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any further changes in response to this submission point, however noting the recommended changes to Section 6.2 to include a timeframe for the Action Plan.

Supports the protection of transport corridors, development of more public transport options, such as rail, and promotion of electric transport modes.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (*Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport*). They said the option of rail services in Greater Christchurch is being considered as part of the Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Suzanne Vallance (018)**

Highlights issues related to poorly managed intensification, including the limited control over how these urban environments develop and the need for more place-making and participatory planning processes.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 7 (*Poor intensification outcomes and preferences to focus intensification in the Central City*) in the officers’ report.

They said that Our Space is a high level, strategic document that seeks to ensure there is sufficient land available to meet future housing and business demand across Greater Christchurch. The strategic planning directions set in this document will then be implemented through local planning processes, such as district plan reviews and structure planning, which will provide further opportunities for local consultation and input to place-making discussions.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Notes the need to consider the potential implications of new Government policy on versatile soils and suggests using the Copenhagen model of the ‘hand’ rather than concentric circles to support an integrated urban form.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 3 (*Protecting productive, agricultural and high quality soils from urban expansion*) and 11 (*Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals*) in the officers’ report.

They said that the urban form promoted in Our Space is consistent with the existing strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. Any broader considerations of
Greater Christchurch's urban form would be best considered during the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 of Our Space in the schedule of future work.

We note that while some areas within Future Development Areas contain versatile soils, additional guidance is required at a national level before this matter is addressed. This may be a matter which impacts on net density as a result of the 2022 review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, if such soils are to be protected at a national level.

We accept the officers' position on these matters, which includes additional wording in Sections 4 and 5 to highlight the implications of urban growth on sustainability, and to this extent, we accept the submission in part.

Notes that a resilient city has suitable redundancy, diversity, modularity and distribution of commercial activity.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 ("Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’") in the officers' report.

We accept the officers' recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Suggests solutions for housing an ageing population, including partitioning and building adaptable homes.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 ("Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types"). They noted that Our Space does not limit the potential for appropriate innovative housing options, such as tiny houses or adaptable new builds, nor mechanisms that enable partitioning of existing larger houses to create two households. Territorial authorities already have some planning provisions in this regard and can consider this further through district plan reviews and changes.

We accept the officers' recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Supports the ‘10-minute neighbourhood’ concept and considers that councils should have contingent funding to enable such ideas that surface as part of consultations.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

 Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 ("Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’") in the officers’ report. Officers also addressed this further in their Reply Report (question 9) with respect to the 10-minute neighbourhood concept.

Officers recommend amendments to section 5.7 to clarify the policy intent behind key activity centres and the connection with the 10-minute neighbourhood conceptual diagram in Figure 19.

The allocation of funding in councils’ Long Term Plans is out of scope for Our Space.

We accept the officers' recommendations on this, including the recommended changes to section 5.7. We do not recommend any further changes in response to this submission point.

_Gillman Wheelans (019)_
Considers that the availability of feasible development land in Christchurch is becoming constrained and that the expansion of such towns as West Melton, Prebbleton and Woodend could support capacity shortfalls.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 *(Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district).*

They said that the Capacity Assessment identified sufficient development capacity in Christchurch City to meet long term housing demand, even after discounting areas that were assessed to be commercially unfeasible to develop. Section 3.2 of Our Space outlines the findings on the sufficiency of housing development capacity.

We were told that Our Space proposes future development areas in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi to help address projected housing capacity shortfalls in Selwyn and Waimakariri. These future development areas align with the strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. Officers considered that the appropriate process to consider the potential growth of other towns in Greater Christchurch is during the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 of Our Space in the schedule of future work.

We heard from Mr Hamish Wheelans in relation to his submission, who provided us with an overview of some of the costs and constraints in relation to dealing with TC3 land.

He noted the housing booms, when markets were strong, there was a greater desire for larger sections, whereas when the market was weaker, higher density development prevailed. He described the Delamane development at Yaldhurst which was developed at around 13.4 households per hectare. When the global financial crisis hit in 2006, that higher density development stopped as builders were not able to get finance. This was an example of how the development market changes. The increase in density requires more roading, and that change gets exponentially harder. In addition, costs are involved with remediation of TC3 land, either through the land itself or through foundation design. He did not agree that an urban limit is appropriate, in particular at West Melton.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Wheelans acknowledged that higher density living was growing, but that did not cater for everyone. He considered that this type of living was location based, and appropriate in the inner city, but not in the outlying suburbs. In terms of land cost, the difference between a unit in a greenfield site and a house on a single lot was not that great, and so the demand is much higher for those stand-alone houses. This compares to the city where the land is much more expensive, which creates a greater gap between standalone houses and apartments. He highlighted that land that was constrained by TC3 rated land would struggle to develop to an appropriate cost. He indicated that approximate costs for development of TC3 land could be between $50-60,000, which would make it uneconomic to develop. He had not seen any examples of cheap foundations for TC3 land.

We agree with the position put forward by the officers. Updated capacity assessments will continually inform areas for development. This will lead to future planning and identification of land as part of future changes. The appropriate time to consider those additional areas is as part of the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. We note that although Our Space does not discount the possibility that other land may be appropriate for future housing and business uses, it is important that any land identified for urban development is consistent with the strategic directions from the Urban Development Strategy and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement that seek to promote a consolidated urban form in Greater Christchurch, and that it aligns with the infrastructure servicing arrangements outlined in Long Term Plans and infrastructure strategies.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Considers that the demand for multi-unit developments is overstated and that constraining land supply for greenfield subdivisions in Christchurch will increase costs and prices for housing.
Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) and 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types). They said that the primary purpose of Our Space is to demonstrate there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in Greater Christchurch to meet demand over the medium and long term, and that this demand is provided in a way that aligns with the strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy. This is achieved by assessing the development capacity of currently zoned areas and identifying new future development areas where there are projected capacity shortfalls, as is the case in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts that are consistent with the Urban Development Strategy, district development strategies (Selwyn 2031 and Our District, Our Future for Waimakariri) and Long Term Plans.

We do not consider that demand for multi-unit development is overstated. Planned development will provide for a range of housing typologies, and demand changes over time.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Notes that private developers are unlikely to consider affordable housing without Government subsidisation.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types). Officers said that Christchurch City Council, working in partnership with the Ōtautahi Community Housing Trust, has a substantial social housing stock, while Selwyn District Council has recently agreed a policy approach that fosters social and affordable housing but does not entail any direct provision. Nationally, they noted new Government initiatives such as KiwiBuild can complement and support the work locally undertaken by housing providers. We were also told of the use of incentives in Queenstown regarding inclusionary housing in relation to the submission of Te Waipounamu Affordable Housing Network. An action plan to look at social and affordable housing is included in Our Space.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Considers that requiring commercial activity to locate in existing centres contradicts having shops and services that are accessible without the use of transport modes, and that there should be allowances for new centres.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to their comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’) in the officers’ report. Reporting officers also addressed this in their reply report in response to Question 9. They said that Our Space reflects the current Canterbury Regional Policy Statement policy direction that the Central City and Key Activity Centres are the focus for commercial activity (office and retail), not just shopping malls, but also other public and community facilities such as education, health and leisure services. These centres integrate high quality public realm spaces and are well-connected by public transport services and safe cycle networks. Medium density housing in and around such centres support their vitality and viability.

Officers recommend amendments to section 5.7 to clarify the policy intent behind key activity centres and the connection with the 10-minute neighbourhood conceptual diagram in Figure 19.

We further note provision for neighbourhood centres in the district plans, which are smaller centres providing for smaller scale commercial activities. These are also an important factor when considering 10-minute neighbourhoods.
We accept the officers’ recommendations, and do not recommend any further changes in response to this submission point.

Considers that the projected growth for Selwyn is understated, and that growth is dynamic so ring-fencing the growth of towns based on currently known factors will result in inflexibilities.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (*Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands*) in the officers’ report. They noted that in July 2018, MFE and MBIE published a report that evaluated capacity assessments undertaken for the high growth urban areas. This report stated that most high growth urban areas used an alternative to Statistics NZ’s medium projections, and in general, the choice to use a different projection could be clearly explained and justified with recent trends. The report considered the demand assessment for Greater Christchurch to be best practice amongst high growth urban areas.

They noted that the projections are only the starting point for spatial planning. For instance, the setting of territorial authority housing targets in *Our Space* reflects projections over the medium term, but over the long term it was considered that simply duplicating projections would not take account of Greater Christchurch’s unique post-earthquake circumstances and may not align with the strategic goals of the Urban Development Strategy to increasingly enable growth through redevelopment. The approach to territorial authority housing targets in *Our Space* allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term. Greater Christchurch targets still provide for projected demand over the long term. It is in the apportionment by territorial authority that *Our Space* differs from current projections.

We are satisfied with the officers’ response. In addition, we note there are a number of other considerations such as ability to service, maintenance of a compact urban form, and presence of natural hazards which will all contribute to whether it is appropriate to develop in a particular location.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Questions whether privately supplied infrastructure to encourage growth would be appropriate if it meant the population could have greater say in where and what form of housing they chose to reside.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 10 (*Provision and protection of key infrastructure, and integration with development*). They also noted that the evidence base associated with *Our Space* demonstrates there is sufficient capacity planned for other infrastructure to support the projected growth in Greater Christchurch. *Our Space* will need to monitor and review the effect of future growth on this infrastructure provision as part of subsequent capacity assessments, which includes engaging closely with infrastructure providers and operators.

We note that the request by the submitter is inconsistent with the Urban Development Strategy. We also note that the Council is usually vested with infrastructure and becomes responsible for that infrastructure. We are satisfied that the current approach to infrastructure, including the planning for it, is appropriately provided for in LGA infrastructure plans.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

*Dalkeith Holdings Limited (020)*
Landowner supports the inclusion of land (within the PIB) in Rangiora for future development and seeks expedited plan changes to enable timely development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Ms Fiona Aston, a planning consultant, in relation to the Dalkeith submission. She sought that the land be identified as a Greenfield Priority Area. It is currently located within the projected infrastructure boundary at Rangiora and has just 3 landowners. The site is within the projected infrastructure boundary (identified as the ‘urban limit’) in the first version of Proposed Change 1 (PC1) to the CRPS, which indicated the possibility of development from 2028 to 2041.

Ms Aston considered that the Dalkeith land should be identified for development before any other land outside of the projected infrastructure boundary. She sought that if sequencing were to take place, provision should be made to develop this land.

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district).

We are satisfied that the proposed Change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS to enable the development of future development areas, the subsequent district plan review and the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022 provide adequate timing for development.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Queries why the future development areas have not been identified as Greenfield Priority Areas and considers that deferring decisions on when these areas are developed until the District Plan Review stage could risk adding delays and uncertainties.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers’ report. They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but considers that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the CRPS Map A proposed in Our Space for 2019). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas. In addition to this, we note that Greenfield Priority Areas are those that were introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. This is the reason for differentiating them from future development areas, as set out in the officers’ response to questions from the Hearings Panel (question 1).

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Considers that a high growth projection scenario could be more appropriate for Waimakariri given recent trends.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands). In summary, they said that there are uncertainties in determining future demand. This is reflected in the NPS-UDC requirements for ongoing monitoring and review of projections and targets as part of periodic capacity assessments. Officers said that subsequent capacity assessments will benefit from new data and information, for example, the results of the 2018 Census and the anticipated release of new sub-regional and territorial authority household projections by Statistics NZ in 2020.
We accept the officers’ position on this, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Lionel Green (021)**

Landowner seeks the inclusion of land (outside the PIB) on Marshlands Rd, Christchurch for development through changes to the CRPS that provide flexibility to respond to minor zoning anomalies or development proposals.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Mr Green seeks to subdivide his land into two approximately two hectare lots. We heard from Ms Aston in relation to the request for flexibility around the urban edge. Ms Aston considered that development under 4 hectares could be considered on the ‘urban continuum’, and should be provided for in Our Space. Ms Aston referred us to the definition of urban environment in the NPS-UDC.

Ms Aston could only provide anecdotal evidence that there is a lack of supply of rural residential land. Officers provided a further explanation in relation to rural residential and large lot development in their reply.

We are satisfied with and accept the officers’ recommendation that in terms of changes to existing policy this is properly left for the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Sharon Jones (022)**

Landowner seeks the inclusion of land (outside the PIB) in Rolleston for future development, noting the imminent changes to the airport noise contours, and seeks expedited plan changes to enable timely development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from Ms Aston and Mr Phillip Kennard describe in relation to the submission of Ms Sharon Jones.

The combined area subject to the submission is just under 42 hectares adjoining existing Greenfield Priority Areas, and is located under the noise contours for Christchurch Airport. Ms Aston noted that Mr Matthew Bonis said that it was likely that the noise contours would be reduced at Rolleston and Kaiapoi. As such, they would like to identify that land in advance as Greenfield Priority Area. Ms Aston noted that the Future Development Area at Kaiapoi includes land that is located within the contour at Kaiapoi. In terms of the suitability of the land, it was defensible and created a consolidated urban form. She said it was close to the town centre, and could be serviced, even it is wasn’t in the Projected Infrastructure Boundary.

Mr Kennard said that the land met all of the criteria under the NPS-UDC for zoning urban land except for the airport noise contour. In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Kennard said that it would lend itself well to medium to high density development, as well as rest home type activities.

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (*Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district*), and reporting officers’ reply report (question 13) regarding further investigation ahead of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. They acknowledged the work being undertaken by Christchurch International Airport to trial alternative flight paths. The most appropriate process to consider the impacts on zoning from any changes to the airport noise contour is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. They noted the review is identified in Section 6.2 of Our Space in the schedule of future work.
We accept the officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Requests that the status of future development areas, as amended to include the submitter’s land, are changed to Greenfield Priority Areas to enable zoning and development to proceed.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers’ report. They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but considers that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the CRPS Map A proposed in Our Space for 2019). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas. In addition to this, we note that Greenfield Priority Areas are those that were introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. This is the reason for differentiating them from future development areas, as set out in the officers’ response to questions from the Hearings Panel (question 1).

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Seeks changes to the CRPS that provide flexibility to accommodate meritorious proposals for urban development and zoning, and facilitate a more responsive planning approach to urban growth management.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. By way of observation, we note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop, and increases the likelihood of fragmentation of that land, potentially resulting in less ability to properly structure plan and develop that land for urban activities at a later date.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Notes that no further capacity is provided in Selwyn for the medium term and only in Rolleston for the long term.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers said that the proposed change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement to identify future development areas in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi that are within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary will seek to ensure there is sufficient capacity to meet the demands for housing in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts over the medium and long term. Section 5.3 of Our Space outlines the proposed planning response in greater detail.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Ivan Robertson, Lindsay and Judith Blackmore, and Malcolm Main (023)**

Landowner supports the inclusion of land (within the PIB) in Rolleston for future development and seeks expedited plan changes to enable timely development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Ms Aston in relation to the Robertson, Blackmore and Main submission. She sought that the land be identified as a Greenfield Priority Area. It is currently located within the projected infrastructure boundary at Rolleston. She sought that if sequencing were to take place, provision should be made to develop this land.
In relation to higher densities sought by CCC, she noted that Rolleston had been very successful without that requirement, and that it operated a high frequency bus service.

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district).

We are satisfied that the district plan reviews and the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement provides adequate timing for development.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.

Requests that the status of future development areas are amended to Greenfield Priority Areas to enable zoning and development to proceed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers' report. They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but considers that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the CRPS Map A proposed in Our Space for 2019). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas. In addition to this, we note that Greenfield Priority Areas are those that were introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. This is the reason for differentiating them from future development areas, as set out in the officers’ response to questions from the Hearings Panel (question 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seeks changes to the CRPS that provide flexibility to accommodate meritorious proposals for urban development and zoning, and facilitate a more responsive planning approach to urban growth management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We accept officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. By way of observation, we note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop, and increases the likelihood of fragmentation of that land, potentially resulting in less ability to properly structure plan and develop that land for urban activities at a later date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes that no further capacity is provided in Selwyn for the medium term and only in Rolleston for the long term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers said that the proposed change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement to identify future development areas in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi that are within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary will seek to ensure there is sufficient capacity to meet the demands for housing in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts over the medium and long term. Section 5.3 of Our Space outlines the proposed planning response. We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CIFA Holdings Ltd - South Rolleston (024)*
Landowner supports the inclusion of land (within the PIB) in Rolleston for future development and seeks expedited plan changes to enable timely development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Ms Aston and Mr Bob Patton in relation to the CJFA Holdings Limited Land, a 16 ha block adjoining Farringdon. Ms Aston sought that the land be identified as a Greenfield Priority Area. It is currently located within the projected infrastructure boundary at Rolleston. She sought that if sequencing were to take place, provision should be made to develop this land.

Mr Patton said it was important to get affordable housing with a variety of house sizes noting that terrace housing was a potentially good outcome. Mr Patton said his client was happy to develop up to 15 households per hectare.

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (*Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district*).

We are satisfied that the district plan reviews and the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement provides adequate timing for development.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.

Requests that the status of future development areas are amended to Greenfield Priority Areas to enable zoning and development to proceed.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (*Sequencing and staging of greenfield land*) in the officers’ report. They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but considers that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas. In addition to this, we note that Greenfield Priority Areas are those that were introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. This is the reason for differentiating them from future development areas, as set out in the officers’ response to questions from the Hearings Panel (question 1).

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.

Seeks changes to the CRPS that provide flexibility to accommodate meritorious proposals for urban development and zoning, and facilitate a more responsive planning approach to urban growth management.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. By way of observation, we note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop, and increases the likelihood of fragmentation of that land, potentially resulting in less ability to properly structure plan and develop that land for urban activities at a later date.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.

Notes that no further capacity is provided in Selwyn for the medium term and only in Rolleston for the long term.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers said that the proposed change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement to identify future development areas in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi that are within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary will seek to ensure there is sufficient capacity to meet the demands for housing in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts over the medium and long term. Section 5.3 of Our Space outlines the proposed planning response.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.

**Barry Gallagher and David Tipple (025)**

Landowner seeks the inclusion of land (outside the PIB) in north-east Christchurch for future development as a Greenfield Priority Area that provides for large lot residential subdivision, and seeks expedited plan changes to enable timely development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from both Ms Aston and Mr David Tipple in relation to the submission from Barry Gallagher and David Tipple, seeking large lot development. We note that the net density for development under the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement excludes areas that are subject to geotechnical constraints, which can give rise to larger lot sizes. In addition to this, no information was provided in relation to quantification of, or supply or demand for larger lots, or the impact of this on the efficient use of the land resource. Mr Tipple provided us with his opinion about the need to provide larger lots for development. We do not consider that the densities recommended by us preclude provision for social development of children for the types of activities indicated by Mr Tipple. No information was provided to us that provision of further greenfield land was required due to a shortfall in capability to provide for housing in Christchurch City. We note the significant supply in the short term that is provided for in Table 3 of Our Space.

We accept the officers’ recommendations that consideration of large lot or rural residential development outside of the urban area can be considered as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Ellis Darussette Ltd (026)**

Landowner supports the inclusion of land (within the PIB) in Rolleston for future development and seeks expedited plan changes to enable timely development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from Ms Aston and Ms Jeanette Ellis in support of the submission for Ellis Darussette. Ms Aston described how Ellis Darussette land was excluded from the Housing Accord Special Housing Area (HSA) over the neighbouring land. There is subdivision being undertaken on that land. No opportunity was given to join the SHA. The owners have been advised that because the land is not included in Map A of the CRPS, they are unlikely to get consent. She sought that the land be identified as a Greenfield Priority Area. It is
currently located within the projected infrastructure boundary at Rolleston. She sought that if sequencing were to take place, provision should be made to develop this land.

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district).

We are satisfied that the district plan reviews and the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement provides adequate timing for development.

We accept in part the submitters request, to the extent that we have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

Requests that the status of future development areas are amended to Greenfield Priority Areas to enable zoning and development to proceed.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers’ report. They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but considers that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the CRPS Map A proposed in Our Space). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas. In addition to this, we note that Greenfield Priority Areas are those that were introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. This is the reason for differentiating them from future development areas, as set out in the officers’ response to questions from the Hearings Panel (question 1).

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Seeks changes to the CRPS that provide flexibility to accommodate meritorious proposals for urban development and zoning, and facilitate a more responsive planning approach to urban growth management.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. By way of observation, we note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop, and increases the likelihood of fragmentation of that land, potentially resulting in less ability to properly structure plan and develop that land for urban activities at a later date.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Considers that it is appropriate to provide additional Greenfield Priority Areas in both Selwyn and Waimakariri to provide for demand over the medium term given the uncertainties associated with the assessments.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers said that the proposed change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement to identify future development areas in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi that are within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary will seek to ensure there is sufficient capacity to meet the demands for housing in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts over the medium and long term. Section 5.3 of Our Space outlines the proposed planning response.
We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Requests that Figure 16 (p. 25) is amended to identify the submitter’s land as a Greenfield Priority Area and show that it is not located within the Special Housing Area.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We agree that the submitter’s land should not be identified as a Special Housing Area on Figures 15 and 16. We do not accept that the submitter’s land should be included as a greenfield priority area for the reasons set out in response to the above submission points. We accept the submission point in part and recommend amending Figures 15 and 16 so that the submitter’s land is not identified as a Special Housing Area.

### Victoria Foxton (027)

**Landowner seeks the inclusion of land (outside the PIB) on Port Hills Rd/Scruttons Rd, Christchurch for future development.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the assessment in the officers’ report which is set out in Section 4 Theme 4. Demand can be met for future housing needs through appropriate densities both within the Christchurch City area, and Greater Christchurch. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas should be considered as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We accept in part the submitter’s request, to the extent that we have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

Considers that there are plenty of potential greenfield areas available in and around Christchurch for development, and that areas being encouraged for redevelopment and higher densities have had negative outcomes.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 7 (*Poor intensification outcomes and preferences to focus intensification in the Central City*) in the officers’ report. This notes that Christchurch has many examples of high quality residential intensification, and that these matters are best dealt with at a territorial authority level. We accept this and further note that Christchurch has recently been through a district plan review which addresses design matters comprehensively, and that Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils are about to embark on their reviews.

We accept the officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Questions the role of Christchurch City Council in providing and funding social and affordable housing.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We refer to the officers’ comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (*Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types*).

The purpose of a social and affordable housing action plan would be to enable social and affordable housing across Greater Christchurch. However, specific details of such an action plan have yet to be determined. The action plan is discussed in Section 5.1 and Section 6.2 of Our Space.

We additionally note that submissions on matters such as provision and funding of social and affordable housing is also a matter for annual plan and long term planning processes.
We accept the officers’ position that no changes are necessary, and as a result, no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers that commercial developments in suburban areas should not be disregarded as not all people want to shop in a mall or the Central City, and it is important that suburban communities are allowed to grow.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (*Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’*) of the officers’ report. This acknowledges that the explanation of, and policy intent behind, Key Activity Centres is limited in Our Space, and officers recommend the connection with the 10-minute neighbourhood concept should be clarified in Our Space through additional wording in Section 5.

We accept the officers’ recommendation and accept the submission point in part.

Questions why more industrial land shouldn’t be made available instead of having enough to just meet demand.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 6 (*Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport*) and 8 (*Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’*) of the officers’ report. They noted the Capacity Assessment identified a significant over-supply of industrial land in Greater Christchurch to meet long term demand. Section 3.3 of Our Space outlines these findings.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Supports the proposals for rapid transport corridors.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (*Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport*) in the officers’ report. We note support for rapid transport corridors.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**M. Springer (028)**

Landowner seeks the inclusion of land (outside the PIB) in Prebbleton for future development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendation in the officers’ report which is set out in Section 4 Theme 4. This outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and Greater Christchurch. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of areas outside the Projected Infrastructure Boundary should be considered as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We accept in part the submitters request, to the extent that we have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

**Inovo Projects (029)**
Considers that additional greenfield land may be necessary in Christchurch as some identified greenfield areas will be unsuitable for development from a geotechnical perspective.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (*Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district*) in the officers’ report.

They said that the Capacity Assessment identified sufficient development capacity in Christchurch City to meet long term housing demand, even after discounting areas that were assessed to be commercially unfeasible to develop. The feasibility test considered geotechnical conditions. Section 3.2 of Our Space outlines the findings on the sufficiency of housing development capacity.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Notes that additional greenfield land may be required to meet demand in other towns, such as West Melton.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (*Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district*), and reporting officers’ reply report (question 13) regarding further investigation ahead of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

They said that the Capacity Assessment identified sufficient development capacity in Christchurch City to meet long term housing demand, even after discounting areas that were assessed to be commercially unfeasible to develop. Section 3.2 of Our Space outlines the findings on the sufficiency of housing development capacity.

We were told that Our Space proposes future development areas in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi to help address projected housing capacity shortfalls in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts. These future development areas align with the strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. Officers considered that the appropriate process to consider the potential growth of other towns in Greater Christchurch is during the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 of Our Space in the schedule of future work.

We agree with the position put forward by officers. Uptake and capacity assessments will continually inform constraints on existing areas identified for development. This will lead to future planning and identification of land as part of future changes. The appropriate time to consider those additional areas is as part of the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022, noting although Our Space does not discount the possibility that other land may be appropriate for future housing and business uses, it is important that any land identified for urban development is consistent with the strategic directions from the Urban Development Strategy and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement which seek to promote a consolidated urban form in Greater Christchurch, and that it aligns with the infrastructure servicing arrangements outlined in relevant Long Term Plans and infrastructure strategies.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Supports the approach of requiring a diverse range of housing but considers that the 15 households per hectare requirement for greenfield areas in Christchurch inhibits the delivery of housing diversity.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (*Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts*) and 9 (*Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types*) in the hearing reports. They considered the evidence base associated with Our Space demonstrates the need to enable a range of
housing types and identifies the matters that are likely to impact demand for different housing types over time. Our Space will need to monitor and review the anticipated scale and pace of changes to housing demand as part of subsequent capacity assessments.

We consider that in Christchurch city, provision for higher densities is required to avoid sprawl, as well as create a good environment that supports public transport patronage.

We accept the officers' recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Supports commercial activities in the main town centres but considers that some activities may be better located outside these areas.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to their comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’) in the officers’ report. They said that Our Space reflects the current Canterbury Regional Policy Statement direction that the Central City and Key Activity Centres are the focus for commercial activity (office and retail), not just shopping malls, but also other public and community facilities such as education, health and leisure services. These centres integrate high quality public realm spaces and are well-connected by public transport services and safe cycle networks. Medium density housing in and around such centres support their vitality and viability.

We further note provision for neighbourhood centres in the district plans, which are smaller centres providing for smaller scale commercial activities. These are also an important factor when considering 10 minute neighbourhoods.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Highlights the uncertainties with the projected demands and the impacts of uncontrollable events.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) in the officers' report. They noted that in July 2018, MFE and MBIE published a report that evaluated capacity assessments undertaken for the high growth urban areas. This report stated that most high growth urban areas used an alternative to Statistics NZ’s medium projections, and in general, the choice to use a different projection could be clearly explained and justified with recent trends. The report considered the demand assessment for Greater Christchurch to be best practice amongst high growth urban areas.

They noted that the projections are only the starting point for spatial planning. For instance, the setting of territorial authority housing targets in Our Space reflects projections over the medium term, but over the long term it was considered that simply duplicating projections would not take account of Greater Christchurch’s unique post-earthquake circumstances and may not align with the strategic goals of the Urban Development Strategy to increasingly enable growth through redevelopment. Hence the adoption of the transitional approach to territorial authority housing targets in Our Space that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term. Greater Christchurch targets still provide for projected demand over the long term. It is in the apportionment by territorial authority that Our Space differs from current projections.

We are satisfied with the officers’ response. In addition, we note there are a number of other considerations such as ability to service, maintenance of a compact urban form, and presence of natural hazard which will all contribute to whether it is appropriate to develop in a particular location.
We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Oderings Nurseries Limited (030)**

Landowner seeks the inclusion of land (outside the PIB) on Cashmere Rd, Christchurch for future development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from Mr Julian Ordering, Director Shareholder and Property Manager, and Mr Lewis in relation to the submission of Oderings Nurseries Limited. Mr Ordering confirmed that he wanted the Panel to enable him to develop his land through rezoning of both their Cashmere Road and Philpotts Road properties.

Officers do not support the inclusion of additional development in the Hendersons Basin/Cashmere floodplain area, on the basis that there is sufficient land available within the existing Christchurch area to cater for greenfield growth. We have considered the submitters request, and note that in relation to the land, we have not received expert evidence on the matter of flooding and flood heights, either from the submitter, or the Christchurch City Council. We do note that the Christchurch City Council, in the additional information it provided to us, did not consider that the site sought to be included by the submitter fulfilled its criteria for small, site specific additions to future development areas. We were not able to discuss or test the conclusions with the authors of that report. We must take a precautionary approach to that information, but it is relevant information for us to take it into account.

We agree with the officers, who do not consider that the additional land proposed by the submitter is preferable to the land identified in Our Space, or is necessary to demonstrate sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term for Greater Christchurch. The inclusion of additional land is best considered as part of subsequent RMA planning processes, including review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans, and relevant LGA process, including structure planning.

We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Identifies RMA processes, council charges and health and safety requisites as barriers to affordable housing.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 *(Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types)*. Officers said that Christchurch City Council, working in partnership with the Ōtautahi Community Housing Trust, has a substantial social housing stock, while Selwyn District Council has recently agreed a policy approach that fosters social and affordable housing but does not entail any direct provision. Nationally, they noted new Government initiatives such as KiwiBuild can complement and support the work locally undertaken by housing providers. We were also told of the use of incentives in Queenstown regarding inclusionary housing in relation to the submission of Te Waipounamu Affordable Housing Network. An action plan to look at social and affordable housing is included in Our Space. As such, we consider that there are pathways to enabling affordable housing.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

---
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Considers that public transport and cycling are unattractive modes of transport, and supports commercial developments in the suburbs and towns as they are more accessible by car than the Central City.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport) and 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’) in the officers’ report, and the reporting officers’ reply report (question 9) with respect to the 10-minute neighbourhood concept.

They noted that higher densities provide for modal choice, and if more people cycle or use public transport, this will reduce congestion.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Notes that greenfield developments located near existing infrastructure is advantageous for councils and residents.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 10 (Provision and protection of key infrastructure, and integration with development). The submission point is noted.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**Car Distribution Group Limited (031)**

Landowner supports the identification of land (within the PIB) on Johns Rd, Christchurch as a Greenfield Priority Area for business.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that this land is identified as a Greenfield Priority Area for business on Map A of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. However, the recent Christchurch District Plan Review concluded that this land could not be rezoned at that time. We are advised that further consideration of this matter is proceeding between the landowner and Christchurch City Council.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**Infinity Investment Group Holdings Limited (032)**

Developer with mixed-use developments (within the PIB) at Yaldhurst Park, Christchurch and Ravenswood, Woodend requests a projections-led approach to targets to ensure housing is not under-supplied in Waimakariri.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) and theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) in the officers’ report.

They noted that Statistics NZ incorporate immigration forecasts in the population projections and this remains the most robust information available to predict future population changes. The NPS-UDC requires a new capacity assessment every three years to ensure planning is responsive to such changing trends.
Officers said that the approach to setting housing targets in Our Space, as outlined in Section 3.2 is also considered to represent a principles-based approach rather than following a purely projections-led approach.

Our Space also outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and Greater Christchurch. As discussed below, the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022 is the appropriate time to consider identification of further areas.

We accept officers' position. We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

**Majority Beneficiaries of the Bellgrove Family Trust; Gary Inch, Devin Inch, Sharlene Inch and Courtney Inch (033)**

Landowner supports the inclusion of land (within the PIB) in Rangiora for future development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from Mr Courtney Inch on behalf of the Beneficiaries of the Bellgrove Family Trust, which supported the identification of its land for future development. Officers continue to support the current identification of the site.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Geoff Marks (034)**

Notes the need to consider the development of tiny house communities as a new form of affordable housing.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers refer us to comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types) in the officers’ report. They said that Our Space does not limit the potential for appropriate innovative housing options, such as tiny houses or adaptable new builds, nor mechanisms that enable partitioning of existing larger houses to create two households. Territorial authorities already have planning provisions in this regard, and further consideration may be appropriate through district plan reviews.

We understand from officers that Christchurch City Council is currently working with the Canterbury Tiny House Society on its proposal for a temporary land use in the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor Regeneration Area.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**RJ Civil Construction (035)**
Landowner seeks the inclusion of land (outside the PIB) on Sawyers Arm Rd, Christchurch for future development as a Greenfield Priority Area for business, thereby reflecting the current use of the site as a contractor’s yard.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Mr Fitzgerald in relation to the submission from R J Civil Construction. The site at 510 Sawyers Arms Road is currently operating as a contractors yard, operating under a temporary resource consent for business activities following the earthquakes. Mr Fitzgerald told us that the site has significant access advantages to arterial roads, which suited the civil engineering contracting business operating on the site. Including the site as an urban area would reflect the existing use on the site for vehicle storage.

Officers referred to their general assessment regarding the need for further greenfield areas in Christchurch City.

We are cognisant of the role that the identified greenfield priority areas and future development area land has in providing a reasonable amount of certainty for rural amenity, particularly given that the projected supply of land for industrial and commercial purposes is considered to be sufficient for the next 30 years. We also note the temporary nature of the activity which is directly related to the earthquakes.

Given the above, we do not consider that expansion of the future development area for business land to incorporate the submitter’s land to be appropriate. In this respect, we accept the recommendations as set out in Section 4 Theme 4 of the officers’ report.

We accept the officers’ position in relation to this submission and have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

Concerned that Figure 16 (p. 25) does not reflect recent developments and existing land use activities.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that the Map at Figure 16 is not developed at that scale and it is not appropriate to identify such detail. In addition, we note that there are various business type activities through the rural area that operate by way of consent, such as that at the submitter’s location.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**Lawrence and Cherry McCallum (036)**

Considers that recent growth has represented controlled urban sprawl, which is a distortion of the UDS strategic direction and at the expense of providing well-designed medium density living in the central core.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Mrs Cherry and Mr Lawrie McCallum in relation to their submission.

Mr McCallum said that a disproportionate amount of growth has gone to Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts, when it should have gone to the key activity and central cities and intensification. He hoped that the Partnership was a true Partnership, and that perhaps this was reflected in the different reports and submissions from Christchurch City Council.

Mr McCallum considered that more development should be going to the city, rather than to Waimakariri and Selwyn. More medium density was required in the central city for aging people that can walk to cafes, and that there needed a reboot of the public transport system. He did not consider buses would do it on their own, and there is a need to move to light rail. There is a need to integrate exercise to address the
obesity epidemic, and climate change needs to be addressed. He said this all points towards more medium density in the central city and better public transport. He said that we need to live in a climate friendly way. Mrs McCallum agreed and that investment in light rail needed to be made now, including separation between scooters, bikes and pedestrians.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr McCallum did not want more effort put into getting people between Rolleston and Rangiora and the City, but did want to see more effort put into getting people from within Christchurch moving around, particular from the eastern Christchurch into the city. He said that aggregation of land would lead to better design.

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) and 7 (Poor intensification outcomes and preferences to focus intensification in the Central City). Officers noted that Our Space seeks to ensure there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in Greater Christchurch to meet demand over the medium and long term, and that this demand is met in a way that aligns with the strategic directions from the Urban Development Strategy. With this in mind, over 80% of the development capacity identified in Our Space is already zoned in district plans, either in existing urban area zonings that enable redevelopment at higher densities (45%) or in undeveloped greenfield areas (36%).

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Supports providing a range of new housing types and developing a social and affordable housing action plan.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types) of the officers’ report.

They did not recommend additional changes in the officers’ report, but as part of their reply, they included a timeframe for the development of the action plan. The matters addressed above will explore a number of different options in terms of providing for social and affordable housing.

We accept the officers’ position noting the recommendation to include a timeframe for the development of the action plan.

No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Seeks more urgent provision for high frequency public transport and active transport modes.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred us to their comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to theme 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport). They said the option of rail services in Greater Christchurch is being considered as part of the Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Promotes putting power and telephone lines underground to improve the amenity of existing residential areas.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers noted this. They said that this matter is more appropriately addressed through more detailed planning and development processes at a local authority level.
We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Seeks the retention of noise sensitive development policies surrounding the airport, protection of the unconfined aquifer from quarrying and development, and no development in floodplains and coastal hazard zones.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted this. No changes are proposed to the matters set out in the submission point.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Sustainable Ōtautahi Christchurch (037)**

Considers that planning for future growth needs must be firmly redirected towards the ‘big picture’ issues, such as zero carbon aspirations, with the risks of continuing along a path of market-led growth likely to become very clear within a generation.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Mr John Peet for Sustainable Ōtautahi Christchurch. He said that changes from raw economic growth to wellbeing over the last few years had changed. He said that world-wide, there is a gathering storm of high level risks, which are outlined in the submission, including climate change, sea level rise, and depletion of high quality resources. The assumptions behind the study assume a linear environment, rather than one that will radically change. This requires an overarching risk-based philosophy to be adopted for the strategy. He argued that it needs to be flexible, adaptable and evolutionary approach that is solutions-based, and it was his opinion is that the strategy would not deliver this, even though it is looking 30 years into the future.

Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to theme 11 (*Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals*).

They said that Our Space seeks to balance the projected future demands of housing and business markets with the urban form that will best enable sustainable growth. This is reflected in the approach to setting housing targets, as outlined in Section 3.2, which is projections-led over the medium term and principles-based over the long term. They said that the proposed development of a social and affordable housing action plan also responds to the need for intervention. This action plan is covered in Section 5.1 and Section 6.2.

We consider the response with regard to addressing climate change, achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals merits its own new section under Section 4 in Our Space, elevated to a higher priority, and amendments to Section 5 of the report, with tighter, clearer and more aspirational wording. As a result, we accept the submission in part to the extent that changes to those sections are made.

To that extent, the submission is accepted in part, to better recognise those matters as set out above.

Notes that the consultation processes currently followed by government are seldom put forward in a way that encourages response for meaningful input from third sector organisations.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers consider that the role of Third Sector Organisations as collaborative partners could be referred to more explicitly in Our Space. They recommend adding a reference to third sector organisations in the second para of section 6.3 beginning “Although the implementation...”.

We accept Officers’ position on this and recommend that it is amended accordingly.
Cathedral City Development Ltd (038)

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) on Port Hills land, Christchurch.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We heard from Ms Fiona Aston (planning) and Mr David Fox (surveying and land development) regarding the submission from Cathedral City Development Limited in relation to its land on Harry Ell Drive in Cashmere. It was submitted that large lot residential would be the most efficient use of the land which is served by public transport and provided for walking linkages. It was considered that the addition of 10 lots is very minor in the scale of the capacity figures in Our Space and it would be better to provide for development now, rather than waiting for it. Apart from anecdotal evidence, no information or analysis was provided to us on the market for large lot development land. We note that large lot development can be achieved anywhere throughout the city by way of amalgamation and/or purchase of adjacent titles at market rates.

We accept the officers' comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district). This outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and the wider Greater Christchurch area. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas should be considered as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers capacity assessment targets to be uncertain, inaccurate and based on a flawed methodology.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
No recommendations were made by the submitter as to how this should be addressed in the housing capacity methodology. We accept the officers' position that the capacity assessment is sound and fit for purpose. We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment's report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the housing demand assessment undertaken by Greater Christchurch to be an example of 'best practice'. The report recognises that more could be done regarding setting out assumptions around feasible development, but throughout the document, this appears as a recommendation for future capacity assessment reports. We are satisfied that the housing capacity assessment is fit for purpose, and that continual refinement will address future capacity and feasibility as markets change and more information is gathered.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that some existing zoned hill areas will not be practical, economic or feasible to develop.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We acknowledge that there may be examples where some hill development will not necessarily be feasible to develop to its full potential, however we accept the officers' position that capacity for both Christchurch and over the Greater Christchurch area is catered for in the medium term, and that those estimates build in an additional capacity margin to address this situation.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes the inclusion of a new policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS to provide flexibility to develop outside the urban boundary where certain criteria are met.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We accept officers' position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work. We note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty and guidance for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop.

---
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**No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.**

Proposes that Figure 16 should be included in District Plans rather than the CRPS.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that the appropriate process to consider such policy changes is through the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022.

**Christchurch International Airport Limited (039)**

Advises that noise contours are currently being re-modelled with revised contours available in early 2019.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Ms Jo Appleyard (legal counsel), Mr Rhys Boswell (CIAL operations and landholdings), Mr Greg Akehurst (economics), Mr Anthony Penny (transport) and Mr Matthew Bonis (planning) in relation to the submission and evidence presented on behalf of Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL). They described how the revised noise contours would be approximately 6 months away. Indications at present were that they would not be extended into areas of future development identified in Our Space.

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 10 (Provision and protection of key infrastructure and integration with development). They noted the comment from CIAL and said that this matter can be addressed as part of subsequent RMA processes, including the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Considers airport should be recognised as a Key Employment, Commercial and Transport Node and assists in providing for medium to long term commercial needs.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
CIAL seeks that the Projected Infrastructure Boundary is expanded, to identify a Future Development Area which will provide access (adjacent to the runway) to CIAL for logistics and freight in the next 10-30 years. Not providing for this use will lead to lower GDP contribution from Christchurch if the activities such as courier and manufacturing industries (which is then transported by air) cannot locate there, and business will be lost to other cities. CIAL considers that it is important not to preclude the ability of surplus land to become general industrial into the future.

Mr Rhys Boswell, General Manager of Strategy and Sustainability for CIAL, provided examples of activities that required easy access to runways. He described how land north of Memorial Avenue is not well set up and is spatially constrained, and how CIAL has tried to separate heavy vehicle movements from passenger movements. This has means that rental vehicle activities are focussed in the north, with freight in the south at Dakota Park.

Mr Anthony Penny, a traffic engineer, presented to us on traffic matters. He noted that extensions to Dakota Park are feasible from a traffic perspective, including links to bypass Hornby via Pound Road. Identifying Memorial Road as a potential rapid transit route, or at least a key bus route would help with assisting for upgrades, including provisions for cyclists and road widening.

Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 7 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood) in the officers’ report.

Officers do not consider it appropriate to promote the airport as a location for a broad range of commercial uses; the primary objective of the Airport Zone is the efficient use and development of the land, infrastructure and operational facilities of the airport. Such use and development must also be undertaken...
in a way that is consistent with the overall urban form of Christchurch City, including the centres based commercial strategy. Commercial and industrial zones provide for this wider range of employment sectors. While officers agree that the airport provides significant employment, it is not considered necessary or appropriate to introduce a specific new designation.

We accept the officers reasoning regarding this. In addition, we note that the airport already has special consideration and a framework around its operation as significant infrastructure. That term properly describes its function.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Suggests some airport land would be appropriate to meet identified shortfall of commercial land in the NW of Christchurch.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas (including specific sites proposed in each district) in the officers’ report.

They said that the Business Capacity Assessment identifies a localised shortfall of commercial land in the northern quadrant of Christchurch City, and this (10ha) shortfall is not forecast to occur until near the end of the long-term planning horizon (i.e. 2044). Provision of capacity to meet longer term needs by expanding the urban boundary or otherwise enabling greater commercial floorspace at the airport is not supported by officers at this time because:

- there is sufficient inner-city industrial land available to transition to commercial use to meet longer term needs
- future monitoring will identify the extent of any shortfalls
- there are other methods available to meet more localised demands in the northern quadrant without needing to expand the urban boundary. These will be explored as part of subsequent capacity assessments and district plan reviews.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Seeks extension of the airport designation towards Ryans Road to accommodate air freight related distribution and warehouse activities.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that Our Space identifies a significant oversupply of industrial land across Greater Christchurch. If the submitter considers additional land is needed for designated purposes the appropriate process is for the requiring authority to pursue an alteration to the existing designation either through a new Notice of Requirement or an alteration to the existing designation as provided for under Part 8 of the RMA. That designation can be considered on its merits and if appropriate inserted into the relevant district plan.

Officers also addressed the evidence of Mr Gregory Akehurst (economics) in their reply. They noted that the evidence provided by CIAL suggests there will be a long term shortfall of industrial land within the Special Purpose (Airport) Zone (SPAZ) appropriate for logistics, distribution and freight activities that rely on proximity to the airport. The evidence of Mr Akehurst states there is currently approximately 120ha of vacant land immediately surrounding the airport. More detailed analysis of demand, take-up, related locational preferences and reported capacity constraints was not provided. Nevertheless, CIAL has sought additional land be identified for industrial purposes by Our Space outside the current SPAZ adjacent to the SPAZ and Ryans Road.

Officers noted that in recent years some airport land has been used for non-airport industrial uses, albeit permitted within the zone rules, such as commercial activities and development for trade-based activities (i.e. Bunnings). They said that while this may be considered necessary and appropriate to ensure the airport
has a reliable revenue stream and runs as a profitable business, it reduces the capacity for industrial use on existing SPAZ land. Officers do not support any changes to Our Space.

We accept the officers' recommendations in this regard, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Seeks identification of an Airport to Central City Rapid Transit Route

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Transport needs and implications, including public transport). They noted that the Future Public Transport Business Case has identified the North and South-West Corridors as future rapid transit routes as they have future demand projections over the next 30 years that could support investment in rapid transit. They also have potential for land use growth. Demand and potential for growth on the Airport to Central City corridor is much lower. It is identified as a core high frequency bus route. Our Space (Section 5.2) does however identify that over time other corridors such as to the airport, to Linwood and Cashmere could be considered for rapid transit to stimulate redevelopment.

We accept the officers' recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Seeks identification of SH1 (Johns Road/Russley Road) as a strategic freight route and acknowledgement of the need for significant upgrades along that route, in particular the grade separation at Sawyers Arms Road.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Transport needs and implications, including public transport) in the officers’ report.

They said that the strategic freight routes were not identified in Our Space, as they are identified in other documents (such as the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan). Instead SH1 (Johns Road/Russley Road) is identified as a State Highway on Figure 18.

Officers noted that the NZTA has completed a Programme Business Case which outlines future upgrades of Russley Road; e.g. the upgrade of Sawyers Arms intersection, and reshape of Harewood intersection. It would not be appropriate to include the level of detail sought by the submitter, in terms of the specifics of upgrades to roads or intersections, in Our Space.

In their reply, officers recommended:

- Amended wording for Section 5.6, paragraph 7 to make it clear that Our Space recognises that other processes are underway that will address specific transport-related matters, such as potential impacts arising from anticipated future growth in Greater Christchurch.
- Amended wording for Section 5.6, paragraph 9 that acknowledges the need to protect strategic infrastructure and networks in Greater Christchurch.
- Amending Figure 18 to better identify strategic infrastructure and networks in Greater Christchurch.

As a result, we accept the submission in part to the extent that changes to those sections are made.

Flood hazard map should show full extent associated with a breakout of the Waimakariri River.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers said that the level of hazard to the Christchurch urban area and to the airport from a breakout from the Waimakariri River has been reduced to insignificant because of the construction of the secondary stop bank. However, they said that within the secondary stop bank floodplain there are high hazard flooding areas which could be shown on the map, to be consistent with this notation for the rest of the City.
As a result, we accept the submission and amend Figure 10 to depict the full extent of high hazard flooding areas.

Bird strike should be an identified hazard.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that bird strike hazard can be managed by appropriate location and design of some land uses and is not an absolute constraint to development. Officers consider that district plans are the appropriate planning document for managing bird strike hazard; and that an appropriate set of rules is included in the Christchurch District Plan.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Ben and Sally Tothill (040)**

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) on Marshs/Shands Road by CSM2 in Selwyn.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Ms Nicola Rykers (planning consultant) and Mr Tothill in relation to this submission. The site is crossed by two arms of the CSM2 motorway leaving three distinct land areas that are contained on the same title. Parts of the site are now effectively landlocked, including by the motorway and other industrial land, and it is not economic to use. The Panel sought clarification as to any previous business activities on the site. Mr Tothill described the land, operated by PGG Wrightson, contained buildings with quite a strong industrial form. As a consequence of the zoning rules, the Tothills are not able to subdivide the land, which is separated by the motorway.

The officers’ position is that the best time for consideration of what the future use of the land will be is as part of the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. Generally, officers consider that given the over-supply of industrial land that provision of further industrial land as part of a future development area is not appropriate at this stage.

Having considered the evidence, we are satisfied that the Tothill’s land presents a unique situation. However, we also consider that further information would be required as to rezoning of land or identification of it for urban development, given the buffer that is provided between industrial land and smaller block rural land to the south west. Detailed consideration should be given to the function and form of the land in the immediate area as part of the district plan review, and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement review.

We accept the officers’ comment in this regard and we recommend amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

Some land is now dissected by location and construction of CSM2 and more appropriate for industrial use.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We refer to the above submission point.

The officers’ position is that no new industrial areas are proposed, given the significant oversupply of industrial land in Greater Christchurch to meet long term demand identified in the Capacity Assessment. They noted that while there may be reasons other than land supply which weigh in favour of enabling the rezoning of this land, the appropriate process to consider the merits of any expansion of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary and/or other enabling policy changes is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work.
We accept the officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Spokes Canterbury (041)**

Suggests links are included to relevant documents – e.g. public transport routes, airport noise zone restrictions, urban boundaries, water shed protection areas.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers noted that Figure 6 of Our Space identifies relevant plans, strategies and programmes, including the Regional Public Transport Plan, Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and District Plans.

We accept officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that where a proposal is not directly committed to by other documents (e.g. 10 minute neighbourhood, complete cycle networks), make this clear and call for support; make clear what has the legislative and policy backing to be implemented and what still needs to be done.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers noted that the proposals will inform the review of other documents and the ongoing work as outlined in Section 6.2 which seek to progress the proposals in Our Space.

We accept officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Supports building higher density housing and commercial outlets on public transport routes and 10 minute neighbourhood concept – expand and apply these ideas better. Make sure neighbourhoods are close together and well connected by cycle networks.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to Theme 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’) in the officers’ report, and the reporting officers’ reply report (question 9) with respect to the 10-minute neighbourhood concept. Officers did consider that better linkages could be made in Our Space as to the policy intent behind Key Activity Centres and the relationship with 10 minute neighbourhoods, and recommended changes to Section 5 of the Strategy. They also noted that Our Space is principally focussed on the land use component of settlement planning, and that transport matters are addressed in other plans such as the Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Public Transport Plan.

We are satisfied that these matters are adequately addressed in Our Space.

We accept the officers’ position, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Mandate cycle networks within and between neighbourhoods and towns.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from Mr Dirk De Lu who spoke on behalf of Spokes Canterbury in relation to this submission point. Mr De Lu is concerned that there is little mention of cycling, or transport mode choice, and funding for these is, in his view, inadequate.

Officers noted the submissions. They also said that the Christchurch City Council had invested, and is planning to continue to invest, significantly in developing improved cycle infrastructure.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Drop greenfield developments which will only increase single occupancy vehicles; build housing where the jobs are; make sure higher density urban development offers features such as the 10 minute neighbourhood and affordability to attract residents.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Mr De Lu said that does not focus on single occupancy cars, the impacts of sprawl, and not prioritising for climate change, sea level rise, and real sustainability. This leaves the members with real concerns that the plan will fail. It does not support the change needed to change people's habits or changing people's carbon emissions. Increasing urban density and providing for 10 minute neighbourhoods will help, but this will not be achieved by building on the fringe of the city. He said that affordability of living on the fringe of the city is not sustainable. He said that urban sprawl that requires subsidies from ratepayers is, in his view, not commercially feasible.

He said that it was important to put higher densities in the existing centres, and provide for jobs within those areas. Mr De Lu considered that the plan could reject the business as usual approach and deal with issues that arose out the earthquakes, by planning for development in the best places.

Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (Reducing urban sprawl, developing in the City (and Central City) first ahead of surrounding districts), 7 (Poor intensification outcomes and preferences to focus intensification in the central city) and 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a '10-minute neighbourhood').

Officers noted that Our Space seeks to ensure there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in Greater Christchurch to meet demand over the medium and long term, and that this demand is met in a way that aligns with the strategic directions from the Urban Development Strategy. With this in mind, over 80% of the development capacity identified in Our Space is already zoned in district plans, either in existing urban area zonings that enable redevelopment at higher densities (45%) or in undeveloped greenfield areas (36%).

We note that in terms of planning for further development, that concepts such as the 10-minute neighbourhood can be worked into both greenfield and intensification proposals.

We accept officers' position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Explore ‘value capture’ and make this a requirement in the plan.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers noted this point. The said that Value Capture can be explored as part of a range of related business cases.

We accept the officers' position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Our Space needs to take account of sea level rise.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation: Mr De Lu urged the Panel to consider future generations that have not yet been born, and raised concerns in relation to those areas subject to sea level rise. Spokes Canterbury considers that planning should be undertaken with a 100 year timeframe in mind and plan for sea level rise. In response to questions from the Panel, he said that provision should be made for managed retreat for sea-level rise.

Officers referred to their comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 11 (Addressing climate change and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals). Officers said that the proposed direction of Our Space are guided by the vision, principles and strategic goals in the Urban Development Strategy, especially in terms of the 'integrated and managed urban development' theme. This involves planning for risks from natural and other hazards, including those related to sea level rise and climate change. The Urban Development Strategy approach to addressing broader sustainability objectives could be referenced through additional wording in Section 4 and 5 of Our Space. They also noted that climate change, and in particular sea level rise, is an integral part of the work undertaken by district councils related to coastal and river flooding issues.

We consider the response with regard to addressing climate change, achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals merits its own new section under Section 4 in Our Space, elevated to a higher priority, and
amendments to Section 5 of the report, with tighter, clearer and more aspirational wording. As a result, we accept the submission in part to the extent that changes to those sections are made.

Concern that much of the land for greenfield development is agricultural.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 3 (Protecting productive/agricultural/high quality soils from urban expansion). Officers noted that the role of Our Space is to ensure there is sufficient land available to support future housing and business demand, and that this demand is supported in a way that aligns with the wider strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy. Section 2.3 of Our Space highlights these strategic directions, having particular regard for the theme of ‘integrated and managed urban development’ for the purposes of this document.

While some areas within Future Development Areas contained versatile soils, additional guidance is required at a national level before this matter is addressed. This may be a matter which impacts on net density as a result of the 2022 review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, if such soils are to be protected at a national level.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**One Voice Te Reo Kotahi (OVTRK) Organising Group (042)**

Supports the submission from Sustainable Ōtāutahi Christchurch.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We refer to our recommendations in relation to the submission of Sustainable Ōtāutahi Christchurch (#37).

Suggests the role of Third Sector Organisations as collaborative partners should be explicit in the document.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers consider that the role of Third Sector Organisations as collaborative partners could be referred to more explicitly in Our Space. They recommend adding a reference to third sector organisations in the second para of section 6.3 beginning “Although the implementation...”.

We accept the officers’ position on this and recommend that it is amended accordingly.

---

**Red Spur Limited (043)**

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) on Kennedys Bush Road, Christchurch.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ evidence in the hearing report which is set out in Section 4 Theme 4. This outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and Greater Christchurch. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas for inclusion should be considered as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.
Considers capacity assessment targets to be uncertain, inaccurate and based on a flawed methodology.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) in the officers’ report.

We accept the officers’ position that the capacity assessment is sound and fit for purpose. We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the housing demand assessment undertaken by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’. The report recognises that more could be done regarding setting out assumptions around feasible development, but throughout the document, this appears as a recommendation for future capacity assessment reports. We are satisfied that the housing capacity assessment is fit for purpose, and that continual refinement will address future capacity and feasibility as markets change and more information is gathered.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that some existing zoned hill areas will not be practical, economic or feasible to develop.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers said that the assessment of sufficiency of housing development capacity underpinning Our Space includes an additional capacity margin as required by the NPS-UDC, to account for sites (such as the example given in the submission) that may not presently be practical, economic or feasible to develop.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes the inclusion of a new policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS to provide flexibility to develop outside the urban boundary where certain criteria are met.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work. We note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty and guidance for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes that Figure 16 should be included in District Plans rather than the CRPS.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that the appropriate process to consider such policy changes is through the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that streamlined RMA processes be used to rezone the submitter’s land.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ reasoning that such changes are better considered through subsequent Resource Management Act processes.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

*Simon Britten (044)*

---

5 Page 8 National Policy Statement of Urban Development Capacity – Summary evaluation report of Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessments for high-growth urban areas, published July 2018
Seeks investment in active transport and public transport.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport). They noted that Our Space is principally focussed on the land use component of settlement planning, and that transport matters are addressed in other plans such as the Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Public Transport Plan.

We accept the officers’ position, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Need for a more supportive approach to creative affordable housing solutions with current rules a barrier.**

**Officers’ comment:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types). They noted that Our Space does not limit the potential for appropriate innovative housing options, such as tiny houses or adaptable new builds, nor mechanisms that enable partitioning of existing larger houses to create two households. Territorial authorities already have some planning provisions in this regard and can consider this further through subsequent district plan reviews and changes. They noted the comment regarding rule provisions in the Christchurch District Plan outside this process.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Tony Dale (045)**

**Predictions to 2048 are probably wrong.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) in the officers’ report. They noted that in July 2018, MfE and MBIE published a report that evaluated capacity assessments undertaken for the high growth urban areas. This report stated that most high growth urban areas used an alternative to Statistics NZ’s medium projections, and in general, the choice to use a different projection could be clearly explained and justified with recent trends. The report considered the demand assessment for Greater Christchurch to be best practice amongst high growth urban areas.

They noted that the projections are only the starting point for spatial planning. For instance, the setting of territorial authority housing targets in Our Space reflects projections over the medium term, but over the long term it was considered that simply duplicating projections would not take account of Greater Christchurch’s unique post-earthquake circumstances and may not align with the strategic goals of the Urban Development Strategy to increasingly enable growth through redevelopment. Hence the adoption of the transitional approach to territorial authority housing targets in Our Space that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term. Greater Christchurch targets still provide for projected demand over the long term. It is in the apportionment by territorial authority that Our Space differs from current projections.

We are satisfied with the officers’ response. In addition, we note there are a number of other considerations such as ability to service, maintenance of a compact urban form, and presence of natural hazard which will all contribute to whether it is appropriate to develop in a particular location.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Highly productive agricultural land should not be wasted.**
Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 3 (Protecting productive/agricultural/high quality soils from urban expansion). Officers noted that the role of Our Space is to ensure there is sufficient land available to support future housing and business demand, and that this demand is supported in a way that aligns with the wider strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy. Section 2.3 of Our Space highlights these strategic directions, having particular regard for the theme of ‘integrated and managed urban development’ for the purposes of this document.

While some areas within Future Development Areas contained versatile soils, additional guidance is required at a national level before this matter is addressed. This may be a matter which impacts on net density as a result of the 2022 review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, if such soils are to be protected at a national level.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Intensification north of Riccarton is occurring but need ways to encourage central city population rather than around suburban centres.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 7 (Poor intensification outcomes and preferences to focus intensification in the Central City). They said that the Capacity Assessment confirms that the existing provisions of the Christchurch District Plan are sufficient to accommodate such demand and that the Christchurch District Plan’s zones and associated rules allow for a range of densities and housing types appropriate to their location (Central City, inner suburbs or outer suburbs).

Officers said that an approach to limit intensification to the Central City alone would be counter to these existing Plan provisions, would likely only deliver a segment of the housing types envisaged by intensification policies (i.e. higher density townhouses and apartments), and would be highly unlikely to provide the level of new housing required to meet projected demand.

They noted that Christchurch City Council has embarked on an ambitious programme to encourage Central City living, titled Project 8011, with a target of increasing the Central City population to 20,000 by 2028 from a current level of around 6,000. Project 8011 signals that over time the initiatives and mechanisms that comprise the programme can be rolled out more broadly, where appropriate, to encourage and support city-wide intensification.

They also observed that Christchurch City has many examples of high quality residential intensification. However, it is recognised that there are examples of poor outcomes resulting from past intensification, including poor urban design, amenity impacts (noise, car parking, etc) and reduced social cohesion. The reasons that lie behind this matter and the potential solutions that can ensure future higher quality intensification are many and varied and are best dealt with at a territorial authority level. It is also noted that improving intensification outcomes is currently a priority for the Government as it develops a new National Policy Statement on Quality Intensification.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Social and affordable housing could revitalise the city centre.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types) in the officers report.

The submitters point is noted.
No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Commercial activity should be directed towards the city centre rather than suburban centres.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (*Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a '10-minute neighbourhood'). This acknowledges that the explanation of, and policy intent behind, Key Activity Centres is limited in Our Space, and officers recommend the connection with the 10-minute neighbourhood concept should be clarified in Our Space through additional wording in Section 5.

We accept the officers' recommendation. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Supports reversion of converted industrial premises in eastern Christchurch back to industrial use.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted this, however considered this is outside the scope of Our Space.

We accept the officers' recommendation on this. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**Don Babe (046)**

Encourage more of the growth within the Central City.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Mr Don Babe in relation to his submission.

He considered there is too much emphasis on housing away from the central city in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts. A big issue was climate change, in particular issues with carbon as a result of transport, and a key way to address this is through density. He showed us a presentation that included a graph showing carbon created per person, compared to urban density. He considered that a vibrant central city was needed, and for this it needed more people in it. A concentrated central city would have benefits such as agglomeration effects, but also social benefits as well. He considered that if people had a 20 minute bus ride, or a 10 minute walk from work to home, then this would have benefits.

Mr Babe also showed us costs of infrastructure costs from Halifax in Canada, that suburban costs approximately $3000 per year to service infrastructure, compared to $1000 per year for urban development. He admitted there were differences in what was funded, but even if the savings were half of what they were in Canada, there would still be significant savings. Mr Babe concluded that more housing needs to be met in the central city, rather than Rolleston or Rangiora.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Babe said that there was a significant amount of land in the central centre that could be upgraded, such as the area between Fitzgerald and Barbadoes Street. He noted sites that are land banked, and financial incentives need to be made so that land is developed. He said that while 70% of people live and work in Rangiora, there are another 30% that don't and they commute. He also said that people are changing in terms of their preferences, and migrants are used to much different densities.
Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) in the officers’ report. They said that Our Space seeks to provide a balanced approach that both provides for current market demands and reflects the anticipated changes in these demands over the next thirty years.

In doing so, it identifies a range of greenfield and redevelopment opportunities to support new housing, and adopts an approach to housing targets that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term than would be anticipated based on the projections.

They considered this holistic approach to targets seek to respond to projected changes over the long term and is different to constraining growth in the districts over the medium term to benefit development prospects and outcomes in the City, especially the Central City, as suggested by some submitters.

Officers said that an approach to limit intensification to the Central City alone would be counter to these existing Plan provisions, would likely only deliver a segment of the housing types envisaged by intensification policies (i.e. higher density townhouses and apartments), and would be highly unlikely to provide the level of new housing required to meet projected demand.

They noted that Christchurch City Council has embarked on an ambitious programme to encourage Central City living, titled Project 8011, with a target of increasing the Central City population to 20,000 by 2028 from a current level of around 6,000. Project 8011 signals that over time the initiatives and mechanisms that comprise the programme can be rolled out more broadly, where appropriate, to encourage and support city-wide intensification.

We note the principle behind the submission, and to that extent we accept it. However, no changes are proposed to Our Space in response to the submission point.

Less caveats on new development and development levy discounts for affordable housing.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers noted this, however considered this is outside the scope of Our Space.

We accept the officers’ recommendation. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

2013 Census biased due to EQ work so cannot be relied upon.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands). They note that the projections are only the starting point for spatial planning. For instance, the setting of territorial authority housing targets in Our Space reflects projections over the medium term, but over the long term it was considered that simply duplicating projections would not take account of Greater Christchurch’s unique post-earthquake circumstances.

We accept that there is uncertainty in the projections. The ongoing capacity analysis cycle (undertaking capacity assessments every three years) provides for monitoring of uptake and development, and the ability to adjust capacity assessments and improve the capacity assessment methodology to ensure demand and uptake is understood.

We are satisfied that no changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

Considers BAU approach needs to be tested in light of changes since the original strategy.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers noted the comments, and that the proposals set out in Our Space are strongly guided by the vision and strategic goals from the Urban Development Strategy and the extensive planning framework that has already been developed for Greater Christchurch to support long term growth. They noted it focuses on
responding to key growth issues for Greater Christchurch identified in Section 4 of Our Space. Section 6 recognises additional work is required to ensure the planning directions for the longer term are appropriately investigated and implemented and effectively respond to emerging drivers of change for Greater Christchurch.

We accept the Officers’ recommendation. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Does not fix the problems that remain or halt urban sprawl, better resolved through a common % increase in each area, meaning targets of 70k in Christchurch, 9k in Waimakariri and 7.6k in Selwyn.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 1 (*Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands*) and 2 (*Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts*) in the officer reports. They note that Our Space allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term. Greater Christchurch targets still provide for projected demand over the long term. It is in the apportionment by territorial authority that Our Space differs from current projections.

We accept the officers’ recommendation. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Most jobs in the central city impact travel and transport infrastructure from outlying areas.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (*Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport*) in the officers’ report.

This point is acknowledged.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Transport, infrastructure, social, health and business agglomeration benefits of more housing in the city.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (*Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts*).

This point is acknowledged.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Carrot and stick approach needed to encourage more development in the city.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

This point is acknowledged.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**Foddercube Products Limited (047)**

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside PIB) on Springs Road on Christchurch Selwyn boundary. Some land is adjacent to the CSM2 and more appropriate for industrial use.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard and considered the evidence provided by Ms Fiona Aston (Planner) and Mr Jeremy Speight (Bayleys Commercial and Industrial sales and leasing) on behalf of their client, Foddercube Products Limited. The land itself covers approximately 20 hectares and is located outside of the projected infrastructure boundary on the corner of Springs Road and Marshs Rd in South Hornby, adjoining existing industrial general zoned land.

Following questions from the Panel about the impact of the proposed development on rural amenity, Ms Aston did not consider the area to be critical as a buffer and considered it as a logical infill of industrial land.

Mr Speight identified that industrial land in Christchurch was held by a few owners, with a lack of supply of bare land, given that a lot of industrial land had been developed using ‘design build sale’ or ‘design build lease’ models, rather than sale of bare land. No proposal was put forward as to how this would be addressed for the subject land, nor that its ownership would necessarily be retained.

Officers’ position is that the best time for consideration of what the future use of the land will be is as part of the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. Generally, officers consider that given the over-supply of industrial land that provision of further industrial land as part of a future development area is not appropriate at this stage.

We do not consider that expansion of the future development area for industrial land to incorporate the submitters land to be appropriate. In this respect, we accept the recommendations of staff as set out in Section 4 Theme 4 of the officers’ report. However, we do recommend amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

We address the matter of flexibility around the provisions of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement below.

Development capacity targets are uncertain and likely to be inaccurate and based on flawed methodology.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We refer to the officers’ comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (*Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands*).

While the submitter provided further information as to the nature of design build sale and lease forms of industrial land supply, no recommendations were made as to how this should be addressed in the methodology, or how the submitters land would supply a different market. We accept the officers’ position that the capacity assessment is sound and fit for purpose. We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the business land capacity and feasibility work done by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’.6

We are satisfied with the officers’ position that no changes are required, noting that further refinement of the methodology may be undertaken as part of future capacity assessments as part of continual improvement.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

Proposes the inclusion of a new policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS to provide flexibility to develop outside the urban boundary where certain criteria are met.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers' position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work. By way of observation, we note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes that Figure 16 should be included in District Plans rather than the CRPS.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers' position that the appropriate process to consider such policy changes is through the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that streamlined RMA processes be used to rezone the submitter's land.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept officers' reasoning that such changes are better considered through subsequent Resource Management Act processes.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Olly Powell (048)**

Questions need for growth and considers city to already be a good size and growth would impact this.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts).

They noted that the NPS-UDC requires the local authorities in Greater Christchurch to ensure there is sufficient development capacity to support projected population growth. This is explained in section 1 of Our Space. Further, Our Space does not propose any additional greenfield future development areas for Christchurch City (beyond those already identified in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the Christchurch District Plan); therefore in this respect the city's urban boundary is not increasing in size, growth will be accommodated within existing areas of Christchurch City (primarily through intensification).

We accept the officers' recommendation. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Transpower New Zealand Ltd (049)**

Impact on National Grid and giving effect to NPSET unclear, appropriate buffer from critical infrastructure.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that the assessment of capacity of greenfield priority areas took account of Outline Development Plans, which show powerlines that are a constraint on development. For redevelopment in Christchurch City, the District Plan zones with the higher potential for redevelopment largely avoid powerlines. They noted that relatively small areas of Residential Suburban and Residential Hills zoned land are affected, however, the overall impact is considered to be minimal in the overall assessment of capacity. Officers therefore consider the requirements of Policy PB3(a) of the NPS-UDC have been met.
Officers do not consider it necessary to identify the location of National Grid transmission lines and substations on the maps in Our Space. This is consistent with the approach to (not identifying) telecommunications, water supply, wastewater or stormwater infrastructure networks or social infrastructure.

We accept the officers’ recommendation. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Grant Poultnay (050)

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) on Worsleys Road, Christchurch.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from Ms Jo Appleyard, counsel for Mrs Sue and Mr Grant Poultnay. Ms Appleyard described previous mapping errors in relation to the Poultnay’s property at 353 Worsleys Road made in 1995, have subsequently informed district plan reviews and the development of Map A in the CRPS. Mr Poultnay has engaged numerous times with the CCC for the error to be corrected. Mr Poultnay submitted on the Christchurch District Plan, however the Independent Hearing Panel was unable to make the changes requested.

Mr Poultnay is concerned about being deferred to later resource management processes, which has happened in the past, and seeks the ability to place two dwellings on the flat part of the property. Our Space is an important document for the CRPS review and will have significant implications. Ms Appleyard noted that the CCC’s technical advice supported the inclusion of Mr Poultnay’s land. She highlighted that the officers’ report does not recommend any changes to Our Space to recognise the Poultnay’s land.

Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) in the officers’ report.

They said that the points made in the submission relating to an alleged historical error in the zoning of this property are noted. However, officers consider that the merits of any amendments required to Map A to address this are more appropriately considered through an RMA process.

We agree with the Officers’ position. However, we have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

Suburban Estates Ltd, Sovereign Palms Ltd and Doncaster Developments (051)

Considers the approach does not meet market demand or lifestyle preferences of development in the districts and that the NPS-UDC does not support the directive or coercive approach to the provision of feasible development capacity. Identifies risk that NPS-UDC policies will not be given effect to.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard legal submissions from Ms Pru Steven, counsel for the submitter and evidence from Mr Adam Thompson (economics) Mr Kim Sanders (company engineer for Suburban Estates), Mr Bruce Thompson, (planning consultant), and Mr Regan Smith (engineer) for Suburban Estates Limited.

Ms Steven described the ‘long term’ in the NPS-UDC as that applying to the next 20-30years. She invited the Panel to consider whether the land identified in Our Space is sufficient. She submitted that Our Space must
also balance certainty with the need to be responsible to demand for such development. She said there is a clear current demand for development in Selwyn and Waimakariri at a density that is lower than that in the Christchurch City.

Ms Steven submitted to us that Our Space fails to give effect to Policy PA3 of the NPS-UDC as it is not sufficiently responsive to the type or the market of housing in Waimakariri and Selwyn Districts. Ms Steven adopted the submissions of Mr Fuller in this respect where he referred to the requirement for housing choices that meet the needs of the people. Ms Steven also challenged the "allocative approach" evident in Our Space, being the percentage of growth allocated to the districts (Selwyn and Waimakariri) relative to that provided for within Christchurch City, which she submitted was too directive and lacking in support from the NPS-UDC provisions.

In relation to table 3 of Our Space, Mr Thompson noted the shortfalls for Waimakariri over the medium and long term. He took us through the shortfalls in the Market Economics report undertaken by Waimakariri District Council, which also showed a shortfall in the medium to long term. Mr Thompson said that meeting demand meant having a range of housing types. In terms of the proposed development in west Rangiora, he said he had reviewed the Rangiora market and considered there was insufficient greenfield priority land, and he considered there was no infill development that was feasible. The submitter’s proposal would add 96 lots to the market in north west Rangiora. He considered more developers in the market would provide more competitive pricing. In relation to Kaiapoi, he said that there was approximately 1 year of greenfield land left, and only sufficient land out to 2021.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Thompson conceded that you could think about Greater Christchurch as a whole market, but he would recommend that ensuring that Waimakariri and Selwyn can meet their housing targets is an important piece of the puzzle, should Christchurch not be able to deliver on its targets. Mr Thompson said that event with including the land put forward by the submitter, there would still be a shortfall.

Officers noted that Our Space is guided by the vision, principles and strategic goals of the Urban Development Strategy, which were developed after extensive consultation and represent the collective aspirations and preferences of people in Greater Christchurch. Section 2.3 of Our Space highlights these strategic directions, having particular regard for the theme of ‘integrated and managed urban development’ for the purposes of this document.

Officers consider the approach is consistent with the NPS-UDC and associated guidance. Policy PC9 of the NPS-UDC provides that territorial authorities shall set minimum targets in accordance with the Capacity Assessment under Policy PB1, and with Policies PA1, PC1 or PC2, and PD3. Policy PD3 states that local authorities that share jurisdiction over an urban area are strongly encouraged to collaborate and cooperate to agree upon the specification of the minimum targets required under PC5 and PC9 and their review under policies PC6, PC7 and PC10. This indicates that local authorities have discretion to agree upon a territorial authority target that is different from the Capacity Assessment, provided that the aggregated targets are not less than the regional minimum target, and that other requirements of the NPS-UDC are met. They also said that as required by the NPS-UDC, market indicators will be monitored on a frequent basis and the housing and business development capacity assessment will be updated every three years. This will ensure an up to date base of information is available and enable spatial planning decisions to be responsive to changing population and household projections as well as changes in market conditions and other relevant factors. The housing and business development capacity assessments will provide a clear evidential basis for understanding the amount of feasible development capacity that has been enabled and what additional capacity is required in different locations.

We disagree that Policy PA3 should be read in the manner suggested by the submitter. We must provide for the social, cultural, and environmental wellbeing of people and communities, but in doing so, we have particular regard to those matters set out in PA3(a)-(c). It does not require that we meet demand in micro-markets in all locations. If that were the case, we would be directing intensification to all high demand areas, such as more expensive suburbs within the city.
This is where the evidence of Mr Adam Thompson was incorrectly focussed at a local level. We note that Mr Thompson’s assessments were narrow, based solely on supply within specific townships. We take a broader, and more strategic view, and consider that it is appropriate to look wider across all of Greater Christchurch. To that extent, it is only the officers who have provided an analysis of the entire area.

We are satisfied with the officers’ recommendations and reasons in this respect. We accept the officers’ recommendation on this matter, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Seeks that the Projected Infrastructure Boundary / Urban Limit lines be removed from the update, the CRPS and other planning documents.

Ms Steven accepted that changes would be required to Map A in the CRPS, but that recommendations could be made in our Space for changes to the CRPS.

Officers said that Map A was inserted into the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement through the Land Use Recovery Plan, having previously been included in Plan Change 1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. They said that the projected infrastructure boundary gives infrastructure providers certainty around where growth will be focused, for forward planning and infrastructure planning purposes. Officers consider this remains an appropriate mechanism to ensure the strategic integration of infrastructure with urban activities and the attainment of the intensification and consolidation objectives of Chapter 6 in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. Officers considered that the appropriate process to consider the merits of such a policy change is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work.

While that may be a matter that could be considered through the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement review, we consider that there are strong reasons for containment of urban activities in order to achieve the vision and principles of the Urban Development Strategy. We received many submissions concerned with the effects of more greenfield development. We are satisfied at this time that sufficient feasible development capacity can be provided within this framework and that the ongoing monitoring and review required by the NPS-UDC and signalled in the schedule of further work in Section 6.2 balances the certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development as required by Policy PC13(b) of the NPS-UDC.

We accept the officers’ recommendation and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) in north-west Rangiora and south-west Prebbleton.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) in the officers’ report.

Mr Smith presented to us in relation to ground conditions, wastewater, the ability to service the site with minimal upgrades.

Mr Bruce Thompson also described the land in west Rangiora. He said that except for its identification outside the projected infrastructure boundary, he was not aware of any reason for it not to be developed. The point made in the submission and Mr Bruce Thompson’s evidence relating to an alleged historical error in the zoning of the northwest Rangiora land is noted. However, given its use for rural residential purposes, which is what the Residential 4a and 4b zones are, it is difficult to understand what the error is.

Officers consider that the merits of any amendments required to Map A to address this are more appropriately considered through an RMA process.

We accept the officers’ recommendation on this matter, and recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of
Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

Expresses concern that the approach in Our Space is too directive, and that the ‘deferred status’ should be removed from land identified for development and a move to higher densities of housing be supported and facilitated but not required or directed through statutory plans.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) and 6 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land). They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but considers that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas.

We continue to support the use of minimum densities. Submissions in relation to those can be considered as part of the review to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We accept the officers’ recommendation and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Seeks that the future development area identified in Kaiapoi is a Greenfield Priority Area.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers' report.

Mr Kim Sanders presented evidence to us and said that there were people that wanted to build in Kaiapoi, but there was no land left. He said that restricting supply had an impact on price.

Officers addressed this matter in their Reply Report and explained the reasons why proposed future development areas are included in Our Space rather than greenfield priority areas. We agree with the response provided by Officers.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Areas of Christchurch existing zoned land to remain undeveloped due to geotechnical remediation costs.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
No evidence has been provided to support this submission point. A number of greenfield areas have been economically remediated and bought up to TC2 equivalent. Assessment and allowances for site conditions are as set-out in the Harrison Grierson report: "Development Feasibility Assessment – Greenfields". For the assessment of redevelopment feasibility in Christchurch City, the foundation cost assumption was adjusted to reflect the Technical Category of each tested development site.

Notwithstanding that, monitoring will determine whether shortfalls in planned development exist. This can feed into future capacity assessment noting uptake.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Woolworths New Zealand Limited (052)**

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) cnr of Marshlands/Prestons Road, Christchurch.
Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We heard and considered the evidence of Mr Dean Chrystal, planner, on behalf of Woolworths New Zealand Limited. Mr Chrystal is concerned that the Our Space document will form an extremely strong direction through later RMA processes such as the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. He noted that in relation to those processes, it is his view that the proposed extension will most certainly be declined as it is not consistent with Our Space, and then it would become a circular argument. He told us he was concerned that in relation to Woolworth’s submission, that officers had recommended that there was sufficient inner city industrial land available to transition to commercial use to meet the cities long term needs. He noted that the central city was a completely different market to that land at Prestons. He did not consider that there were ‘other methods’ available to locate a supermarket, as they have specific land needs (approximately 2 hectares for carparking etc.). He did not consider that a supermarket would have distributional effects on surrounding key activity centres or the central city.

In relation to the second part of the submission, Mr Chrystal noted that the submission sought a review of identified commercial areas as part of the comprehensive Canterbury Regional Policy Statement review. Consideration needs to be given as to where projected commercial growth will occur, whether existing identified but undeveloped commercial activity remains appropriately zoned, and whether the hierarchy of centres remains appropriate. He said that the difficulty with the Capacity Assessment is that it has not been ground truthed and has been a desktop analysis.

The officers’ position on the submission is that at present, sufficient capacity is identified to meet short term needs in the north, and also notes that shortfalls in the long term will be met through transitioning of industrial land in the inner city over time. We understand that this was not to say that Woolworths should be setting up further supermarkets in the central city; rather that the wider business market could be catered for in the long term through the conversion of industrial land.

Mr Chrystal was not able to provide any information on the need for local shopping services, nor any updated traffic information in support of identification of the land for commercial use. This will be impacted by changes from the Northern Arterial route currently under construction. We accept that there may be difficulties with provision of residential activities on commercial zoned land, but at the same time consider that changes to the urban area need to be supported by wider analysis of business development in the north. We accept the officers’ position that opportunity needs to be provided for development of the Key Activity Centre at Northwood/Belfast, and that the proper opportunity to address this further is as part of the future review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Land has opportunities for commercial and residential development.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers noted this matter. We refer to our reasons set out above.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Cockburn Family Trust (053)

Landowner seeks inclusion of land (inside the PIB) for industrial use at Hoskyns Road, Rolleston. Land, adjacent to I-Zone, is within PIB but not identified as a Greenfield Priority Business area in the CRPS.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We heard from Mr Dean Chrystal, planner (who also presented in relation to the statement of evidence from Mr Beresford regarding industrial real estate matters) in relation to the submitter’s 49.2 hectare block of land at Rolleston, which is inside the Projected Infrastructure Boundary, but is not identified as a Future Development Area or Greenfield Priority Area.
Mr Chrystal talked to us about matters that are similar to those for Rolleston Industrial Holdings (refer submission 073). That included land that was able to be purchased as vacant land, and the importance of access to the rail network. He also highlighted what he considered to be discrepancies with identification of vacant land, which he did not consider properly reflected vacant business land.

We didn’t hear any evidence regarding the makeup of business located next to rail sidings or with access to the rail network, nor whether specific land was being set aside for those business that require rail transport modes. Better understanding is required as to the demand for this type of development with access to the rail network, and the potential impact that releasing more industrial land will have on the viability of existing centres. As such, we consider the Greater Christchurch Partnership should look to refine its methodology for industrial business land by considering, as part of future capacity assessments, the impact of modal shift (from road to rail) on demand. We consider that this is important in respect of Objective 5.2.1 and 6.2.1. and 6.2.4. of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement regarding integrating land use and infrastructure under.

It appeared to us that the identification of the land as a future development area (or not) was a matter of timing. As we mention above, further work may also need to be done around particular industrial activities with locational needs such as the rail network (including consideration of areas served by rail elsewhere in the city).

We note that the land has specific infrastructure requirements associated with the rail network. We also note that an over-supply of specific types of industrial land should not be compared in the same way as an oversupply of residentially zoned land, which has the potential to impact on residential intensification objectives and targets in the central city and key activity centres, although they may have an impact on maintaining a compact urban form. We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

We accept in part the submitter’s request, to the extent of our recommendations for Environment Canterbury to engage with the landowner and for the local authorities to consider the relationship of transport modes to demand in specific locations as part of future capacity assessments.

**Grassmere Residents (054)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should develop land in the City first to create density and vibrancy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Ms Ngaire Button, Mr Ryan Geddes, Mr Stuart Mitchell, Mr John Button and Mrs Ann and Mr Mike Toth appeared on behalf of the Grassmere Residents.

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 *(Reducing urban sprawl, developing in the City (and Central City) first ahead of surrounding districts).*

We accept that it is appropriate that both greenfield development and infill should take place contemporaneously.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Take care not to build on land suited for growing food.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 3 (Protecting productive/agricultural/high quality soils from urban expansion). Officers noted that the role of Our Space is to ensure there is sufficient land available to support future housing and business demand, and that this demand is supported in a way that aligns with the wider strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy. Section 2.3 of Our Space highlights these strategic directions, having particular regard for the theme of ‘integrated and managed urban development’ for the purposes of this document.

While some areas within Future Development Areas contained versatile soils, additional guidance is required at a national level before this matter is addressed. This may be a matter which impacts on net density as a result of the 2022 review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, if such soils are to be protected at a national level.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Partner with Government to help finance affordable housing.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing and a range of housing types), and reporting officers’ reply report (question 8). Officers said that Christchurch City Council, working in partnership with the Ōtautahi Community Housing Trust, has a substantial social housing stock, while Selwyn District Council has recently agreed a policy approach that fosters social and affordable housing but does not entail any direct provision. Nationally, they noted new Government initiatives such as KiwiBuild can complement and support the work locally undertaken by housing providers. We were also told of the use of incentives in Queenstown regarding inclusionary housing in relation to the submission of Te Waipounamu Affordable Housing Network. An action plan to look at social and affordable housing is included in Our Space.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

More extensive use of development contributions to build infrastructure.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers noted the comment, but considered that this submission point falls outside the scope of Our Space.

We do, however, encourage the submitter to make submissions on the Annual Plan. In addition, we recommend that Christchurch City Council consider whether there are any options or alternatives available to facilitate, fund or enable infrastructure development at Cranford Basin, that was the subject of the Cranford Basin Regeneration Plan.

Hughes Developments Limited (055)

Provision of additional greenfield land in Rolleston is essential.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We heard from Mr Mark Brown, a planner, and Mr Jake Hughes for Hughes Developments Limited. Mr Brown described the land development of Hughes Developments Limited, including Faringdon in Rolleston. He described how addition of Faringdon South wasn’t successful through the Land Use Recovery Plan, but was later added as a Special Housing Area. The submitter supports the identification of actions to address medium term shortfalls in Rolleston, however they consider that there is uncertainty around demand and capacity identified in the capacity assessment. Mr Brown described how the minimum densities are not supported at 15 households per hectare, nor do they support maximum caps as a means of sequencing.

Officers said that Our Space proposes that some new greenfield housing areas should be released in Rolleston to help address projected housing capacity shortfalls for Selwyn over the medium to long term (Section 5 of Our Space).
No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Current supply levels identified in the capacity assessments potentially do not reflect what is actually happening.

**Officers’ comment:**
In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Brown considered that the capacity assessment was highly driven by score analysis, and that analysis about how things look on the ground should be undertaken. He also noted the lag of land being identified, through to houses getting on the land. In relation to land at Rolleston, he did not think that growth and uptake was being accurately portrayed. In terms of their yield to date, yield was around 12-13 households per hectare. He said that demand for different densities had varied, and they responded accordingly. In relation to responding to demand, Mr Brown noted that they responded to this by looking at sales, then adjusting subdivisions that are underway. He noted they were moving away from the more intense super lot development.

Officers noted that the capacity assessment will be reviewed every 3 years and can be updated to reflect recent developments and changes in terms of the provision of infrastructure.

We accept the officers’ position and note that future capacity assessments will provide for a responsive planning framework in relation to any action undertaken. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**Graeme Alan and Joy Yvonne McVicar (056)**

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) on Worsleys Road, Christchurch.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ response in Section 4 Theme 4 in the Officers Report. This outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and the wider Greater Christchurch area. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

Officers consider that the appropriate consideration of further areas for inclusion should be considered as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Considers capacity assessment targets to be uncertain, inaccurate and based on a flawed methodology.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) in the officers’ report.

We accept the officers’ position that the capacity assessment is sound and fit for purpose. We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the housing demand assessment undertaken by Greater
Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’. The report recognises that more could be done regarding setting out assumptions around feasible development, but throughout the document, this appears as a recommendation for future capacity assessment reports. We are satisfied that the housing capacity assessment is fit for purpose, and that continual refinement will address future capacity and feasibility as markets change and more information is gathered.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that some existing zoned hill areas will not be practical, economic or feasible to develop.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers said that the assessment of sufficiency of housing development capacity underpinning Our Space includes an additional capacity margin as required by the NPS-UDC, to account for sites (such as the example given in the submission) that may not presently be practical, economic or feasible to develop.

We accept the officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes the inclusion of a new policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS to provide flexibility to develop outside the urban boundary where certain criteria are met.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work. We note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty and guidance for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes that Figure 16 should be included in District Plans rather than the CRPS.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that the appropriate process to consider such policy changes is through the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that streamlined RMA processes be used to rezone the submitter’s land.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept officers’ reasoning that such changes are better considered through subsequent Resource Management Act processes.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**B. Welsh, S. McArthur, T. Kain (057)**

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) in NW Belfast, Christchurch.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ evidence in the hearing report which is set out in Section 4 Theme 4. This outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and the wider Greater Christchurch area. As discussed previously, the appropriate consideration of further areas is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

---
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We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Canterbury District Health Board (058)**

Need to ensure greenfield development enables easy access to core amenities, nearby public services and employment opportunities.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Dr Anna Stevenson in relation to the CDHB submission. Dr Stevenson noted that in general, Our Space is supported, but that the CDHB considered that there were some areas that required some more emphasis. She considered more needed to be included about intergenerational equity, and that uncertainty is recognised. This provides the ability to be able to monitor and respond to change. She considered there needed to be more emphasis on the challenges associated with aging, as well as other wellbeing impacts. In addition, Dr Stevenson considered that the impact of greenfield development was more nuanced than just dealing with congestion. Dr Stevenson noted issues with affordability now and into the future, and the need to address this through better refined actions. She also highlighted the importance of the protection of drinking water, and sought greater emphasis on climate change. The CDHB supported the 10-minute neighbourhood concept and the way this tied into the key activity centre approach. She said that the CDHB strongly supports the relationships between partners to ensure the ability to move forward together, and to enable the Partnership to be responsive.

Subsequently, at the Panel’s request, Dr Stevenson provided us with some recommended wording in relation to Our Space, which officers commented on and responded to.

We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

Supports 10 minute community diagram but notes not specifically identified for implementation.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

Supports a range of housing types and housing being close to existing centres; housing should be good quality, affordable, accessible and in a location that builds community; encourage universal design principles to ensure homes are suitable for all ages and stages.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

Supports the focus of commercial development around existing centres and encourages a focus on employment opportunities for people who live in the area and placement of public services within these areas.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

Evidence provided by capacity assessment should be supplemented by information from communities on what they want and need.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considers densities around key centres to be key to the success of Our Space.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

Suggests the document makes a clear statement as to the importance of building strong, connected neighbourhoods using the 10 minute neighbourhood as an example.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Refer to the above.

Notes that specific populations may require additional resourcing for active and public transport infrastructure e.g. Eastern areas of Christchurch.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

Encourages infrastructure planning to be clearly articulated in Our Space including how other plans or strategies might contribute e.g. linking into community knowledge, signalling spaces and places for park and ride options so these can exist around existing infrastructure.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

Considers Our Space does not deal strongly with natural capacity and resource sustainability, and suggests there could be stronger links to zero carbon plans.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

---

**Ernst Frei (059)**

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) on Cashmere Road, Christchurch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) on Cashmere Road, Christchurch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Refer to the officers’ comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 ([Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district](#)).

Mr Frei owns land at 564 Cashmere Road. Part of the site is zoned New Neighbourhood in the Christchurch District Plan. Mr Frei seeks further development of the site. Mr Frei emphasised that the addition to the existing zoned area would amount to approximately two rows of houses which he considered very small. Mr Fox told us that it was not economically viable to undertake the development of just 25 lots, and that it needed to get to the 50 lots to be economically viable. The land sought to be rezoned lies within the Henderson Basin ponding area. Ms Aston explained how compensatory storage can be formed to overcome this.

The officers’ report did not agree to adding further future development areas, on the basis that sufficient capacity is provided for in the existing Christchurch district plan area. However, a report prepared by the
Christchurch City Council did consider that there was merit in considering three additional areas on the basis that these landholdings are:

- Small-scale;
- Have no servicing constraints;
- Are considered feasible to develop by the landowners; and
- Support urban consolidation (and other key objectives) of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement

We did not have the opportunity to test the authors on those criteria, as they did not appear as witnesses. Christchurch City Council has indicated that it does support considering the three areas by way of changing the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

Having considered the information filed with us by the Christchurch City Council, the officers’ report, and the evidence of Ms Aston and Mr Fox, and we consider that this land should be investigated further as part of the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

Considers capacity assessment targets to be uncertain, inaccurate and based on a flawed methodology.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

No recommendations were made by the submitter as to how this should be addressed in the housing capacity methodology. We accept the officers’ position that the capacity assessment is sound and fit for purpose. We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the housing demand assessment undertaken by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’. The report recognises that more could be done regarding setting out assumptions around feasible development, but throughout the document, this appears as a recommendation for future capacity assessment reports. We are satisfied that the housing capacity assessment is fit for purpose, and that continual refinement will address future capacity and feasibility as markets change and more information is gathered.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes the inclusion of a new policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS to provide flexibility to develop outside the urban boundary where certain criteria are met.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We accept officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work. We note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty and guidance for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes that Figure 16 should be included in District Plans rather than the CRPS.

---

8 Appendix E, Supplementary technical advice in support of the Christchurch City Council’s submission, dated 15 February 2019, by Mr David Falconer, Ms Sarah Oliver and Ms Adele Radburn
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Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We accept the officers’ position that the appropriate process to consider such policy changes is through the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that streamlined RMA processes be used to rezone the submitter’s land.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We accept officers’ reasoning that such changes are better considered through subsequent Resource Management Act process.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

GFR Rhodes Estate & Larson Group (060)

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) in Prebbleton.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We heard from Mr Peter Fuller, counsel for the submitter, Mr Adam Thompson, an economist, and Ms Fiona Aston, a planner for GFR Rhodes Estate and Larson Group. Mr Fuller’s legal submissions and Mr Thompson’s economic evidence were based on the premise that growth had to be provided for in relation to all communities. We refer to our assessment in relation to submission 51.

We accept the officers’ position set out in Section 4 Theme 4. Of the Officers’ Report. This outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and Greater Christchurch. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Propose zoning for smaller more affordable sections based on Urban Economics assessment of Prebbleton.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We refer to the evaluation above and accept that officers’ report discussion set out in Section 4, Theme 4. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers capacity assessment targets to be uncertain, inaccurate and based on a flawed methodology.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) in the officers’ report.

We accept the officers’ position that the capacity assessment is sound and fit for purpose. We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the housing demand assessment undertaken by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’.10 The report recognises that more could be done regarding

---
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setting out assumptions around feasible development, but throughout the document, this appears as a recommendation for future capacity assessment reports. We are satisfied that the housing capacity assessment is fit for purpose, and that continual refinement will address future capacity and feasibility as markets change and more information is gathered.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes the inclusion of a new policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS to provide flexibility to develop outside the urban boundary where certain criteria are met.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers' position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work. We note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty and guidance for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes that Figure 16 should be included in District Plans rather than the CRPS.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers' position that the appropriate process to consider such policy changes is through the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that streamlined RMA processes be used to rezone the submitter’s land.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept officers' reasoning that such changes are better considered through subsequent Resource Management Act process.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Martin Pinkham (061)**

Sees a lack of long term planning in Waimakariri and a need for standalone infrastructure authorities.

Mr Pinkham appeared before us and presented his submission. He spoke to us about the lack of integration of transport infrastructure and land use in the Greater Christchurch area. He said that Christchurch had sat on its hands and not created a credible case for transport funding. He considered the lack of development of a Council Controlled Organisation to manage transport had been a disaster. He said there was a major disconnect between transport planning and Our Space.

Officers noted this submission point and said that Waimakariri Council does have a District Development Strategy and is working on structure planning for new residential areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi and an update to the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy. Officers did not recommend any changes in response to the submission point.

No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

Lower development contributions, more apartments, improved legislation to improve housing affordability.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing and a range of housing types) in the officers’ report. We note that a social and affordable housing action plan is to be developed, which may address some of the submitters concerns. Matters such as development contributions are a matter for annual plan processes.
No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Townsend Fields Limited (062)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowner supports inclusion of greenfield priority land (inside the PIB) on Johns Road, Rangiora.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers noted supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield priority area should be rezoned ahead of identified future urban areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers' report. They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but consider that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas. In addition to this, we note that Greenfield Priority Areas are those that were introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. This is the reason for differentiating them from future development areas, as set out in the officers' response to questions from the Hearings Panel (question 1).

We accept the officers' recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Carolina Homes Limited (063)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowner supports inclusion of greenfield priority land (inside the PIB) on Johns Road, Rangiora.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers noted supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield priority area should be rezoned ahead of identified future urban areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers' report. They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but consider that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas. In addition to this, we note that Greenfield Priority Areas are those that were introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. This is the reason for differentiating them from future development areas, as set out in the officers' response to questions from the Hearings Panel (question 1).

We accept the officers' recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Riccarton Bush Kilmarnock Residents Association (064)**
Considers future projections beyond 2030 based on data sets to be risky approach.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to theme 1 (*Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands*) in the officers' report.

They noted that Statistics NZ incorporate immigration forecasts in the population projections and this remains the most robust information available to predict future population changes. The NPS-UDC requires a new capacity assessment every three years to ensure planning is responsive to such changing trends. Officers said that the approach to setting housing targets in Our Space, as outlined in Section 3.2 is also considered to represent a principles-based approach rather than following a purely projections-led approach.

We accept the officers' recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Intensification in existing areas ongoing, such as Riccarton, but no on-site parking causes problems, including health and safety issues.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 7 (*Poor intensification outcomes and preferences to focus intensification in the central city*).

We note that on-site parking is a matter for the district plan to consider.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Avoid large medium density communities due to potential social problems.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 7 (*Poor intensification outcomes and preferences to focus intensification in the Central City*). They said that the Capacity Assessment confirms that the existing provisions of the Christchurch District Plan are sufficient to accommodate such demand and that the Plan’s zones and associated rules allow for a range of densities and housing types appropriate to their location (Central City, inner suburbs or outer suburbs).

Officers said that an approach to limit intensification to the Central City alone would be counter to these existing Christchurch District Plan provisions, would likely only deliver a segment of the housing types envisaged by intensification policies (i.e. higher density townhouses and apartments), and would be highly unlikely to provide the level of new housing required to meet projected demand.

They noted that Christchurch City Council has embarked on an ambitious programme to encourage Central City living, titled Project 8011, with a target of increasing the Central City population to 20,000 by 2028 from a current level of around 6,000. Project 8011 signals that over time the initiatives and mechanisms that comprise the programme can be rolled out more broadly, where appropriate, to encourage and support city-wide intensification.

They also observed that Christchurch City has many examples of high quality residential intensification. However, it is recognised that there are examples of poor outcomes resulting from past intensification, including poor urban design, amenity impacts (noise, car parking, etc) and reduced social cohesion. The reasons that lie behind this matter and the potential solutions that can ensure future higher quality intensification are many and varied and are best dealt with at a territorial authority level. It is also noted that this improving intensification outcomes is currently a priority for the Government as it develops a new National Policy Statement on Quality Intensification.
We adopt the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We refer to the submission point above in relation to Section 4, Theme 7 of the officers’ report. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Difficult and expensive to impose a comprehensive new public transport system with low current patronage.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport). They noted that Our Space is principally focussed on the land use component of settlement planning, and that transport matters are addressed in other plans such as the Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Public Transport Plan.

We adopt the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Still a reliance on cars and plans should be more pragmatic and realistic.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We refer to the submission point above in respect of Section 4, Theme 6. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**Scarborough Hill Properties Ltd and Directors/Shareholders Ruth Kendall & Ewan Carr (065)**

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) in Scarborough, Christchurch.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Ms Juliette Derry, counsel for the submitters, and Mr Ewan Carr, director, presented the submission for Scarborough Hill Properties. Part of the submitters site lies within the Residential Port Hills zone, while part is zoned Rural Port Hills. The submission seeks that the Our Space strategy does not preclude the inclusion of additional land outside of the urban boundary. Mr Carr discussed his vision for the block. He considers that residential use on the site (such as high-end larger lots with revegetation) is a relatively natural progression for the urban edge and should not be constrained, and the site is already connected to services which fun from Godley Drive. At present the site has little economic use for running stock on the land, and caters for about 100 stock units, essentially running at a loss.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Carr described how in 1999, work done by Davis Ogilvie estimated a yield of approximately 200 sites from the development. He acknowledged there are issues with the road (Scarborough Road), but that Richmond Road had similar issues but was only one way, and yet approximately 150 additional sites were allowed. Mr Carr talked about the ability to merge with the hillside. He mentioned that there might be the opportunity to have a thoroughfare through the site for walking and pedestrian access up to Godley Head Road.

We accept the officers’ recommendations set out in Section 4 Theme 4 of the Officers’ Report. This outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and the wider Greater Christchurch area. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Concern that uncertainties will mean identified development opportunities will not be realised.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that the assessment of sufficiency of housing development capacity underpinning Our Space includes an additional capacity margin as required by the NPS-UDC, to account for sites that may not presently be feasible to develop.

We accept the officers' recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Lacks flexibility to accommodate all needs and/or future market changes.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that Our Space highlights how changing demographics and affordability will likely affect future housing demand in Greater Christchurch, with growing demand for smaller, more affordable housing. Section 6 highlights the key role of ongoing monitoring of household trends and further investigation of opportunities to encourage the provision and uptake of a range of housing types to meet future demands. District plan provisions play an important role in helping to deliver a broad range of housing types.

We accept the officers' recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**AgResearch (066)**

**Need to provide sufficient buffer between research farms and urban development.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted the submission point.

No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

**Maintain PIB in current proposed position for Rolleston and Lincoln.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (*Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district*).

Our Space does not propose any changes to the projected infrastructure boundary.

No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

**Lyttelton Port Company (067)**

**Seeks extension of urban limits (PIB) to account for port reclamation area.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Ms Appleyard, Counsel for Lyttelton Port Company, described the process of reclaimed land becoming formally 'land' for the purpose of planning documents, and the consequences for resource consent applications for land use activities. She said that the Port was essentially an industrial activity, in the CRPS, and therefore could be considered an urban activity. She acknowledged that the officers had recommended changes to the Existing Urban Area be considered as part of the review of the CRPS.

The geographic extent of Greater Christchurch, for the purposes of Chapter 6 of the CRPS and Our Space, is the area shown on Map A in Chapter 6 of the CRPS. The reclamation area facilitated by the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan is not located within the Greater Christchurch Area shown on Map A. This is because the boundary of the Greater Christchurch Area shown on Map A represents the territorial authority boundaries at the time that Map A was inserted into the CRPS. As the reclamation area was not 'land' at that time it did not fall within the territorial authority boundaries. Therefore, the reclamation area is not within the Greater Christchurch Area shown on Map A and the provisions of Chapter 6 of the CRPS do not apply. Likewise, the
reclamation area sits outside the geographic area of focus for Our Space. On that basis, we do not consider Our Space or Chapter 6 of the CRPS to be an impediment to activities on the future reclamation site and do not consider it necessary, or appropriate, to identify the future reclamation site in Our Space.

We note for completeness that in accordance with section 60 of the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016, a decision maker on a resource consent application cannot make a decision that is inconsistent with the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan. Under section 60(4), Lyttelton Port Company Limited may request that the Minister consider and decide whether a decision would be inconsistent with the Recovery Plan.

Officers consider that the appropriate process to consider any alteration to the Projected Infrastructure Boundary is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work. We are satisfied that the officers recommendation is appropriate, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Seeks that sensitive activities are avoided in any development adjacent to the Midland Port facility in Rolleston.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 10 (Provision and protection of key infrastructure and integration with development) of the officers’ report, and the reporting officers’ reply report (question 7). They noted that the protection of key infrastructure (such as the port and airport operations, and railway network) from the adverse effects arising from development is considered to already be well-managed by the existing planning framework, including through Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans. Given the proposals in Our Space do not deviate from the growth strategy that has been in place for Greater Christchurch for some time, the proposals are not expected to have significant adverse effects on key infrastructure and therefore have only been briefly referenced.

We accept the officers’ recommendation, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Include strategic freight routes and upgrading of the Brougham Street section of SH76 and possible Lyttelton freight tunnel.

**Officers’ comment:**

Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 5 (Transport needs and implications, including public transport) and 10 (Provision and protection of key infrastructure and integration with development), and the reporting officers’ reply report (question 7).

Officers noted that the strategic road and rail networks have been identified in the Business Capacity Assessment which informs Our Space but could be included in a final Our Space document. Constraints with SH76 are identified in the Business Capacity Assessment which informs Our Space. They also said that further investment options are better investigated through Land Transport Management Act processes.

Officers did recommend amending wording for Section 5.6 to provide greater explanation of freight hubs/networks and strategic infrastructure, with potential identification in Figure 18.

We accept the officers’ recommendation and recommend that Our Space be amended accordingly.

Highlight constraints on rail network impacting freight now and into the future with expected growth.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Transport needs and implications, including public transport) in the officers’ report. Officers consider the vision, strategic direction and work underway to implement the intent of recently updated transport plans, such as the Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Public Transport Plan, will provide appropriate land
use and transport integration to support the consolidated urban form outlined in Our Space. Our Space is principally focused on the land use component of settlement planning and will need to monitor and review the implementation of such plans as part of subsequent capacity assessments.

We accept the officers' recommendation, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Supports roading overpass proposed at Rolleston.

**Officers' comment:**
Noted. Refer to the submission point above.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**Central City Business Association (068)**

Opposes the proposed changes to the settlement plan as it will undermine the recovery of Christchurch, particularly in terms of the rebuild and revitalisation of the Central City.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl, developing in the City (and Central City) first ahead of surrounding districts). They said that the submission notes that the Central City Business Association (CCBA) is opposed to the proposed changes to the Greater Christchurch settlement pattern, but does not indicate what changes in particular the submission opposes. This makes it difficult to directly respond to the submission.

We agree that the submission lacks specificity.

No changes are recommended as a result of this submission point.

**Fully supports the ChristchurchNZ/Development Christchurch Ltd submission (Submission 077).**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We refer to our discussion and recommendation in respect of submission 77.

---

**Lincoln Developments Ltd (069)**

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) in north Lincoln.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers' evidence set out in Section 4 Theme 4 of the officers' report. This outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and the wider Greater Christchurch area. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.
No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers capacity assessment targets to be uncertain, inaccurate and based on a flawed methodology.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) in the officers’ report.

We accept the officers’ position that the capacity assessment is sound and fit for purpose. We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the housing demand assessment undertaken by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’. The report recognises that more could be done regarding setting out assumptions around feasible development, but throughout the document, this appears as a recommendation for future capacity assessment reports. We are satisfied that the housing capacity assessment is fit for purpose, and that continual refinement will address future capacity and feasibility as markets change and more information is gathered.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes the inclusion of a new policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS to provide flexibility to develop outside the urban boundary where certain criteria are met.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work. We note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty and guidance for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes that Figure 16 should be included in District Plans rather than the CRPS.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that the appropriate process to consider such policy changes is through the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that streamlined RMA processes be used to rezone the submitter’s land.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept officers’ reasoning that such changes are better considered through subsequent Resource Management Act process.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Brendon Harre (070)**

New development in Waimakariri and Selwyn should be integrated with new rapid transport services.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Mr Brendon Harre presented his submission to us at the hearing. He discussed the need to integrate housing with rapid transport and the lack of public transport placing reliance on private motor vehicles which affects peak time transport and subsequent productivity. If Greater Christchurch could reduce its car
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ownership, this would reduce congestion. Congestion charging and road pricing could be incorporated, but in order to do so, rapid transit is needed, and this links into density. He provided examples of development at Hobsonville of up to 100 households per hectare. He considered that with densities lower than 20 households per hectare, it would be difficult to provide rapid transit at a good cost. Mr Harre also showed how rent in the residential market had increased 41% over three and a half years, which placed a burden on households. Building a rapid transport network would help Christchurch out of the choice of congestion versus affordable housing, encouraging the city build upwards, rather than outwards, improving city liveability. Greater Christchurch would need to co-ordinate with central government to deliver such a project.

In response to Mr Harre’s submission, officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Transport needs and implications, including public transport).

That notes that investment in rapid transport north and south-west of Christchurch City, and other service enhancements across the network, can support land uses change and encourage higher density development along such corridors. Officers said it is critical for achieving effective land use and transport integration that land use policies do align with transport investments. Planning and investment decisions, including identifying the most appropriate public transport mode, are the subject of further detailed work underway as part of business case processes. The officers’ informed us that this ongoing work will help to determine what changes may be required through spatial and district planning to support the vision for a fully integrated transport system and urban form in Greater Christchurch.

The Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Public Transport Plan highlight the potential for emerging technology and transport services to alter and enhance transport patterns, mobility and accessibility across Greater Christchurch. This will require ongoing monitoring and review but at this stage it is considered supplementary to the need to provide mass transit options across Greater Christchurch.

Our Space identifies how future transport plans can drive and support the proposed future settlement pattern but relies on these separate transport plans, required under the LTMA. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Use Urban Development Authority powers to achieve a mix of housing.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing and a range of housing types).

We note that the Authority, while it has been announced, does not yet exist. That will require legislative change.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Queries decline in growth from 2023 for all growth scenarios (page 9).

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that the reason for this is that Statistics NZ is projecting that the recent historically high migration rates will reduce back to more average levels and the birth rate will drop.

We accept the recommendations of the officers and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Densification requires rapid transport with delivery in the short to medium term.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
As we note above, transport matters are subject to other processes, including the Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case.
We accept the recommendations of the officers and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

End current dependence on the automobile.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (Reducing urban sprawl, developing in the City (and Central City) first ahead of surrounding districts) and 5 (Transport needs and implications, including public transport).

The submission point is noted, but no changes are recommended in response to the submission point.

**Allan Downs Ltd (071)**

Landowner supports inclusion of greenfield priority land (inside the PIB) on Johns Road, Rangiora.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Support noted. No changes are required in response to this submission point.

Greenfield priority area should be rezoned ahead of identified future urban areas.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers’ report. They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but consider that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas. In addition to this, we note that Greenfield Priority Areas are those that were introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. This is the reason for differentiating them from future development areas, as set out in the officers’ response to questions from the Hearings Panel (question 1).

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Kevin and Bonnie Williams (072)**

Seek to develop land on Marshs Road, Prebbleton for rural residential use.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Ms Fiona Aston (planner) appeared on behalf of and Mr Kevin Williams and Ms Kelly Williams, seeking to develop their land for rural-residential purposes, or potentially industrial land use. The site is approximately 55 hectares, after land was acquired for the Christchurch Southern Motorway, on the boundary of Christchurch and Selwyn districts.

Ms Aston considered the site was well serviced and is close to Christchurch, with services to the boundary. She noted that it is the buffer between Christchurch City and Prebbleton, but that the site is proposed for development of a low-density nature.

---

12 Mr Kevin Williams and Ms Kelly Williams (#72)
In relation to rural residential land, the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement sets out a framework for consideration of these areas, and requires them to be included in a rural residential strategy in the case of Waimakariri or Selwyn District, or in the case of Christchurch City, no provision is made for further new rural residential land.

No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

Development capacity targets are uncertain and likely to be inaccurate and based on flawed methodology and do not consider rural residential development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers' position that the capacity assessment is sound and fit for purpose. We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, which considered that the housing demand assessment undertaken by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’. The report recognises that more could be done regarding setting out assumptions around feasible development, but throughout the document, this appears as a recommendation for future capacity assessment reports. We are satisfied that the housing capacity assessment is fit for purpose, and that continual refinement will address future capacity and feasibility as markets change and more information is gathered.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited (073)**

Industrial development capacity does not accurately account for the space intensive and low employee occupancy nature of activities at I-Zone and I-Port.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Rolleston Industrial Holdings opened iPort and own a further 25 hectares of land that has a railway siding. They seek that this land be included as a Future Development Area, should it be required.

We received evidence from Mr Phillips (planner) and Mr Copeland (economist), and received legal submissions from Ms Semple and further oral submissions from Mr Carter (Company Director) regarding the Rolleston Industrial land, in particular regarding freight movements and the availability of land related to iPort, which incorporates the Midland Port owned by the Lyttelton Port Company. The key criticism of the industrial land capacity assessment was that it did not properly take into account freight modes, and this was also identified as an issue for the Cockburn Trust land. Mr Carter offered that in his opinion, there would be serious land supply issues in the next 2-3 years, and that it was important to have additional land available that has a railway siding, to ensure that businesses wishing to use rail for freight could be efficiently supported.

We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, which considered that the business land capacity and feasibility work done by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’. The officers' position was that the Business Capacity Assessment methodology does take account of the different industrial sectors and applies different employee to floorspace / land area ratios. It looks not just at site specific landholdings but the wider industrial market. This includes land in southwest Christchurch (Hornby and Islington) where there are also significant areas of industrially zoned land. Officers consider that no further provision for industrial land is considered necessary at this time, and noted that the Greater Christchurch
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Partnership will continue to monitor take up and market indicators and will review the capacity assessments on a three-yearly basis so as to be responsive to market needs.

We have considered the submissions and in particular the evidence of Messrs Copeland and Phillips, and the position of officers. We didn’t receive any evidence regarding the makeup of business located next to rail sidings or with access to the rail network, nor whether specific land was being set aside for those businesses that require rail transport modes. We do think that a better understanding is required for the demand for this type of development with access to the rail network, and the potential impact that releasing more industrial land will have on the viability of existing centres. As such, we signal that it is appropriate that the Greater Christchurch Partnership look to refine its methodology for industrial business land by considering, as part of future capacity assessments, the impact of modal shift (from road to rail) on demand. We consider that this is also an important aspect of fulfilling the objectives under the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement for integrating land use and infrastructure.

We note that the land has specific infrastructure requirements associated with the rail network. We also note that an over-supply of specific types of industrial land should not be compared in the same way as an oversupply of residentially zoned land, which has the potential to impact on residential intensification objectives and targets in the central city and key activity centres, although they may have an impact on maintaining a compact urban form. We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

We accept in part the submitter’s request, to the extent of our recommendations for Environment Canterbury to engage with the landowner and for the local authorities to consider the relationship of transport modes to demand in specific locations as part of future capacity assessments.

**Christchurch City Council (074)**

**Inconsistencies in Our Space.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers provided a response in relation to inconsistencies in Our Space in the officers’ report, along with an analysis of those matters in Appendix F to the report.

They noted that Table 3 of Our Space reports a surplus of housing development capacity in Selwyn District over the medium term of 1,125. The associated text (page 13) and table footnotes in Our Space, as well as the evidence base documented in the Capacity Assessment highlight that feasibility tests produced a wide range of results and that further work to improve the modelling tools was underway. Given such uncertainty with regard to the feasibility of development capacity (and the implications for sufficiency in the medium and long term) Our Space refers to a ‘potential shortfall in capacity’ in relation to this matter.

They told us how updated feasibility analyses for Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts completed prior to the Our Space consultation period but too late to be incorporated into the Our Space document, were included as part of the supporting consultation material. This was therefore available to submitters and reinforced the work required to refine feasibility and sufficiency conclusions as part of a final Our Space document. Christchurch City Council did not appear in relation to its submission.

Officers recommended updating the Actions in Our Space to work on an improved methodology for capacity and making amendments to the wording of Section 3.2. We accept the reasons and recommendations of the officers. We understand that density in new urban areas in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts remains an issue.

*Updating proposed policy interventions to reflect emerging data.*
**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 *(Accuracy and uncertainties of projected future demand)* in the officers' report.

They said that throughout Our Space the need for ongoing monitoring and review of the evidence base to support decision making is clearly stated. This is a requirement of the NPS-UDC as part of monitoring of market indicators and the preparation of a capacity assessment at least every three years (with subsequent consideration to review housing targets and the future development strategy where necessary).

We accept the officers' position on this matter, noting that policy interventions are available to reflect emerging data. In particular, for the short to medium term these can be addressed in the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

### Sequencing of development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 *(Sequencing and staging of greenfield land)* in the officers' report. In addition, the evaluation in Appendix F of the officers' report is also relevant. In relation to this they recommend that sequencing is identified as part of structure planning processes and infrastructure servicing, which is best determined by the relevant territorial authorities. They noted that such processes would need to have regard to existing Canterbury Regional Policy Statement provisions, and recommended wording amendments to clarify this.

We accept the officers' reasons and recommendations on these matters, and accept the submission in part to the extent that the changes outlined in theme 5 of the officers' report are made clarifying that sequencing will be addressed in the manner described.

**Intensification in townships and increase densities in greenfield areas and future development areas.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Christchurch City Council seeks a minimum net density of 15 households per hectare, while the remaining Councils are satisfied that 12 households per hectare is appropriate. The Chief Executives of the Greater Christchurch local authorities presented to us in relation to achieving 12 households per hectare as part of the district plan review processes.

The Hearing Panel heard oral evidence regarding densities from developers and planners undertaking work within Rolleston and Waimakariri, as well as evidence from individuals seeking higher densities in the settlement areas outside of Christchurch. Generally, the position was that 12 households per hectare is appropriate in those areas. This is higher than the current requirement of 10 households per hectare in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

Having considered the Christchurch City Council's submission and the officers' position, we accept the officers' position in part. In terms of timing, we do not agree with officers that a review of density takes place as part of the 2019 change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. We consider that this a matter for the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022, as it has the potential to stall the change process planned for 2019, which is urgently required. In addition, we consider that Our Space contains a strong direction that 12 households is to be achieved in the interim. We are satisfied on the evidence we received that this is both achievable and appropriate.

**Factoring in rural capacity.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers recommended in Appendix F of the officers' report that Table 3 in Section 3.2 be updated in relation to this submission point to recognise rural capacity, and made recommendations to include this in future updates for capacity assessments, noting factors that create uncertainty around the assessment.
We accept the officers’ position and therefore accept the submission, and recommend changes in accordance with officers’ recommendations.

**Reviewing business sufficiency.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers told us that modelling of business demand was undertaken for the Capacity Assessment using the projected household demand in Table 1 of Our Space. With the development of Our Space, in particular the proposed housing targets in Table 2, there was insufficient time to remodel the implications of such an alternative apportionment of demand by each territorial area.

Population growth generally and in different locations will have an impact on the economy, the growth of the workforce and demand for business land or floorspace. Remodelling of business demand using the housing targets in Table 2 Our Space was completed and Table 4 amended to reflect this more accurate assessment of business sufficiency.

We accept the officers’ reasoning and update Table 4 accordingly.

**Addressing social and affordable housing.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Refer to the officers’ comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 *(Provision of social and affordable housing).*

Officers noted that Figure 13 (page 20) of *Our Space* outlines the workstreams anticipated to comprise an action plan to enable social and affordable housing provision across Greater Christchurch, and Action 2 in the schedule of further work in *Our Space* section 6.2 specifically identifies this initiative for completion during 2019-2020.

They said that the more specific mechanisms proposed in the CCC submission primarily relate to RMA land use provisions that can be addressed through respective district plan reviews (including the related submission points on appropriate densities in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts and the officer response outlined in this Officers Report). Section 5.3 and Action 9 in section 6.2 of *Our Space* also reference the investigation of redevelopment and intensification opportunities in existing urban areas and close to town centres (which would presumably encourage smaller lot sizes and multi-unit dwellings).

We accept the officers’ position on this submission for the reasons set out above and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

No changes to Our Space are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Ministry of Education (075)**

Overall support for the proposed strategy, and the inclusion and consideration of social infrastructure.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
The submission point is noted.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Encourages councils to undertake early engagement with the Ministry when implementing development areas.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
The submission point is noted.
No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Support for the concept of a '10-minute neighbourhood' but notes there is limited commentary in Our Space.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (Focused commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a '10-minute neighbourhood'). This acknowledges that the explanation of, and policy intent behind, Key Activity Centres is limited in Our Space, and officers recommend the connection with the 10-minute neighbourhood concept should be clarified in Our Space through additional wording in Section 5.

We accept the officers' recommendation with the recommended clarification.

Encourages exploring opportunities for the Ministry and councils to share recreational and community facilities.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

The submission point is noted.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**Carter Group Limited (076)**

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) in Kainga.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) in the officers' report. The officers' position is that no new industrial areas are proposed, given the significant oversupply of industrial land in Greater Christchurch to meet long term demand identified in the Capacity Assessment. They noted that while there may be reasons other than land supply which weigh in favour of enabling the rezoning of this land, that the appropriate process to consider the merits of any expansion of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary and/or other enabling policy changes is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work.

We accept the officers' position on this. However, we have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

---

**ChristchurchNZ and Development Christchurch Limited (077)**

Proposed settlement pattern approach in Our Space driven by growth forecasts rather than an active approach that considers how urban areas should be developed to meet broader strategic aspirations.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from Mr Nick Bryan and Mr Steve Clarke for ChchNZ and Development Christchurch. In preparing the Strategy, Mr Clarke would have liked to have seen explicit analysis of the strategic priorities for Greater Christchurch and how these shape the settlement patterns to best deliver these. He considered the starting point should be an articulation of the preferred outcomes, then an analysis of how spatial distribution of activities can best support these. Instead, the proposal provides for a passive approach, responding to demographic forecasts. The organisations would prefer an approach that responds to outcomes.
Officers said that the principal aim of Our Space is to ensure that there is sufficient housing and business development capacity in Greater Christchurch to support future demand, and that this demand is supported in a way that aligns with the vision, principles and strategic goals of the Urban Development Strategy.

The main source of demand for housing and business space relates to population growth. To understand the scale and type of demand that is likely in the future, Policy PB2 of the NPS-UDC states that local authorities shall use information on demand when preparing their capacity assessment, including likely demographic changes using Statistics NZ population projections.

They noted to accommodate these projected demands in a way that aligns with broader strategic aspirations for Greater Christchurch, Our Space was guided by the strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy. This is set out in Section 2.3 of Our Space. The long term settlement pattern approach outlined in Our Space reflects the previously agreed urban limits of the Urban Development Strategy and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

Adopting a transitional approach to housing targets in Our Space also demonstrates a clear strategic consideration of how future demand should be accommodated in Greater Christchurch, diverging from the adopted growth projections. This approach directs more demand to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term.

Taking into account the explanation from officers, we consider that the approach taken is correct, and aligns with both the requirements NPS-UDC and the vision, principles and strategic goals of the Urban Development Strategy.

We accept the position of officers’ and as a result, we do not recommend any change in response to this submission point.

Cities’ prosperity is vulnerable unless the mix of economic activity shifts away from reliance on the rebuild and servicing the local population, which requires the aspiration to create new and better economic prospects.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers noted that Our Space does not determine the types of economic activities to be undertaken across Greater Christchurch, but seeks to ensure there is sufficient commercial and industrial space available to support business needs over the long term. The Capacity Assessment indicated this capacity is well planned for with the Central City recognised as the core commercial hub for the Greater Christchurch area.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Insufficient attention is given to the importance of driving urban growth to the central city and inner suburbs in the short to medium term, to position Greater Christchurch as an attractive proposition in the long term.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) in the officers’ report. They said that Our Space seeks to provide a balanced approach that both provides for current market demands and reflects the anticipated changes in these demands over the next thirty years. In doing so, Our Space identifies a range of greenfield and redevelopment opportunities to support new housing, and adopts an approach to housing targets that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term than would be anticipated based on the adopted projections.

They considered this holistic approach to targets seek to respond to projected changes over the long term and is different to constraining growth in the districts over the medium term to benefit development prospects and outcomes in the City, especially the Central City, as suggested by some submitters.
Officers said that an approach to limit intensification to the Central City alone would be counter to these existing Plan provisions, would likely only deliver a segment of the housing types envisaged by intensification policies (i.e. higher density townhouses and apartments), and would be highly unlikely to provide the level of new housing required to meet projected demand.

They noted that Christchurch City Council has embarked on an ambitious programme to encourage Central City living, titled Project 8011, with a target of increasing the Central City population to 20,000 by 2028 from a current level of around 6,000. Project 8011 signals that over time the initiatives and mechanisms that comprise the programme can be rolled out more broadly, where appropriate, to encourage and support city-wide intensification.

We note the principle behind the submission, and to that extent we accept it. No changes are proposed to Our Space in response to the submission point.

Concern regarding the information and assumptions used in the preparation of Our Space, specifically in terms of the post-earthquake effects on population and employment forecasts.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands). They note that the projections are only the starting point for spatial planning. For instance, they said, the setting of territorial authority housing targets in Our Space reflects projections over the medium term, but over the long term it was considered that simply duplicating projections would not take account of Greater Christchurch’s unique post-earthquake circumstances.

We accept that there is uncertainty in the projections. The ongoing capacity analysis cycle (undertaking capacity assessments every three years) provides for monitoring of uptake and development, and the ability to adjust capacity assessments and improve the capacity assessment methodology to ensure demand and uptake is understood. No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

Specific comment on the Executive Summary, that wellbeing strategies should inform and drive settlement pattern strategies, not be made to fit and complement them.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted the submission point.

No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

Specific comment on Section 2.1 (page 3), that central city employment levels are well-below pre-earthquake levels and there is still a long way to go to create a vibrant ‘principal commercial hub’ for the region.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers acknowledged that wording in Our Space related to Central City employment levels nearing those attained prior to the earthquakes may be misleading and should be amended.

We agree and recommend amending Section 2.1 of Our Space to clarify that employment levels in the Central City remain below pre-earthquake levels.

Specific comment on Section 4.1 (page 15), that a key issue that is missing is the need to ensure momentum in regeneration is maintained and accelerated to create a vibrant urban centre and higher economic relevance.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl, developing in the City (and Central City) first ahead of surrounding districts). They note and support the submission point highlighting the importance of the Central City and that it should be a
focus for development. However, the challenges outlined in Section 4.1 relate to an assessment across Greater Christchurch and have not identified where in particular such issues are most important.

For the reasons set out, no change is recommended.

**Lincoln University (078)**

Need to provide sufficient buffer between research farms and urban development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted the submission point.

No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

Maintain PIB in current proposed position for Rolleston and Lincoln.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district).

Our Space does not propose any changes to the Projected Infrastructure Boundary.

No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

**KiwiRail Holdings Limited (079)**

Support for UDS principles and strategic goals guiding Our Space, and reference to the GPS on Land Transport.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Ms Rebecca Beals (RMA team leader) and Ms Jeanine Benson in relation to the submission from KiwiRail Holdings Limited.
In relation to this submission point, support is noted, and no changes are recommended.

Industry and tourism growth is anticipated to result in some increased demand on the rail network.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Comment is noted, no changes are recommended.

Relevant business areas should be appropriately protected and developed, along with links to the transport network, to ensure existing rail functions and future opportunities to use rail are not compromised.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 10 (Provision and protection of key infrastructure and integration with development) in the officers’ report.

The rail network is strategic infrastructure for Greater Christchurch that requires protection from inappropriately located development, thereby ensuring safety and efficiency are not compromised, or reverse sensitivities created. The submitter notes that KiwiRail already works closely with councils to ensure such issues are recognised and addressed through district plans, which is the appropriate planning mechanism to address such matters.

We consider that that protection is adequately recognised and provided for in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.
Need to ensure any new development does not generate reverse sensitivities for the rail network.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 10 *(Provision and protection of key infrastructure and integration with development)* in the officers’ report.

The rail network is strategic infrastructure for Greater Christchurch that requires protection from inappropriately located development, thereby ensuring safety and efficiency are not compromised, or reverse sensitivities created. The submitter notes that KiwiRail already works closely with councils to ensure such issues are recognised and addressed through district plans, which is the appropriate planning mechanism to address such matters.

We consider that that protection is adequately recognised and provided for in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

Will work with the Partnership where possible to assist in achieving the vision for the transport network.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Comment is noted, no changes are recommended.

Seeking clarification around what is intended in terms of improvements to the transport network, and that KiwiRail is party to any discussions that have implications for the rail corridor.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
These matters will be further explored as part of transport business cases.

No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

Include a reference in Section 5.6 of Our Space that future growth may require changes to the rail network.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
These matters will be further explored as part of transport business cases. Changes are recommended to section 5.6 to provide further detail about transport business cases.

Expand the last paragraph in Section 5.7 of Our Space (beginning "Further more detailed assessment...") to include consideration of how future growth areas will integrate with land transport.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
These matters will be further explored as part of transport business cases.

No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

**Robert Fleming (080)**

Considers that Christchurch City should be developed prior to additional greenfield space outside the city boundaries (cost, efficient infrastructure provision, diminishing quality and quality of productive land).

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 *(Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts)* in the officers’ report. They said that Our Space seeks to provide a balanced approach that both provides for current market demands and reflects the anticipated changes in these demands over the next thirty years. In doing so, it identifies a range of greenfield and redevelopment opportunities to support new housing, and adopts an approach to housing targets that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term than would be anticipated based on the adopted projections.
They considered this holistic approach to targets seek to respond to projected changes over the long term and is different to constraining growth in the districts over the medium term to benefit development prospects and outcomes in the City, especially the Central City, as suggested by some submitters.

Officers said that an approach to limit intensification to the Central City alone would be counter to these existing Plan provisions, would likely only deliver a segment of the housing types envisaged by intensification policies (i.e. higher density townhouses and apartments), and would be highly unlikely to provide the level of new housing required to meet projected demand.

They noted that Christchurch City Council has embarked on an ambitious programme to encourage Central City living, titled Project 8011, with a target of increasing the Central City population to 20,000 by 2028 from a current level of around 6,000. Project 8011 signals that over time the initiatives and mechanisms that comprise the programme can be rolled out more broadly, where appropriate, to encourage and support city-wide intensification.

We accept the officers' reasons and recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Supports active and public transport options, better transport options within the city, shared transport options, and rapid transit between regional Canterbury towns combined with workable park and ride solutions.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Transport needs and implications, including public transport) in the officers’ report.

The NZTA and local authorities in Greater Christchurch are working towards making more efficient use of the network. The importance of taking a multi modal approach to managing the network, which includes active transport such as walking and cycling and public transport for those who are less mobile or unable to cycle, is recognised.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Better transport options to industrial areas should be provided for.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Transport needs and implications, including public transport) in the officers’ report.

The NZTA and local authorities in Greater Christchurch are working towards making more efficient use of the network. The importance of taking a multi modal approach to managing the network, which includes active transport such as walking and cycling and public transport for those who are less mobile or unable to cycle, is recognised.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Malc Dartnall (081)**

Highlights a lack of larger houses.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing and a range of housing types).
Officers said that the evidence underpinning Our Space highlights how changing demographics and affordability will likely impact the range of housing types demanded, increasing the need for smaller and multi-unit dwellings to complement the existing housing stock dominated by larger standalone houses. The number of larger families, as a proportion of overall household growth, is predicted to decline. Our Space seeks to provide for the range of housing types likely to be needed to accommodate future population growth – it does not preclude the development of larger houses. Our Space will need to monitor and review the anticipated scale and pace of changes to housing demand as part of subsequent capacity assessments.

We accept the officers’ reasons and recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Concerned that the current planning framework encourages small houses and disregards the needs of larger families; considers that Our Space should be family friendly with the needs of larger families specifically mentioned.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We refer to the evaluation in relation to the above submission point and do not recommend any changes in response to the submission point.

Considers there is a lack of industrial zoned land in Waimakariri.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers note that the Capacity Assessment identified a significant oversupply of industrial land in Greater Christchurch to meet long term demand. Section 3.3 of Our Space outlines these findings.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Helen Broughton (082)**

Concerned that this process is occurring so soon after the same issues were considered through the Christchurch District Plan Review.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We note that the development of Our Space, being a future development strategy, is a requirement under the NPS UDC and is mandatory.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that both low and medium growth projections should be used.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands).

Our Space adopts population projections that reflect recent growth trends in Greater Christchurch, with the rationale for the adopted projections fully documented in the Capacity Assessment. The projection scenario used for the purposes of Our Space anticipates a Greater Christchurch population of 640,000 in 2048, which is higher than Statistics NZ’s medium (or most likely) projections by 22,000, but much lower than Statistics NZ’s high projections that anticipates a population of 742,000 in 2048. The projection scenarios considered in developing Our Space are shown in Figure 7.

It is of note that in developing the Urban Development Strategy in 2007, the Greater Christchurch population was expected to be in the region of 550,000 in 2041. In comparison, the projections used for Our Space anticipates this population closer to 2031, some ten years sooner than was anticipated by the 2007 UDS.
In July 2018, MfE and MBIE published a report that evaluated capacity assessments undertaken for the high growth urban areas. This report stated that most high growth urban areas used an alternative to Statistics NZ’s medium projections, and in general, the choice to use a different projection could be clearly explained and justified with recent trends. The report considered the demand assessment for Greater Christchurch to be best practice amongst high growth urban areas.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Questions whether the decrease in home ownership in Christchurch identified on page 11 is realistic.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers advise that the projected decrease in home ownership rates reported on page 11 was one of the findings of a comprehensive assessment of the future housing demand profile for Greater Christchurch commissioned as part of the Capacity Assessment (Livingston Associates, Housing Demand in Greater Christchurch). This refers to the proportion of the additional households projected in Christchurch City over the period to 2048 whose housing needs are likely to be met by the rental market.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that given there is sufficient housing in Christchurch City major urban planning changes for Christchurch need not occur.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands).

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Identifies negative effects of intensification. Comments that intensification should be directed to the central city, with no further intensification in suburban Christchurch beyond what is currently permitted; if intensification is further considered any area the [Christchurch District Plan Review] Hearings Panel judged to be inappropriate for medium density should retain suburban density. If medium density is to be continued it should have allowance for parking and more courtyard space and plantings.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
In response to questions from the Panel, Ms Broughton said that in Ilam, some accommodation was needed for students, but that students do have cars and can travel. Ms Broughton considered that the current zonings were enough. She thought there would need to be an attitude change to transport, and that would only happen if the price of petrol went up. She would prefer to see greenfield land opened up, or intensification in the city, before additional intensification took place in the suburbs.

Officers refer to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing and a range of housing types).

We note that the Independent Hearings Panel left future decisions regarding further up-zoning to the Christchurch City Council.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers there is sufficient land in Christchurch City for the long term with low to medium growth and no need to focus on further medium density areas.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Refer to the officers’ comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands). Officers noted that Statistics NZ population projections remain the most robust information available to predict future population changes. The NPS-UCD requires a new capacity assessment every three years to ensure planning is responsive to changing trends. Officers said that
the approach to setting housing targets in Our Space, as outlined in Section 3.2 is also considered to represent a principles-based approach rather than following a purely projections-led approach.

Our Space also outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and the wider Greater Christchurch area. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas should be considered as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We accept the officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Questions the accuracy of the infographic in Section 3.2 of Our Space (p 11) with regard to the affordability constraints of new households.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers addressed this matter in their Reply Report. They considered that on investigation, the wording in the infographic should more accurately read:

62% of new households in the City, 35% in Selwyn and 58% in Waimakariri.

Officers stated that this information is derived from the expert analysis of Livingston Associates who prepared a Housing Demand Assessment as part of the Capacity Assessment. This work used Statistics NZ demographic data and extrapolated current trends in household size, income and other classifications through to 2048.

New households formed over the next 30 years are expected to experience increasing affordability pressures, even with a sufficient supply of new housing appropriate to the needs of a changing household composition. An important aspect of this infographic however is that it is the total housing stock available that would need to meet the financial thresholds identified (i.e. under $350,000 to buy or $200/week to rent) to be considered affordable.

We accept the officers’ position and changes recommended.

**Youth Voice Canterbury (083)**

Keen to identify how Our Space meets priorities identified in youth strategies, action plans and surveys and consider how the future settlement pattern proposed addresses the challenges over the next 30 years and the quality of life of future generations.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Youth Voice Canterbury tabled information in relation to their submission, which included a number of closing recommendations. Officers considered that this information was best addressed by other processes. We note the issues of concern for Youth Voice, and identify the following processes where these matters may be followed up, or more appropriately addressed in relation to each recommendation:

1. Enforce warrant of fitness standards for houses to ensure that all homes built in the future are of high standards – this is better addressed at a national level through legislative change and will be considered as part of rental tenancy reform.

2. Ensure there is some form of community, low income housing to provide a space for the homeless especially those who are young – this is addressed by housing agencies, but we note that it also is picked up in part by an action in Our Space (Action 2).

3. Investment in more buses that travel around the suburbs/communities without going into the central city – this is a matter for the Regional Public Transport Plan.

4. Re-introduce the free shuttle around the central city – this is a matter for the Regional Public Transport Plan.
5. Reduction of the price of the trams for locals so they are affordable and able to be used as public transport – this is a matter for the Regional Public Transport Plan.

6. Invest in light rail from Kaiapoi/Rangiora to Rolleston, via east side/Marshland area and provide funding and support the introduction of innovative transport concepts like solar powered trains – this is a matter for the Regional Public Transport Plan although we note that amendments have been made in Our Space around transport and funding and identification of rapid transit routes.

7. More opportunity for cultures to express themselves through cultural events – this is a matter that is appropriately directed to district council long term planning and annual planning processes.

8. Increase knowledge of diversity through cultural hubs - this is a matter that is appropriately directed to district council long term planning and annual planning processes.

9. Use empty land and city council public areas to make youth friendly spaces - this is a matter that is appropriately directed to district council long term planning and annual planning processes.

10. Increase outdoor seating, street lighting, and shaded areas - this is a matter that is appropriately directed to district council long term planning and annual planning processes and engagement with community boards in particular locations.

11. Improve footpaths - this is a matter that is appropriately directed to district council long term planning and annual planning processes and engagement with community boards in particular locations.

12. Make the central city greener, create more and improve places and walks with native trees and fauna, and increase community input into creating green spaces - this is a matter that is appropriately directed to district council long term planning and annual planning processes and engagement with community boards in particular locations.

13. Ensure green spaces have natural and peaceful seating areas and adequate lighting - this is a matter that is appropriately directed to district council long term planning and annual planning processes and engagement with community boards in particular locations.

We accept the officers' position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point except to the extent that amendments are recommended to Our Space in relation to Action 2 in the Schedule of Further Work and transport and funding and identification of rapid transport routes.

Richard Graham (084)

Considers that the plan should first consider what level of population growth (if any) there should be in Greater Christchurch and questions whether providing for housing and infrastructure for levels growth indicated by Statistics NZ projections is the best outcome for the region.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Refer to the officers' comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands). Officers noted that Statistics NZ population projections remain the most robust information available to predict future population changes. The NPS-UDC requires a new capacity assessment every three years to ensure planning is responsive to any changing trends. Officers said that the approach to setting housing targets in Our Space, as outlined in Section 3.2 is also considered to represent a principles-based approach rather than following a purely projections-led approach.

Our Space also outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and the wider Greater Christchurch area. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas should be considered as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We accept officers' position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

No assessment of the impact of further urban expansion on existing rural amenity or on holiday destinations.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 *(Reducing urban sprawl, developing in the City (and Central City) first ahead of surrounding districts).*

The comment related to impacts on holiday destinations is noted, but is beyond the scope of matters considered in Our Space.

We accept officers' position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Comments that all new developments should be encouraged to provide a range of housing typologies that provide for a range of family sizes and requirements.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that Our Space supports the delivery of a range of housing types, sizes and tenures that will be required to meet future demand, including by responding to projected changes in housing need and demand over the next thirty years. District planning plays an important role in the delivery of a broad range of housing types.

We accept officers' position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Comments that new commercial development should be contained within existing commercial hubs where possible, particularly encouraging greater activity within the CBD.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 *(Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’).* This acknowledges that the explanation of, and policy intent behind, Key Activity Centres is limited in Our Space, and officers recommend the connection with the 10-minute neighbourhood concept should be clarified in Our Space through additional wording in Section 5.

We accept the officers' recommendation on this, with the recommended clarification.

**Pomeroy’s round table (085)**

*Submission withdrawn*

**Kieran Williamson (086)**

Considers that greenfield development in exurban areas such as Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi is unsustainable (increased CO2 and PM pollution, congestion and obesity).

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 *(Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts)* in the officers' report. They said that Our Space seeks to provide a balanced approach that both provides for current market demands and reflects the anticipated changes in these demands over the next thirty years. In doing so, it identifies a range of greenfield and redevelopment opportunities to support new housing, and adopts an approach to housing targets that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term than would be anticipated based on the projections.

They considered this holistic approach to targets seeks to respond to projected changes over the long term and is different to constraining growth in the districts over the medium term to benefit development prospects and outcomes in the City, especially the Central City, as suggested by some submitters.
Officers said that an approach to limit intensification to the Central City alone would be counter to these existing Christchurch District Plan provisions, would likely only deliver a segment of the housing types envisaged by intensification policies (i.e. higher density townhouses and apartments), and would be highly unlikely to provide the level of new housing required to meet projected demand.

They noted that Christchurch City Council has embarked on an ambitious programme to encourage Central City living, titled Project 8011, with a target of increasing the Central City population to 20,000 by 2028 from a current level of around 6,000. Project 8011 signals that over time the initiatives and mechanisms that comprise the programme can be rolled out more broadly, where appropriate, to encourage and support city-wide intensification.

We accept the position of the officers and no changes are proposed to Our Space in response to the submission point.

Proposes that all future development should be restricted to the current Christchurch City limits and a large majority of new development should be multi-unit dwellings (close to shopping, work and public transport) with single family detached dwellings discouraged.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We refer to the above evaluation, in respect of Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) in the officers’ report. For the reasons referred to above, we do not recommend any changes to Our Space in response to the submission point.

Our Space pays only lip service to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 11 (Addressing climate change and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals). We generally accept the officers’ position on those matters, however we recommend changes with regard to addressing climate change, achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals. We consider this merits its own new section under Section 4 in Our Space, elevated to a higher priority, and amendments to Section 5 of the report, with tighter, clearer and more aspirational wording. As a result, we accept the submission in part to the extent that changes to those sections are made.

Large format retail serviced only by road corridors and suburban shopping mall developments should not be allowed to develop in new areas or expand in existing commercial areas.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to their comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’) in the officers’ report, and the reporting officers’ reply report (question 9) with respect to the 10-minute neighbourhood concept. They said that Our Space reflects the current Canterbury Regional Policy Statement direction that the Central City and Key Activity Centres are the focus for commercial activity (office and retail), not just shopping malls, but also other public and community facilities such as education, health and leisure services. These centres integrate high quality public realm spaces and are well-connected by public transport services and safe cycle networks. Medium density housing in and around such centres support their vitality and viability.

We further note provision for neighbourhood centres in each of the district plans in Greater Christchurch, which are smaller centres providing for smaller scale commercial activities. These are also an important factor when considering 10-minute neighbourhoods.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Small scale retail and office development should be allowed in areas without sufficient existing amenities within walking distance.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We refer to the evaluation above, namely that Our Space reflects the current policy direction in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in regards to Central City and Key Activity Centres which integrate high quality public realm spaces and are well connected to public transport services and safe cycle network.

We do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point and accept the officers’ recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (*Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of the ‘10-minute neighbourhood’*).

Suggests that the best way to retain and increase the viability and vitality of existing commercial centres is to increase the density of housing within the catchment areas of these centres; replace existing old stock single family occupancy homes with multi-unit dwellings and develop greenfield and other underutilised spaces within existing city limits.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that Our Space promotes greater densities around key centres. District Plan provisions also play a key role in this regard. The Christchurch District Plan is enabling of residential intensification within and surrounding existing centres. The recent Christchurch District Plan Review up-zoned many areas around Key Activity Centres to facilitate medium density residential development and considerable potential also exists within the central city to support the CBD economy.

We accept the officers' recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Considers priority should be given increasing / ensuring public transport access to industrial areas.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (*Transport needs and implications, including public transport*) in the officers’ report.

The NZTA and local authorities in Greater Christchurch are working towards making more efficient use of the transport network. The importance of taking a multi-modal approach to managing the network, which includes active transport such as walking and cycling and public transport for those who are less mobile or unable to cycle, is recognised.

Officers have recommended changes to include more detail on the transport business cases underway.

We agree with these recommendations. No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Supports higher densities within the current city limits.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
This submission is noted, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Axel Wilke (087)**

Supports the sentiments expressed in Our Space.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Support noted. No change is recommended in response to this submission point.

Does not consider the targets set in Our Space are ambitious enough to prevent further climate change; much of the development will only be supportable by auto-centric lifestyles; objective should be to define high-capacity public transport corridors with high density alongside; greenfield developments should only be permissible with good public transport provision from day one.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (*Transport needs and implications, including public transport*). We consider the response with regard to addressing climate change, achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals merits its own new section under Section 4 in *Our Space*, elevated to a higher priority, and amendments to Section 5 of the report, with tighter, clearer and more aspirational wording. As a result, we accept the submission in part to the extent that changes to those sections are made.

**Colin Eaton (088)**

Considers that Christchurch does not have the infrastructure to support more growth – identifies concerns relating to drainage, stormwater, sewerage and market garden land and orchards.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Infrastructure is planned out for a period of 30 years under the infrastructure strategies prepared under the *Local Government Act 2002*. Matters such as market gardens and orchards can be address through treatment of land and sampling under the relevant *National Environmental Standards*.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Comments that social housing does not mix well.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Noted. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that all vacant industrial land and buildings should be revitalised before planning for more industrial areas.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

No new industrial areas are planned given the existing significant supply of industrially zoned land in Greater Christchurch. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers that the plan should show we care for the future and city environment not driven by the economy and greed.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Noted. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Comments that the transport network will only work if it is good and regular and private cars are banned from the central city.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

The suggestion to ban cars from the city centre is out of scope of the matters considered in *Our Space*.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Chris Morahan (089)**

Considers that resolving distortions in the housing market created by the transport system and removing planning rules that restrict dense development will lead to higher demand in the inner city and along public transport corridors, and lower demand in outlying auto-centric suburbs like Rolleston and Rangiora, in the future.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Noted. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.
Agrees with intensifying the inner city and public transport corridors; disagrees within more auto-centric sprawl.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Mr Chris Morahan presented his submission. Mr Morahan is a transport planner and blogger. Mr Morahan described how the decisions being made now would make a big impact on his daughter and her peers, than it would on the current people in the room. He referred to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and its recent reported on the current state of climate change, and its conclusions. He noted that even without climate change, modal shift provides for public health benefits and safety. He noted that the draft public transport plan was released, and the general theme of submissions was that public transport needed to go further, and it should address passenger rail. He referred to a recent Colmar Brunton survey that noted more than 50% of people are concerned about climate change and the need to act.

In relation to development, Mr Morahan observed that higher density is needed, pedestrian connections are required, with well-planned corridors, and areas are contiguous. He said that people will use rail corridors if rail is provided. He considered it was likely there will be a zero carbon act, with better carbon prices, and a need for better walking and cycling. His three takeaway points would be a need for more ambitious intensification around existing corridors, no more greenfields sprawl, and not to preclude existing rail corridors. He considered while the text of Our Space was good, it didn’t line up with percentages of greenfield development that are proposed, and he did not think it would deliver a dense compact city.

Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) in the officers’ report. They said that Our Space seeks to provide a balanced approach that both provides for current market demands and reflects the anticipated changes in these demands over the next thirty years. In doing so, it identifies a range of greenfield and redevelopment opportunities to support new housing, and adopts an approach to housing targets that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term than would be anticipated based on projections.

They considered this holistic approach to targets seeks to respond to projected changes over the long term and is different to constraining growth in the districts over the medium term to benefit development prospects and outcomes in the City, especially the Central City, as suggested by some submitters.

Officers said that an approach to limit intensification to the Central City alone would be counter to these existing Christchurch District Plan provisions, would likely only deliver a segment of the housing types envisaged by intensification policies (i.e. higher density townhouses and apartments), and would be highly unlikely to provide the level of new housing required to meet projected demand.

They noted that Christchurch City Council has embarked on an ambitious programme to encourage Central City living, titled Project 8011, with a target of increasing the Central City population to 20,000 by 2028 from a current level of around 6,000. Project 8011 signals that over time the initiatives and mechanisms that comprise the programme can be rolled out more broadly, where appropriate, to encourage and support city-wide intensification.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Considers the plan should seek to allow commercial development everywhere it can and let businesses gravitate to the best location for them.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that Our Space has been prepared in accordance with the existing principles of the Urban Development Strategy and policy framework of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. Both documents reinforce the centres-based approach. Any change in policy direction regarding the centres-based approach is more appropriately considered as part of the 2022 review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.
We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Strongly agrees with promoting higher densities around key centres. Suggests that railway lines could be included as key future public transport routes.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We understand that the option of rail services in Greater Christchurch is being considered as part of the Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Wayne Phillips (090)**

Large greenfields development in Rangiora and Rolleston will lock in auto dependence.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (*Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts)* and 6 (*Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport*). We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Planning for other transport options for such towns needs to take place now.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We understand that the option of rail services in Greater Christchurch is being considered as part of the Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Encourage key worker housing (such as nurses, police, teachers).

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred us to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (*Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types*). The purpose of a social and affordable housing action plan would be to enable social and affordable housing across Greater Christchurch. However, specific details of such an action plan have yet to be determined. The action plan is discussed in Section 5.1 and Section 6.2 of Our Space. This may help to facilitate housing for such workers.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are required and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Basing projections on high post-EQ rates is dangerous.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that the projections are only the starting point for spatial planning. For instance, the setting of territorial authority housing targets in Our Space reflects projections over the medium term, but over the long term it was considered that simply duplicating projections would not take account of Greater Christchurch’s unique post-earthquake circumstances and may not align with the strategic goals of the Urban Development Strategy to increasingly enable growth through redevelopment. Hence the adoption of the transitional approach to territorial authority housing targets in Our Space that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term. Greater Christchurch targets still provide for projected demand over the long term. It is in the apportionment between territorial authorities that Our Space differs from current projections.
We are satisfied with the officers’ response. In addition, we note there are a number of other considerations such as ability to service, maintenance of a compact urban form, and presence of natural hazard which will all contribute to whether it is appropriate to develop in a particular location.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Landowners ODP 12 Rolleston (091)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners supporting inclusion of existing greenfield land (within PIB) on East Maddisons Road, Rolleston.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| We heard from Ms Angelene Holton, a landowner, regarding low value rural land which has been identified in Our Space as a Future Development Area. Ms Holton described how the area (known as ODP Area 12B) at the southern end of Rolleston was not included in the Land Use Recovery Plan changes to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. The land is low value rural land that is not of use for much more than grazing horses. Ms Holton advised that she had provided submissions to the Minister on the Land Use Recovery Plan. A copy of the submission to the Minister was attached to her submission. The submission was not supported, and the land was subsequently not included in Map A, Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. Ms Holton described how, in response to questions from the Panel, how this was a constraint to development. Ms Holton generally supported the Our Space document, which identifies the land in which she has interest as a Future Development Area (notated orange in Figures 15 and 16 of the Strategy), although she remained concerned that she had been advised that a private plan change would be required to release the land.

It is noted that changes will still be required to both the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the relevant district plan in order for subdivision and development to occur on the site, and that further discussions are required with Selwyn District Council as to timing.

No changes are recommended in response to the submission point.

**John Law (092)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) for industrial use on Main South Road. Considers that the CRPS inadequately accounts for future industrial development trends.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) in the officers’ report. The officers’ position is that no new industrial areas should be proposed, given the significant oversupply of industrial land in Greater Christchurch to meet long term demand identified in the Capacity Assessment. They noted that while there may be reasons other than land supply which weigh in favour of enabling the rezoning of this land, the appropriate process to consider the merits of any expansion of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary and/or other enabling policy changes is during the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022 as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work.

We accept the officers' position on this, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.
APPENDIX 2 – Our Space document

This incorporates amendments recommended in the Addendum dated 5 June 2019 to the Report and Recommendations of the Hearings Panel.
Have Your Say

This Settlement Pattern Update (Update) to the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS) is a review of the land use planning framework for Greater Christchurch. It outlines the Greater Christchurch Partnership’s proposed settlement pattern and strategic planning framework to meet our land use and infrastructure needs over the medium (next 10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years) periods. The Update has been prepared in order to satisfy the requirement to produce a future development strategy, as outlined in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC).

Why you should make a submission

The Partnership wishes to hear from stakeholders and the public to ensure the decisions made in relation to the Update are well-informed by feedback. This includes whether the proposed planning directions set out in this consultation draft will sufficiently provide for the needs of people and communities, and our future generations, and support broader opportunities to improve social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing by planning for growth and development.

Submissions will help shape the final content of the Update, which is due to be adopted early in 2019. Your input is important to let us know whether you consider we have got it right, and if not, what needs to be changed and why.

How to make a submission

Anyone can make a submission. It may be in written, electronic or audio format, and can range from a short email or letter on a single issue, to a more substantial document covering multiple issues. Please provide any supporting facts, figures, data, examples and documentation where possible to support your submission. Every submission is welcome, however, identical submissions will not carry any more weight than the merits of the arguments presented.

A submission form is available on the Partnership’s website at www.greaterchristchurch.org.nz/ourspace

Submissions may also be emailed to ourspace@greaterchristchurch.org.nz

Submissions made in Word or searchable PDF formats are preferred. Hard copies may also be posted, particularly if appending other material. If you send your submission by post, please also email an electronic copy if possible. Postal submissions should be addressed to:

Our SPACE Consultation
Greater Christchurch Partnership
PO Box 73012
Christchurch 8154

Submissions should include the submitter’s name and contact details, and the details of any organisation represented. Please clearly state if you wish to be heard in support of your submission. The Partnership will not accept submissions that, in its opinion, contain inappropriate or defamatory content.

The deadline for submissions is 30 November 2018.

What the Partnership will do with submissions

The Partnership will make all submissions publicly available on its website.

Your written comment, including your name, will become public information. If you consider there are compelling reasons why your name and/or feedback should be kept confidential please outline this in your submission. Even if
you request confidentiality we may have to release your written comment at a later date if a request is made under
the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 or the Official Information Act 1982.

A Hearings Panel will hear from submitters wishing to be heard, review the content of all submissions and make
recommendations on changes to the consultation draft. A final version of the Update, which has been informed by
the feedback received and any further information, will be considered by the Partnership for adoption, followed by
ratification of the Update by constituent partner councils.

Other ways to participate in the consultation

The Partnership’s constituent partner councils will be holding drop-in sessions in Christchurch, Rolleston and Rangiora.
Further details are available on the Partnership’s website.
Mihi

Hārō ana te kāhu i te ipukarea o Tahu Pōtiki
Tau atu rā ki te tihi o tōku pou tīpua
Aoraki Matautū, Aoraki Mataoho
Ka mihi ki ngā maunga, ka mihi ki ngā awa
Tīhei Mauri Ora

Tēnei te mihi ki ngā tātaitanga o te takiwa nei
Kia tākina te hono kia puawai te kaupapa
me ngā hua o te Mātāpono ki ū, kia mai
hui e! Tāiki e

The Kāhu soars the lands of Tahu Pōtiki
And settles on the summit of my ancestral mountain
Aoraki Steadfast, Aoraki Vigilant
It acknowledges all the mountains and rivers
Behold the essence of life

We acknowledge those with a vested connection to the land,
who ensure this bond on the collaboration of this document
and the values within to ensure its longevity
Together in Unity!
Message from the Strategy Partners

The Greater Christchurch Partnership continues to demonstrate the cross-agency collaboration and leadership required to effectively plan for and manage urban development across the Greater Christchurch area; working together to address those key strategic issues that span council and political boundaries. Te Tira Tū Tahi - One Group, Standing Together.

Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga represents a further building block to ensure our partnership approach to planning takes account how things have changed in recent years, and what demands and trends might shape the future of our urban areas during the next thirty years. Its particular focus is how best to accommodate housing and business land use needs in a way that integrates with transport and other infrastructure provision, building greater community resilience, and contributing to a sustainable future for Greater Christchurch that meets the needs and aspirations of our existing communities and future generations.

We first recognised the need to undertake this work when we adopted an update to the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy in 2016. This was then reinforced by the development of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity, which requires councils with high growth urban areas to produce a ‘future development strategy’ demonstrating there will be sufficient development capacity to meet future needs. Our Space has been collaboratively prepared to satisfy this requirement for Greater Christchurch’s councils.

The strategic planning directions contained in this document have been strongly guided by the vision, goals and principles enshrined in the Urban Development Strategy, which continue to provide the roadmap for growth planning in Greater Christchurch. Our Space therefore does not seek to replace this comprehensive strategy, but rather builds on it by considering and updating many of our key settlement pattern matters. Other plans, strategies and initiatives referred to in this document also complement Our Space, helping provide a broader wellbeing approach that ensures Greater Christchurch remains an attractive place for people to live, learn, work, visit and invest.

We would like to acknowledge and thank those that have helped shape this document, and would encourage all to contribute to its implementation and the realisation of our shared vision for the future of Greater Christchurch.
Executive Summary

Greater Christchurch has responded to the initial challenges following the earthquakes of 2010 and 2011 and is now embracing the opportunities that lie ahead to help us realise our long term vision - mō tātou, ā, mō kā uri ā muri ake nei, for us and our children after us.

A growing urban area can bring future prosperity and enrich our lives and communities, but only if it is managed so we protect and enhance the aspects we value the most and that make it a unique place for people to choose to live, learn, work, visit and invest. Greater Christchurch is growing, with the population expected to grow to about 640,000 by 2048, some 150,000 more people than today.

Planning for future urban growth in Greater Christchurch must also be informed and guided by the principles that are relevant to the exercise by mana whenua of kaitiakitanga. Integral to the exercise of kaitiakitanga are the values of respect, reciprocity and sustainability. For mana whenua, it is vital that the effects associated with urban growth are managed so as to avoid the degradation of the natural environment – including our coastal environment, waterways and landscapes.

The Greater Christchurch Partnership has worked collaboratively for more than a decade on planning and managing urban growth and development across Greater Christchurch. This Partnership brings together the leadership roles of local government, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, the district health board and government agencies and is guided by the vision, principles and strategic goals outlined in the Urban Development Strategy (UDS).

This Update to the UDS addresses various aspects of that Strategy as it:

- focuses on the critical role of how our urban areas accommodate growth and how efficient infrastructure planning can support and guide development decisions;
- reaffirms and builds on existing plans that show we are already well-placed for future development over the next 30 years;
- balances the projected future demands of housing and business markets with the urban form that will best enable sustainable growth;
- recognises that how we live today will be quite different to 30 years from now, so we need to be responsive to these changes, grasping the opportunities afforded by Government policy and emerging technologies to make this transition.

In so doing, this Update demonstrates that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term while maintaining an urban form that helps achieve the UDS vision and strategic goals. Two challenges stand out in this regard:

1. How can future housing provision be affordable, high quality and cater for an aging population that is linked to a more general trend for more one-person and couple-only households?

2. And how can our urban areas grow, through redevelopment and new greenfield subdivisions, without increasing the congestion that would ensue if our current travel patterns remain?

The solutions to these and other challenges will come from a wide range of responses from public agencies, the private sector and communities. Many drivers of change are uncertain, so regular monitoring and review is critical.

This Update outlines the proposed planning framework that integrates and guides other work and demonstrates the commitment of the partners to achieving its strategic goals. It has been informed by an assessment of where we are

---

1 Development capacity refers to the amount of land for development enabled in plans and supported by infrastructure. This development capacity can be provided either ‘outwards’ on greenfield land or ‘inwards’ by redeveloping existing urban areas (infill and intensification).
now and anticipated future demands, and aligns with recently adopted Long Term Plans and infrastructure strategies of the constituent councils. Specifically it:

- sets out how targets for housing for the next 30 years will be met, accommodating an additional 150,000 people;
- identifies preferred locations for housing growth, encouraging Central City and suburban centre living while providing for township growth in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi;
- reinforces the role of key centres in providing additional retail and office floorspace as required, in particular the Central City and, if needed, a transition of its surrounding light industrial zones;
- promotes a compact urban form, which provides for efficient transport and locates development in a manner that takes into account climate change and sea level rise;
- recognises the existing industrial land provision as sufficient to cater for industrial growth for some time yet;
- outlines a series of implementation actions and further work required to give effect to the Update.

It responds to the new Government Policy Statement on Land Transport, which has increased funding for mass public transit schemes, and meets the requirement of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) 2016 to prepare a future development strategy.

Many other plans, strategies and initiatives will complement this Update in improving our wider social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing. The draft Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP) proposes an ambitious vision to fully integrate the public transport system with the wider transport system and urban form, thereby increasing mobility and accessibility across Greater Christchurch. Development and implementation of recovery and regeneration plans for central Christchurch, the Ōtaiko Avon River Corridor (currently being developed) and Kaiapoi address the future land uses of areas most affected by the earthquakes. Coastal hazards, climate change and Carbon Zero projects are underway to better understand the resilience and adaptation needs of Greater Christchurch. And economic and social enterprise strategies help position the City and the region to thrive and show we are open for business and innovation.

This Update is therefore an important piece of the jigsaw that provides certainty for the sustained and collective investment we can all make to the wellbeing of Greater Christchurch, Our Space.
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1. Introduction

The Greater Christchurch Partnership\(^2\) has worked collaboratively for more than a decade on planning and managing urban growth and development in Greater Christchurch to support the long term needs of people and communities. This includes the development of the Urban Development Strategy (UDS) in 2007, and the crucial role the Partnership and its constituent partners played coordinating and facilitating rebuild and recovery activities after the earthquakes.

The Partnership has now reviewed the settlement pattern for Greater Christchurch. This review (referred to as the Settlement Pattern Update or the Update) has been undertaken to satisfy the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) for high growth councils to produce a ‘future development strategy’ that shows there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity to support housing and business growth needs (see Section 2.4 for further detail on the NPS-UDC).

A collaborative approach makes sense because the urban areas and the transport networks across Greater Christchurch function as one interconnected system. In doing so, it will satisfy the requirement of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) for high growth councils to produce a ‘future development strategy’ that shows there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity to support projected growth needs to 2048. Rather than developing an entirely new strategy the Update builds on the existing UDS to meet the NPS-UDC requirements, and this is encouraged in supporting guidance on implementing the NPS-UDC.

This Update comprises a review of the land use framework outlined for Greater Christchurch in the Land Use Recovery Plan and in key resource management documents, such as the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans. It considers how best to accommodate our future housing and business needs based on the comprehensive strategic planning framework that already exists for Greater Christchurch, being guided by the vision, principles and strategic goals established in the UDS and informed by a Capacity Assessment and relevant Long Term Plans and infrastructure strategies.\(^4\)

Our plan for supporting housing and business growth in Greater Christchurch has been shaped by key considerations relating to planning for sustainable urban development, including how we can:

- achieve our desired urban form while supporting our increasing housing and business needs;
- provide for the diversity of housing that meets the needs of a changing resident population;
- integrate land use and transport planning to ensure we create safe, accessible and liveable urban areas.

To ensure that the processes, priorities and outcomes of this Update align with Ngāi Tahu cultural aspirations for Greater Christchurch, both Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Ngā Papatipu Rūnanga have been closely involved with the preparation of this document. Particular significance from a cultural perspective is the need to ensure adequate provision is made for the establishment of kāinga nohoanga settlements in which Ngāi Tahu whānau can live and work on customary Māori land. The Partnership recognises the need for the future role of kāinga nohoanga developments to be an important considerations in our planning and decision making processes.

In this context, this draft Update outlines the Partnership’s proposed planning directions for supporting urban growth in Greater Christchurch through to 2048. It highlights the key issues in terms of meeting our growth needs, and sets out the Partnership’s planned responses to these issues, with the aim of ensuring that Greater Christchurch remains an attractive place for people to live, learn, work, visit and invest, both now and in the future.

---

\(^2\) The Greater Christchurch Partnership has evolved to comprise Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council, Environment Canterbury, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, Canterbury District Health Board, New Zealand Transport Agency, Regenerate Christchurch and the Greater Christchurch Group of the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.

\(^3\) The medium term in this Update includes both the short (next three years) and medium term (between three and 10 years) periods defined by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.

\(^4\) Having particular regard to Policy PA1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.
This draft Update has been released for consultation to provide the opportunity for stakeholders and the public to give feedback on our proposed planning responses.

This feedback will be considered and, where appropriate, incorporated as part of the final document ratified by constituent partner councils.

The remainder of this document covers the following:

- **Section 2, Our Place**, provides the context in which this Update has been developed;
- **Section 3, Our Growth Needs**, outlines the anticipated housing and business demands, and the extent to which this demand is already provided for in district plans;
- **Section 4, Our Challenges**, sets out the key issues and challenges that exist when considering our planning responses;
- **Section 5, Our Plan**, identifies the planning directions and responses that we believe are required to address the key land use and infrastructure issues for Greater Christchurch;
- **Section 6, Our Next Steps**, signals further work required to implement our planning responses and support our future decision making.
Figure 1: Greater Christchurch area
2. Our Place  

Tō tātou wāhi

2.1 Context and trends

Greater Christchurch is a defined geographical area that includes and surrounds Christchurch City, New Zealand’s second largest city and the largest city in the South Island (Figure 1).

Greater Christchurch currently has a population nearing half a million residents. Just under 80% of the Canterbury regional population and about 40% of the South Island population live in Greater Christchurch, emphasising its importance as a strategic regional centre and the primary economic hub of the South Island. Canterbury is the fastest growing region in New Zealand outside Auckland and more population growth is projected in Greater Christchurch over the next 30 years than other high growth cities, such as Hamilton, Tauranga, Wellington and Queenstown.

Administratively, Greater Christchurch comprises parts of three territorial authorities: Christchurch City, Selwyn District and Waimakariri District. The communities and economies in these areas are intrinsically linked environmentally by the rivers, groundwater systems, coastal and other natural features that cross territorial authority boundaries, and by infrastructure, with large numbers of people commuting to work in the City, and facilities and services provided in one district often benefitting neighbouring communities.

The larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri that fall within Greater Christchurch include Rolleston, Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Lincoln, while smaller settlements include West Melton, Prebbleton, Tai Tapu, Springfield, Tuahiwi, Woodend and Pegasus. Lyttelton and its harbour, Whakaraupō, also fall within the defined boundaries for Greater Christchurch, although the rest of Banks Peninsula does not.

The Canterbury earthquake sequence in 2010 and 2011 had a significant impact on Greater Christchurch’s population and employment. As shown in Figure 2, the population in Christchurch City dropped sharply in the first two years after the earthquakes and recovered to its pre-earthquake population only in 2017. In contrast, Selwyn and Waimakariri have experienced strong population growth since the earthquakes, augmenting the high growth rates seen in the two districts prior to the earthquakes.

The widespread earthquake damage to infrastructure networks and housing areas, especially in the Central City, the eastern areas of the City and in the Kaiapoi area, required many households to find new places to live. Much of this post-earthquake demand was supported by opening new housing areas that had been planned to meet longer term growth needs. Although the development around the urban fringes of the City and the larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri has occurred at a faster rate than anticipated at the time the UDS was conceived, it has still been consistent with the longer term growth strategy for Greater Christchurch.

The earthquakes also damaged business premises in Greater Christchurch, especially in the central and eastern parts of the City, with many businesses forced to relocate either temporarily or, in some cases, permanently. Continued momentum behind the Central City recovery has meant businesses and workers are returning to this area, helping to restore the central business district as the principal commercial hub for the region. Employment levels in the Central City have increased but are not yet back to levels that existed prior to the earthquakes, are again nearing those attained prior to the earthquakes.
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Changes to the spatial distribution of housing and business activities in Greater Christchurch, coupled with the damage to roads and other infrastructure from the earthquakes, have had substantial impacts on the transport network. This includes altered travel patterns that have resulted in increased traffic volumes originating from the west of the City, as well as from Selwyn and Waimakariri. This has placed more demand on the road network along the western corridor, as well as on the northern and southern approaches to the Central City. Over the past decade there has been significant investment in the Greater Christchurch roading network, which has helped accommodate this demand. Investment has included the building of the Christchurch Southern Motorway Stage 1, Western Belfast Bypass and four-laning of the State Highway 1 Western Corridor (between Hornby and Belfast). The Christchurch Southern Motorway Stage 2 (between Halswell Junction Road and Rolleston), and the Christchurch Northern Corridor are under construction and expected to be fully operational by 2021.

Disruptions to land use, the transport network, and travel patterns have led to increased travel by car and contributed to reduced public transport patronage in Greater Christchurch. However, with a growing number of businesses and workers returning to the Central City, the share of trips taken by public transport in Greater Christchurch is expected to grow, while major investment in the urban cycleway network continues to encourage active transport choices.
2.2 Cultural values and aspirations

The Greater Christchurch area is an outstanding cultural landscape for Ngāi Tahu whānui. It is the hapū of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri, Ngāti Where (Rāpaki) and Taumutu Rūnanga who hold mana whenua over this cultural landscape. Integral to its role as mana whenua is the inherited responsibility bestowed upon mandated individuals to act as kaitiaki, and to ensure that the principles of respect, reciprocity and sustainability are adhered to when making decisions that affect the environment in the area.

Central to the role and responsibilities of kaitiakitanga is the holistic concept known as Ki Uta Ki Tai (from the mountains to the sea). The concept of Ki Uta Ki Tai maintains that each of the constituent components of the natural environment are interconnected, and that an action in one location will have a flow on effect and impact on another location.

The concept of Ki Uta Ki Tai can apply equally to the built environment whereby decisions that we make about future urban growth will have repercussions for associated infrastructure and service requirements. Accordingly, this Update has sought to adopt an integrated and holistic approach that recognises the interconnected nature of the Greater Christchurch environment.

Contained within the Greater Christchurch cultural landscape is a mosaic of values, many of which date back to time immemorial and which serve as tangible reminders of the intergenerational relationship that Ngāi Tahu Whenua share with the natural environment. In preparing this Update, the Partnership recognizes that decisions we make about the future spatial distribution of housing and business activities in Greater Christchurch must align with traditional and contemporary cultural values. These values include:

- Wāhi ingoa (place names), which often represent people, historical events, geographical features and Natural flora and fauna;
- Ara tawhito (traditional trails), which were the arteries of important social and economic relationships;
- Ngā wai, which are the freshwater resources that are the lifeblood of Papatūānuku (Earth Mother) and the life giver of all things;
- Mahinga kai, which encompasses the customary (and contemporary) gathering of food and natural materials, and the places where these are gathered from;
- Mauri, which encompasses the essence that binds the physical and spiritual elements of all things together, generating and upholding life;
- Wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga sites, which includes both archaeological sites and natural features, and species that are sacred, treasured and revered by Ngāi Tahu whānui.

The key principles that govern the manner in which these values are to be managed are set out in the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan. The Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan is an expression of kaitiakitanga and rangatiratanga, and contains detailed policies that reflect the kaupapa of Ngāi Tahu whānui in respect of the management of natural and physical resources.

Although much of the cultural landscape that encompasses the Greater Christchurch area is now highly modified, its significance to Ngāi Tahu whānui is in no way diminished. The many traditional values that attach themselves to the cultural landscape maintain a contemporary significance. To this end, the preparation of this document has been undertaken in close partnership with both Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (as a member of the Partnership) and Ngā Papatipu Rūnanga who hold mana whenua over Greater Christchurch.

It is important to record that, for Ngāi Tahu, subdivision and land use change can increase the potential for effects on sites and areas of cultural significance. These effects may be concerned with land disturbance and the introduction of activities which are inappropriate in close proximity to, or causing the displacement or loss of wāhi tapu or wāhi taonga values. In addition, intensification of the built environment may increase demand for water supply, wastewater and stormwater disposal, adversely affecting surface and groundwater resources.
2.3 Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy

The Urban Development Strategy (UDS) was produced by the Partnership in 2007 to provide the strategic direction for urban growth in Greater Christchurch. It promotes an integrated and intergenerational approach to planning for urban growth, and seeks to ensure that development is managed in a manner that protects environments, improves transport links, creates liveable areas and sustainably manages population growth. Formed after extensive consultation, the UDS seeks to consolidate development in and around well-defined urban and rural town centres.

The vision, principles and strategic goals in the UDS continue to guide the Partnership’s approach to enabling future growth, and have helped to shape the planning directions proposed in this Update.

Vision (kaupapa)

Greater Christchurch has a vibrant inner city and suburban centres surrounded by thriving rural communities and towns, connected by efficient and sustainable infrastructure.

There is a wealth of public spaces ranging from bustling inner city streets to expansive open spaces and parks, which embrace natural systems, landscapes and heritage.

Innovative businesses are welcome and can thrive, supported by a wide range of attractive facilities and opportunities.

Prosperous communities can enjoy a variety of lifestyles in good health and safety, enriched by the diversity of cultures and the beautiful environment of Greater Christchurch.

1 An update of the UDS in 2016 retained the vision for Greater Christchurch but revised the principles and strategic goals from the 2007 UDS to reflect the changes that had occurred since the earthquakes.
Principles and strategic goals (whainga)

The principles and strategic goals of the UDS expand on the vision by describing the key outcomes we seek to achieve under four themes: healthy communities, enhanced natural environments, prosperous economies and integrated and managed urban development. Given the emphasis of this Update on spatial planning matters, particular regard has been given to the strategic goals related to “integrated and managed urban development”, while also recognising the broader contribution that quality urban environments can bring to our overall quality of life.

Figure 3: UDS principles, themes and relevant strategic goals
2.4 National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity

The National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) came into effect in December 2016, providing direction to decision-makers under the Resource Management Act 1991 in respect of planning for urban environments. It requires all councils that have part, or all, of a medium or high growth urban area within their district or region to produce a future development strategy which demonstrates that sufficient, feasible development capacity is available to support future housing and business growth. This includes over the medium (next 10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years) periods.

The Christchurch urban area\(^6\) was defined by Statistics NZ in 2016 as a high growth urban area. Given the strategic planning arrangements that already exist between councils in Greater Christchurch through the Partnership, it was agreed that a review of Greater Christchurch’s settlement pattern should be done collaboratively, and in doing so, meet the statutory requirements of the NPS-UDC. Accordingly, the Partnership has determined that the Greater Christchurch area shown in Figure 1 should be the geographic area of focus for the Update and the relevant urban environment for the purposes of the NPS-UDC requirements. This Update therefore meets the requirements of Policies PC12 and PC13 of the NPS-UDC (related to producing a ‘future development strategy’) by:

- demonstrating that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity over the medium and long term;
- identifying the broad location, timing and sequencing of future development capacity in new urban environments and intensification opportunities within existing urban environments;
- balancing the uncertainty regarding the provision of future development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development;
- being informed by a Capacity Assessment, the relevant Long Term Plans and Infrastructure Strategies required under the Local Government Act 2002, and any other relevant strategies, plans and documents;
- having particular regard to NPS-UDC Policy PA1.

To inform the spatial planning decisions outlined in this Update, the Partnership has developed an evidence base that provides information about current and future housing and business trends in Greater Christchurch. This has included monitoring urban development indicators and preparing a Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment\(^7\), which are both required by the NPS-UDC.

Figure 4: NPS-UDC policies and their interrelationship

---

\(^6\) The Christchurch urban area is identified by Statistics NZ as including the towns of Prebbleton in Selwyn and Kaiapoi in Waimakariri.

\(^7\) The Urban Development Indicators Monitoring Reports and Capacity Assessment produced by the Partnership can be accessed at www.greaterchristchurch.org.nz.
The Capacity Assessment estimates the demand for and supply of housing and business land to indicate whether there is sufficient, feasible development capacity currently planned in Greater Christchurch to meet our growth needs for the next 30 years.

In undertaking this work, the NPS-UDC requires councils to estimate the sufficiency of development capacity to meet future demand taking into account relevant regional and district plan provisions, actual and likely availability of development infrastructure, the current feasibility and rate of take up of capacity, and the market response in terms of what has been built, where this has occurred and at what price.\[8\]

This Update summarises the findings of the Capacity Assessment, identifies any sufficiency issues and provides our planning and policy response.

### 2.5 Where does this Update fit?

#### National context

This Update has been prepared within the legislative context of the Resource Management Act 1991, Local Government Act 2002 and Land Transport Management Act 2003. It has also been undertaken at a time when the Government is strengthening its approach to urban development and regional economic growth, and reviewing the mix of instruments available to effect change in New Zealand’s cities. This includes a review of how local government can effectively finance infrastructure improvements to support future growth, which is a critical challenge facing most high growth urban areas.

The Urban Growth Agenda is the Government’s response to the challenges confronting New Zealand’s cities, especially in terms of worsening housing affordability. It seeks to address the fundamentals of land supply, development capacity and infrastructure provision by removing any undue constraints, with the initial focus of the programme on:

- enabling responsive infrastructure provision and appropriate cost allocation;

---

\[8\] Requirement of Policy PB3 of the NPS-UDC.
• enabling strategic planning to increase development opportunities and support quality built environments;
• building stronger partnerships between local and central government as a means to undertaking pro-growth and integrated spatial planning;
• ensuring the price of transport infrastructure promotes access to the network and efficient urban form; and
• ensuring the regulatory, institutional and funding settings under the Resource Management Act, Local Government Act and Land Transport Management Act are collectively supporting the objectives of the Urban Growth Agenda.

The Government’s commitment to this Urban Growth Agenda has been reinforced by the creation of a new Ministry of Housing and Urban Development. There are also important interdependencies between the Urban Growth Agenda and other Government initiatives, such as establishing a national Urban Development Authority, the Kiwibuild programme to build 100,000 affordable homes for first-time buyers, the Housing First programme to house and support people who have been homeless for a long time and face multiple needs, the Public Housing Plan to increase the supply of social housing and proposed changes to the Residential Tenancies Act 1986 to improve the conditions for people renting.

The new Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) has also influenced this Update. The GPS makes clear that the transformation of the land transport system is a priority for the Government, signaling its commitment to:

• a mode neutral approach to transport planning and investment;
• incorporating technology and innovation into the design and delivery of land transport investment;
• integrating land use and transport planning and delivery.

Future updates to the GPS are likely to seek to establish local and central government agreements on transport’s role in the future development of metropolitan areas such as Greater Christchurch. It will consider the role of transport as an enabler, connector and shaper of New Zealand’s cities, and opportunities for investment in rapid transit options (e.g. light rail and dedicated bus routes) to support transit-oriented development in major urban areas.

Other considerations at the national level include the emerging National Policy Statement on Versatile Land and High Class Soils and the Zero Carbon Bill, with the latter aiming to achieve net zero emissions in New Zealand by 2050.
Local and regional context

A range of plans, strategies and programmes have been developed, or are being developed, at the local and regional level that will influence how Greater Christchurch grows and changes in the future. It is important this Update aligns and integrates with these initiatives to support a cohesive approach to planning. Key considerations encompass transport plans, regeneration plans and strategies, health programmes, climate change and hazard management programmes, and other plans, strategies and programmes being delivered by councils and iwi in relation to growth management.

The implementation of some of the planning responses proposed in this Update will also require changes to resource management documents, including to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri. This will involve, at a minimum, the insertion of housing targets for each local authority.
3. Our Growth Needs

Guidance produced by the Ministry for the Environment and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment to help councils meet the evidence and monitoring policies of the NPS-UDC acknowledges that the 'future is inherently uncertain and impossible to accurately predict, especially over the long term'.

3.1 Population and household growth

The risks associated with planning for an uncertain future can be managed by utilising the most up-to-date and robust population and household projections, and considering possible growth scenarios. In this way, Statistics NZ provides three possible projection scenarios: low, medium and high growth. As shown in Figure 7, the variances in these scenarios are relatively high for the territorial authorities in Greater Christchurch, partly due to the disruptions and associated uncertainties created by the Canterbury earthquake sequence in 2010 and 2011.

Statistics NZ’s projection scenarios were considered against historic trends and local circumstances to determine the most appropriate scenario to adopt for each territorial authority, and consequently for Greater Christchurch. These provide estimates of the demand for housing (and indirectly for business land) over the medium (next 10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years).

![Figure 7: Population growth scenarios for Greater Christchurch](image)

To reflect the recent growth trends in Greater Christchurch, the Partnership agreed to adopt the medium projection for Christchurch City, and the medium-high projection for both Selwyn and Waimakariri, as the basis for the Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment. This approach sought to balance a desire to be ‘ahead of the curve’ when planning for growth, with ensuring that the financing and provision of new infrastructure is timely to support future growth needs. It is possible, should local trends and circumstances change, that subsequent Capacity Assessments adopt different projection scenarios for Greater Christchurch.

---

9 National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, June 2017, p26
Based on the adopted scenario, the population in Greater Christchurch is projected to grow to about 640,000 by 2048, being 150,000 more residents than in 2018. As outlined in Table 1, this population growth translates to about 74,000 new households in Greater Christchurch by 2048, with 54% of this growth in Christchurch City, 28% in Selwyn and 18% in Waimakariri.

Although not specifically planned for as part of this Update, the Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy suggests the need for net migration in the Canterbury region to be higher than historic rates to help sustain a strong regional economy. Should new policy settings be adopted by the Government in the effort to achieve more aspirational population growth either nationally or regionally, the Partnership would need to consider the implications of an even higher growth scenario as part of future updates and reviews of the UDS.

### 3.2 Housing Demand

Based on the adopted growth scenario for Greater Christchurch, projected population and household growth will generate demand for about 74,000 new dwellings over the next 30 years. When the margins (or buffers) required by the NPS-UDC are added to this housing demand, the number of new dwellings that need to be planned for in Greater Christchurch increases to almost 87,000, as set out in Table 2. These margins provide flexibility to allow for situations when developments are not brought to the market, meaning extra development capacity is required to ensure future needs are met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Projected Housing Demand in Greater Christchurch, 2018 – 2048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christchurch City</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bracketed numbers include the additional planning margins required by NPS-UDC Policies PC1 to PC4. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100.

A comprehensive assessment of the future housing demand profile for Greater Christchurch was commissioned as part of the Capacity Assessment, and revealed common trends likely for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri over the next 30 years. Of significance are the projected increases in the elderly population and decreases in the average household sizes across Greater Christchurch, and the implications of these changes for the types of dwellings required to meet future needs.

While standalone homes on large sections will continue to make an important contribution towards meeting future housing demand, the shifting demographic and household profile in Greater Christchurch means a growing share of demand is expected to be met by smaller housing types, such as apartments and townhouses. Much of the growing demand for smaller housing types will be focused in the City and provided through the private rental market, while some demand for such housing types will also be evident in the larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri by 2048.

Due to the close location of Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri, these local housing markets share a number of similarities, for example three to four bedroom dwellings make up about two thirds of the overall housing stock for each territorial authority. Although some demand for housing will be transferable between these local markets, this is not always the case given individuals and families make decisions on where they want to live based on their own needs and wants at the time of buying a house. Such factors include lifestyle, and proximity to amenities, education...

---

10 Margins include an additional 20% over the medium term and 15% over the long term as outlined in Policies PC1 to PC4 of the NPS-UDC.
11 Livingston Associates, Housing Demand in Greater Christchurch, November 2017
12 Census 2013: Number of bedrooms for occupied private dwellings in Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri.
and employment. In the future, these factors are also likely to alter due to demographic changes, meaning the three housing markets will need to adapt to the changing profile of future housing demand.

Figure 8: Housing demand by Council area and housing type across Greater Christchurch

What key factors will influence our future and changing housing demand profile?

- Increase in the share of households with aged 65 years + Projected to grow from currently 24% to 35% in 2048
- Growth in single person households Number of households projected to increase by 50% by 2048
- Growth in multi-person households Number of households projected to increase by 30% by 2048
- Smaller average household sizes Households sizes projected to decrease from 2.5 to 2.4 in the City, 2.9 to 2.6 in Selwyn and 2.6 to 2.4 in Waimakariri
- Decrease in home ownership rates 71% of housing demand in the City will be met by private rentals, 33% in Selwyn and 36% in Waimakariri
- Share of housing demand likely to be met by multi-unit dwellings 60% of housing demand in the City, 7% in Selwyn and 25% in Waimakariri
- Share of all new households that will need housing under $350,000 to buy or $200/week to rent to be affordable 62% of new households in the City, 35% in Selwyn and 58% in Waimakariri
- Increase in share of households with a long term health condition or disability

Targets

The NPS-UDC directs councils to set minimum targets for housing development capacity for both the medium and long term periods. These targets are informed by the projected demands for housing identified in the Capacity Assessment. Through this Update, Councils need to demonstrate how sufficient, feasible development capacity will be provided and serviced to accommodate the number of new dwellings planned for each territorial authority over these periods and set out how these targets will be met.

Having considered the most appropriate housing targets for Greater Christchurch, the Partnership believes that targets that simply duplicate the projected demands for each territorial authority would not take account of our unique post-earthquake circumstances, and over the longer term, may not align with the strategic goals of the UDS to increasingly support growth by redeveloping and intensifying existing urban areas.
However, the development trends that currently characterise Greater Christchurch will also not change overnight, with the market and people’s preferences needing time to respond to the new opportunities being created by regeneration and place-making initiatives underway in the Central City, suburban centres and surrounding local neighbourhoods in Christchurch City.

The proposed targets for housing development capacity therefore represent a transitional approach that align with projected demands over the medium term, but allow for a greater share of new households in Greater Christchurch to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term. The regional targets for Greater Christchurch correspond to projected demand, it is only the territorial authority apportionment of these targets over the long term that represents a transitional approach.

In this context, the targets set out in Table 2 for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri represent the development capacity that each council will, over the medium term, zone and otherwise, seek to enable through their relevant planning processes and mechanisms (district plans, structure plans, outline development plans and infrastructure strategies) and over the long term, identify in relevant plans and strategies, to meet the demand for housing in Greater Christchurch over the medium and long term. A change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2019 will include a policy that will enable land required to meet an identified medium term capacity need to be rezoned in district plans. Unless already enabled, additional development capacity required over the long term will only be shown on Map A of the Regional Policy Statement as a Future Development Area, identified in relevant plans and strategies, and the development infrastructure required to service it will be identified in each council’s infrastructure strategy.

These targets will need to be revisited every 3 years following the completion of scheduled Capacity Assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Targets for Housing Development Capacity in Greater Christchurch, 2018 - 2048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Term</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(2018 - 2028)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christchurch City</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selwyn</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waimakariri</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greater Christchurch</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures included in the table represent number of dwellings. Bracketed figures represent the share of dwellings for that period.

**Sufficiency**

Collectively, the district plans for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri already allow for a substantial number of new dwellings to be built in and around their urban areas. This development capacity is provided through greenfield housing areas (new subdivisions) and the redevelopment of existing housing areas. Some additional capacity also exists in rural locations surrounding the main towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri. Most of the capacity in Greater Christchurch is currently provided in the City, with only about 13% provided in Selwyn and 6% in Waimakariri.

The Capacity Assessment included extensive work to assess the commercial feasibility of housing development capacity in Greater Christchurch. This work highlighted that assessing feasibility can be extremely complex and that further work is required to better understand and then respond to the challenges of improving feasibility, especially in relation to the redevelopment market. Key areas for further investigation include understanding the influences on and

---

13 The longer term share of new households to be provided within Christchurch City reflects those outlined in the UDS 2007.
14 Table 2 will be inserted into the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in Chapter 6 (Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch). Relevant local authority targets will also be inserted into the district plans for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri.
15 Development infrastructure means network infrastructure for water supply, wastewater, stormwater, and land transport as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003, to the extent that it is controlled by local authorities, and including New Zealand Transport Agency.
of land values, sales prices and build and land development costs, and how these factors could change over time to improve the relative feasibility of housing developments.

In this context, the feasibility tests undertaken as part of the Capacity Assessment produced a wide range of results for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri depending on the adopted set of assumptions and inputs. Further work to improve the modelling tools used for Capacity Assessment findings will occur as part of the next assessment in 2020 reported in this Update is underway.

Based on the housing targets, the overall amount of feasible housing development capacity in Greater Christchurch is sufficient to meet demand over the medium term. However, there is insufficient development capacity in certain locations within Greater Christchurch in the medium term and overall when you consider the long-term housing demand.

At the territorial authority level, given the range of reported feasibility, capacity in Selwyn and Waimakariri may not be sufficient to meet demand over the medium term, while the significant capacity in the City is expected to be sufficient over the next 30 years, even with a higher share of growth apportioned to the City over the long-term period (see Table 3).

These projected shortfalls in housing development capacity must be resolved to enable our urban areas to develop and change, and respond to the needs of both current and future generations. How the Partnership proposes to respond to the projected capacity shortfalls in Greater Christchurch is addressed in Sections 5 and 6.

Table 3: Sufficiency of Housing Development Capacity in Greater Christchurch against Housing Targets, 2018 - 2048

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Housing Development Capacity</th>
<th>Housing Target</th>
<th>Medium Term (2018 - 2028)</th>
<th>Medium and Long Term (2018 - 2048)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>59,950 *</td>
<td>55,950</td>
<td>+3,025</td>
<td>+4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>9,725 **</td>
<td>17,290</td>
<td>+1,252, 1,875 **</td>
<td>-2,250, -475 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>4,200 **</td>
<td>13,360</td>
<td>+1,200, 1,600 ***</td>
<td>-2,225, -7,875 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
<td>73,875</td>
<td>86,600</td>
<td>+17,800, +39,100 **</td>
<td>-12,750, -9,150 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Capacity figures included in the table represent number of dwellings (numbers have been rounded to the nearest 25).

In the medium term, capacity for around 3,500 dwellings in Christchurch is constrained by the provision of necessary infrastructure.

Sufficiency of housing development capacity will be reviewed and published as further feasibility modelling and investigation is completed.

These housing targets include the additional capacity margins required by the NPS-UDC as shown in Table 1. * Alternative modelled scenarios documented in the Capacity Assessment, which are based on less favourable assumptions, identified development capacity for approximately 52,675 or 36,400 dwellings.

** These capacity figures are derived from a qualitative assessment of greenfield land only. An alternative modelled scenario, including existing zoned land and incorporating changes in prices and costs over time, identified development capacity for the long term of approximately 9,200 dwellings in Selwyn and 6,100 dwellings in Waimakariri.

*** These sufficiency figures have been adjusted to discount the demand over the medium and long term likely to be met through uptake of development in rural zoned areas (averaging 70 dwellings/year for Selwyn and 50 dwellings/year for Waimakariri). Demand met through capacity in rural areas will be reviewed following the review of rural zoning as part of respective District Plan Reviews in Selwyn and Waimakariri.

Further and ongoing refinement of the feasibility tools will be undertaken by constituent partner councils and incorporated as part of the next capacity assessment due in 2020. This assessment will also benefit from more up-to-
date data and can be used as the basis for making any zoning changes to address development capacity shortfalls as part of the District Plan Reviews for Selwyn and Waimakariri.

3.3 Business

Demand

Significant business growth is projected in Greater Christchurch over the next 30 years. This increase is driven predominantly by population and household growth and consequently the highest growth sectors are those providing retail goods (contributing 17% of employment growth), health/education (contributing 42% of growth) and services (19% of growth)\(^\text{16}\). Given the strong population growth driver, the structure and quantum of employment growth projected by the Capacity Assessment could be different if the population growth projected by Statistics NZ does not eventuate.

The tourism sector is also expected to contribute to a significant proportion of the growth over the period (accommodation contributing 16% of growth) whilst employment in the primary and industrial sectors is expected to remain relatively stable, contrasting with historic negative trends observed for these sectors.

In total, an additional 71,000\(^\text{16}\) employment opportunities are projected by 2048, with most of these located within Christchurch City (67%) and creating additional demands for land and floorspace.

**Figure 9: Projected employment growth**

---

\(^{16}\) Greater Christchurch Housing and Business Capacity Assessment (2018)
Sufficiency

The Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri district plans already make generous provision for meeting the long term needs for industrial land, and future commercial space is also mostly provided for, at least over the medium term. Over the longer term, the Capacity Assessment identifies potential shortfalls in commercial space, notably in areas projected to experience significant residential growth, including the Central City, the south-west and north-west parts of the City, and the main centres in Selwyn and Waimakariri.

The sufficiency of industrial and commercial development capacity to meet projected demand is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Sufficiency of Industrial and Commercial Development Capacity in Greater Christchurch, 2018 – 2048

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sufficiency of Industrial Development Capacity</th>
<th>Sufficiency of Commercial Development Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium Term (2018 - 2028)</td>
<td>Medium and Long Term (2018 - 2048)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>+ 675</td>
<td>+ 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>+ 215</td>
<td>+ 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>+ 40</td>
<td>+ 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
<td>+ 930 to + 1,010</td>
<td>+ 420 to + 500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures included in the table represent land in hectares (rounded to the nearest 5 hectares from the Capacity Assessment). Ranges reflect the uncertainty that additional demand for business land and floorspace can be accommodated by under-utilised business land. Commercial development capacity includes both commercial office land and commercial retail land.

Business land is inherently more flexible than housing land, with a wide range of business uses enabled on most business sites. As a consequence, the Capacity Assessment identified that most industrial and commercial zoned land in Greater Christchurch was commercially feasible for at least one type of business use. Given that longer term demands for business space can be affected by a wide range of factors, regular monitoring and review of uptake and other market indicators, as well as sensitively testing of modelled assumptions, will be important to confirm actual levels of demand and ensure appropriate planning responses are made at the necessary times.

Reference to commercial space includes both commercial office space and commercial retail space.
4. Our Challenges

4.1 Key growth issues for Greater Christchurch

Arising from the context outlined in Section 2 and the evidence base from the Capacity Assessment summarised in Section 3, the Partnership recognises that there are some key issues that need to be considered as part of developing our proposed planning directions and responses. These key issues for Greater Christchurch are discussed below.

Delivering new dwellings through redevelopment and intensification

Delivering higher density housing is essential to supporting the needs and preferences of a growing share of the population, and for achieving the consolidated urban form that most effectively accommodates growth. Although the uptake of redevelopment opportunities in Greater Christchurch is not yet back to pre-earthquake levels, the scale of redevelopment has started to trend upwards and is getting close to the intensification targets set in the UDS and Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. To unlock further redevelopment opportunities, the new Christchurch District Plan has ‘up-zoned’ areas to allow for medium and high density housing redevelopments, and streamlined consenting approval processes. However, there are challenges to delivering redevelopment in Greater Christchurch requiring the development sector to be appropriately supported to help bring such developments to the market and ensure the rate of new dwellings delivered through intensification strengthens.

Meeting housing needs and preferences for current and future residents

In comparison to other New Zealand cities, the cost of housing in Greater Christchurch is relatively affordable, however the provision of social and affordable housing will become an increasingly critical issue. Enabling higher density housing developments at different price points will be vital to meeting the projected increase in demand for smaller, more affordable dwellings. District plan provisions play an important role in helping to deliver a broad range of housing types, while other targeted programmes by constituent partner councils aim to support the development sector in delivering higher density housing to the market. Public sector investment can also play a role in boosting the attraction of areas for such developments, especially in the Central City, key activity centres and district town centres.

Recognising post-earthquake trends and anticipating future drivers

Since the earthquakes in 2010 and 2011, the location and pace of housing and population growth have been different to that anticipated at the time the UDS was produced in 2007. The increasing uptake of redevelopment in Christchurch City during the 2000s has since slowed, while development of greenfield land enabled by the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP) has been advanced rapidly. These trends partly reflect the unique situation in which a significant number of households had to be urgently reaccommodated following the earthquakes. A key challenge is therefore to understand whether the demands driving these trends will continue in the future or shift back to pre-earthquake trends, and whether any policy intervention will be required. This highlights the importance of both monitoring, to understand any key changes, and the role of planning and policy directions in this Update to enable the market to meet future demands.

Integrating land use and transport planning to shape desired urban form

Integrated land use and transport planning is a key principle that underpins the strategic direction for urban growth in Greater Christchurch. However, the key challenge of achieving sufficient and equitable infrastructure funding remains. In this context, the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) has offered new opportunities for investing in our transport system, with the possible development of a local and central government agreement on transport’s role in the future development of Greater Christchurch signaled in the GPS. Discussions with the Government and infrastructure providers will be important in delivering the types of improvements to our transport network that will help enable our desired urban form. Aligning development with good access to a range of transport modes will reduce the reliance on private vehicles, and provide associated social, environmental and economic benefits for all people and communities.
Living with, and mitigating climate change impacts

The way we plan Greater Christchurch has a big impact on how we use and consume resources, including those that have an impact on climate change, and also how we respond to effects associated with climate change. Providing opportunities for modal shift to active forms of transport, increased uptake of public transport, reducing trip distances, and promoting new non-fuel burning transport technologies all minimise the impact the residents have in terms of their contribution to greenhouse gas emissions. How we enable carbon offsetting activities to work towards zero net carbon emissions also needs to be a consideration in our planning frameworks. Planning for development in the right places ensures that as a wider community, the adverse effects from the impacts of climate change can be appropriately avoided or mitigated, and potentially lead to long term resilience and security for food production. This includes making the right choices that take into account sea-level rise, as well as changing weather patterns and their contribution to severe weather events, including flooding and droughts, so that future generations do not bear the cost of our decision-making.

Valuing the relationship between our urban areas and the environment

Greater Christchurch’s settlement pattern principles from the UDS promote a sustainable urban form that protects our natural environment, rural character and versatile soils. They also align with the Ngāi Tahu value of kaitiakitanga, and recognise the mauri of waterways and cultural landscapes. Where new greenfield development will be required to help meet our future needs, there are constraints as to where development can and should occur across Greater Christchurch. Coastal and flood hazards areas, groundwater aquifers, outstanding natural landscapes, versatile soils and airport noise contours all create limitations on where new development can be located. Figure 10 outlines some of these relevant constraints (some data layers are currently being refined as part of District Plan Reviews). Other constraints exist but some can and have been mitigated ahead of development occurring, such as ground improvements in areas with geotechnical constraints or requiring raised floor levels in areas with lower flood risk. In this context, it is important to ensure that our plan for growth recognises that the vitality of our urban areas is intrinsically linked to that of our environment, and that our urban areas need to be increasingly resilient to changes in our natural environment and better integrate natural systems within the urban landscape.

Fostering an equitable planning approach across our communities

Although the focus of this Update is to demonstrate sufficient development capacity for growth, the wider strategic goals of the UDS will not be realised without considering the needs of more disadvantaged areas and communities. One key element of Christchurch City Council and Regenerate Christchurch’s work programme is supporting regeneration in eastern Christchurch, with the post-earthquake movements of people and businesses westward heightening some pre-existing disparities. Targeted place-making investments by the public sector can give confidence to private sector housing redevelopment which typically favours more affluent neighbourhoods, driven by the more attractive returns from higher sales prices.

Underlying all these challenges will be how Greater Christchurch responds to known or potential shocks and stresses to the economy, society and our environment. For example, understanding, preparing, mitigating and adapting to climate change is a central part of the Partnership’s Resilient Greater Christchurch plan. Furthermore, global financial fluctuations and the pervasive impact of new technology can fundamentally change growth projections, labour force requirements and how we function as a society. This Update is conscious of the role settlement planning can contribute to a more sustainable and resilient future but recognises that, to be effective, change needs to be a shared responsibility across all sectors and appropriately supported nationally and internationally.

The Resilient Greater Christchurch Plan sets out how Greater Christchurch can be stronger, smarter and more resilient to the physical, social and economic challenges that are a growing part of the 21st century. It can be accessed at http://greaterchristchurch.org.nz/projects/resilient-greater-christchurch/
Figure 10: Example constraints on development across Greater Christchurch
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4.2 Priorities for this Update

This Update focuses on those key strategic planning directions that need to be undertaken collaboratively through the Partnership to address the land use and infrastructure issues identified in the Capacity Assessment. It recognises that providing development capacity is not just about land supply so also considers other more detailed planning and policy actions that will need to be implemented to realise our broader growth aspirations.

The priority areas for the Update include:

- Achieving the desired urban form and principles of the UDS, and the coordinated planning and decision-making required under the NPS-UDC, and addressing:
  - Projected shortfalls of housing development capacity in Selwyn and Waimakariri;
  - Projected shortfalls of commercial development capacity across Greater Christchurch;
- Unlocking redevelopment opportunities across Greater Christchurch, but especially in the central city, key activity centres, district town centres and along core transport corridors;
- Ensuring that future housing provides a range of dwelling types to meet the changing demand profile in Greater Christchurch, including the projected higher demand for smaller, more affordable units, and the future demand of Ngāi Tahu whānau to establish kāinga nohoanga settlements on their ancestral land;
- Integrating land use and transport planning to ensure future urban growth is effectively and efficiently supported by the transport network, including delivering a significantly enhanced public transport system;
- Ensuring public and private investments support the desired pattern of urban growth.

Our proposed plan in response to these priorities for Greater Christchurch is described in Section 5, Our Plan. Further actions to be undertaken by constituent partners following this Update are set out in Section 6, Our Next Steps, recognising that although the long term is addressed in this Update, additional work is required to ensure our planning directions for the longer term are appropriately investigated and implemented, and effectively respond to emerging drivers of change for Greater Christchurch.
5. Our Plan

5.1 Greater Christchurch’s settlement pattern

The Partnership’s proposed plan for supporting urban growth over the next 30 years is strongly guided by the vision and strategic goals from the UDS, and the extensive planning framework that has already been developed for Greater Christchurch to support long term growth. It focuses on responding to the priorities detailed in Section 4, Our Challenges, and seeks to provide greater certainty over the medium term (next 10 years) than the long term (10 to 30 years). This will allow the Partnership to further consider the most appropriate planning directions and responses to our longer term issues.

Our plan aims to maintain the UDS principle of consolidating urban development in and around Christchurch City, and the larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri. It balances the strong demand for housing in towns outside the City with the anticipated return to stronger levels of demand for higher density housing in the City. To deliver new housing of the right type and location to meet demand, both now and in the future, it is important that a suitable range of greenfield and redevelopment opportunities are provided to the market.

This takes into account the need to provide for efficient movement of people and goods, so that transport efficiency is optimised. This in turn will have an impact on Christchurch’s overall contribution to greenhouse gas emissions and the efficient use of energy resources. The impact of having a compact urban form increases the ability to contribute to the uptake of public transport opportunities, as well as reduced trip distances that enable active modes of transport. Choices also need to be made to ensure that development takes place in the right places, so that we contribute to intergenerational equity and ensure that our future generations inherit a city that functions efficiently and is resilient to future impacts from climate change and resource scarcity.

In this context, the Partnership proposes identifies that, by setting the housing targets shown in section 3.2, 65% of Greater Christchurch’s housing growth through to 2048 should be supported in Christchurch City, with the remaining 20% in Selwyn and 15% in Waimakariri.

This settlement pattern approach features a slightly lower share of growth in the City than envisaged by the UDS, with the higher share in the districts a reflection of the strong housing demand that has characterised these areas. Our plan seeks to ensure that sufficient housing capacity is provided in both Selwyn and Waimakariri to enable growth in district towns, while also transitioning to more growth being provided through redevelopment in the City over the longer term.

To implement this plan, the Partnership proposes considers that some new greenfield housing areas should be released or otherwise identified in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi to help address projected housing capacity shortfalls for Selwyn and Waimakariri over the medium to long term. The location of these greenfield areas would be consistent with the long term growth strategy from the UDS. Increasing take up of redevelopment opportunities will also be essential to achieve the housing targets for the City and realise the consolidated urban form aspirations for Greater Christchurch. Christchurch City Council is developing programmes to support redevelopment in the City, with the initial focus on the Central City.

Our plan for supporting business growth over the next 30 years is to focus on boosting the self-sufficiency of growing areas and respond to the needs of different commercial and industrial sectors.

While industrial space requirements are already well catered for in Greater Christchurch, new commercial space is required to support the needs of our growing population. The Partnership proposes continue to focus commercial developments predominately in the Central City, reinforcing it as the principal commercial hub of the Canterbury region, while also supporting developments in key activity centres, town centres and neighbourhood centres as part of supporting thriving local communities. Opportunities to facilitate redevelopment of brownfield land will continue to be investigated. 19

---

19 Brownfield land refers to abandoned or underutilised business land with potential for redevelopment.
Underpinning this settlement pattern approach is the vision for a transformation of the transport network that fosters much greater public and active transport usage, and reduced reliance on the private vehicle.

Achieving this vision would require commitment from the Government to invest in the necessary improvements to our transport system, which could include investing in rapid transit services, recognising the key role of transport in shaping urban form and creating liveable urban areas.

**Figure 11: Where will housing growth be located?**

How will the range of housing needs be met?

As well as providing for overall projected household growth this Update encourages a balance between new housing enabled through redevelopment opportunities within existing urban areas and development capacity, in greenfield locations in Christchurch, Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts. The approximate breakdown between these different locations for the period 2018 to 2048 is shown in Figure 12.

**Figure 12: Meeting housing demand through redevelopment and in greenfield locations**

How will we address housing affordability challenges?

Housing need relates to more than just ensuring our district plans provide sufficient development capacity. As outlined in Section 3, Our Needs, and Section 4, Our Challenges, an increasing number of households will face affordability pressures in either renting or owning their home.

Many of the potential initiatives to provide affordable housing choices across a housing continuum will need to be advanced outside of the land use focus of this Update. The Partnership is however committed to working collaboratively to develop an action plan and establish partnerships to enable social and affordable housing provision across Greater Christchurch.
Figure 13: Potential components of a social and affordable housing action plan for Greater Christchurch
### What will urban growth look like in different areas of Greater Christchurch?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central City</strong></td>
<td>Continued investment in the central city significantly advances its regeneration and renewal, and improves its attraction as a vibrant and thriving Central City area. Its vitality as the main commercial hub for Greater Christchurch and the Canterbury region is bolstered by the completion of anchor projects and public realm improvements. Older industrial areas located in and around the central city are available to transition to meet demand for retail and office space, while commercial areas are remodelled and used more efficiently to maximise floorspace. New residential developments that enable 20,000 people to live in the central city are facilitated by a comprehensive programme of support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Activity Centres</strong></td>
<td>New residential and commercial opportunities become available in and around the key activity centres in Papanui, Shirley, Linwood, New Brighton, Belfast/Northwood, Riccarton, North Halswell, Spreydon and Hornby, meeting the demands arising from the growing population. Brownfield sites are increasingly redeveloped to support new land uses linked to the surrounding neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suburbs and Outer Urban Areas</strong></td>
<td>The wellbeing and resilience of communities in the eastern suburbs are greatly improved as a result of major regeneration projects, including the restoration, enhancement and development of the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor. New communities become established in the northern and southwestern parts of the City, especially in and around the Halswell area. Industrial developments are mainly taken up along core freight routes to Lyttelton Port, Christchurch Airport and the rest of the South Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rolleston and Lincoln</strong></td>
<td>Rolleston continues to grow as the principal centre in Selwyn, with a range of new developments supporting a vibrant town centre and the choice of housing broadening to reflect the changing demand profile of the growing town. Industrial and large format retail expand around the I-Zone Southern Business Hub, benefitting from improved connections across State Highway 1. Lincoln develops while retaining its village and university character, with opportunities emerging from new academic and business partnerships through the Lincoln Hub initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rangiora and Kaiapoi</strong></td>
<td>Rangiora remains the principal centre in Waimakariri, continuing its town centre rejuvenation and expanding mostly eastwards to support household growth. Greenfield developments are balanced with opportunities to redevelop some of the town’s older housing stock. New commercial space integrates with the existing town centre, while new industrial developments are focused in the Southbrook area. Mixed use business areas identified through regeneration planning integrate with a growing town centre in Kaiapoi, with new housing supported by extending the town to the north. New housing and business developments in Ravenswood enables growth and better connections between Woodend and Pegasus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customary Maori Lands</strong></td>
<td>Kāinga nohoanga settlements on customary Māori land build stronger Ngāi Tahu networks and relationships, enabling more Ngāi Tahu whānau to live in more traditional housing arrangements, including clusters of housing with a range of housing types, linked to marae, social and community facilities and locally appropriate customary employment activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Christchurch City

By 2048, over half a million people will call Christchurch City home, and the City will provide over 85% of the employment opportunities in Greater Christchurch. The Christchurch District Plan, supported by the Christchurch City Council’s Long Term Plan, provides substantial opportunities to redevelop and intensify existing urban areas to meet both housing and business needs. This includes in and around the Central City, key activity centres, larger neighbourhood centres and nodes located along core public transport corridors.

The Council is developing programmes to support investment and housing redevelopment, with the initial focus on the Central City. A Central City Action Plan is being developed, together with those who already live and do business in the Central City, to provide support over the next two to three years as anchor projects and major attractions are being completed and opened. Another priority action of the Council is the Central City Residential Programme which aims to increase the residential population of the Central City from 6,000 in 2018 to 20,000 in 2028. More people means more activity and more spending which will build confidence in Christchurch’s city centre. This in turn will stimulate new investment, attract residents and deliver on the city’s post-earthquake potential. The Programme is a long term commitment to achieve six overall goals:

- More people - More people choose to live within the Central City;
- Housing choice - There is housing choice that meets the diverse needs of a wide range of households;
- Liveable neighbourhoods - Central City neighbourhoods are rated highly liveable by their residents.
- Encourage delivery - The risks of development are reduced, feasibility is improved;
- Support delivery - Effective support and advice is provided to and used by Central City housing developers;
- Accelerate delivery - Delivery of Central City housing is accelerated and sustained.

Priority actions have been identified for the first three years of the Programme. These actions will put in place the processes, tools and mechanisms to increase and sustain housing delivery for the full 10 years of the Programme, and identify the early, high-potential opportunities to increase housing delivery. The geographical focus for the Programme is the Central City, however it is expected that key programme learnings and initiatives will apply to other Key Activity Centres and along transport corridors targeted for medium density development. A focus of the Council will be working with developers and local communities to support new development that is both commercially viable and of a quality to achieve high standards of liveability.

The new greenfield areas zoned in the District Plan have been carefully chosen to avoid and protect areas of value, such as the Port Hills, the protection of our drinking water sources from unconfined aquifers, efficient operation of our airport (noise contours), preservation of productive rural land and avoidance of risk from natural hazards.

A further focus of the Council will be to advance appropriate elements of the social and affordable housing action plan outlined in Section 5.1, through partnership with central government, housing developers and community housing providers.

There will also be growth in employment opportunities. Over the next 30 years the central city will gain an additional 40,000 jobs, resulting in over 75,000 people working in the central city, many more than pre-quake. Employment is concentrated in a select number of areas – existing industrial and commercially zoned land and expansion of existing centres in the long term if required. Surplus industrial land is available to transition to commercial uses, particularly if needed to support central city growth.

Half of all the jobs in Christchurch are and will likely continue to be located in the corridor between the Central City and Hornby, and nearby suburbs, including Sydenham, Addington, Riccarton, Ilam, Sockburn, and Wigram. Providing rapid transit (busways or light rail) along this corridor will make it easier for people to reach these employment opportunities and also catalyse housing development, so more people can have the opportunity to live closer to where they work. The Northern Corridor (between the Central City and Belfast via Papanui) is another opportunity where the provision of rapid transit could stimulate redevelopment. Over time other corridors such as to the airport, to Linwood and Cashmere could be considered for rapid transit to stimulate redevelopment. Outside these corridors

20 The significant commercial shortfall identified by the capacity assessment for the long term, will be further sensitivity tested in the next capacity assessment.
commercial activity will continue to be located within the existing network of commercial centres particularly key activity centres.

Figure 14: Christchurch Spatial Plan

Christchurch City is the principal centre of Greater Christchurch and contains most of the population, but the surrounding districts have also been growing quickly. Less than half of the residents of the surrounding districts work within the districts, resulting in significant commuter flows from the surrounding districts into Christchurch City. Over 100,000 vehicle trips each day travel between the districts and the City, putting pressure on the City’s transport network.

As our region grows this will increase the delays on the transport network. Encouraging more of the growth to occur in Christchurch City, where the employment opportunities are, will be vital to manage the effects of growth and reduce transport network pressures. The city will work to reduce the number of vehicles that travel into the city, particularly single occupancy vehicles, but improve transport options such as active and public transport, to enable people to move around the city easily. Improvements to public transport services and infrastructure, along with associated demand management and road pricing are being considered as part of transport planning and development of business cases.

21 Riccarton, Hornby, Northlands/Papanui, Linwood/Eastgate, North Halswell, Bellfast/Northwood, New Brighton and Barrington/Spreydon.
5.3 Selwyn and Waimakariri towns

The current district plans for Selwyn and Waimakariri provide for greenfield housing areas in alignment with the settlement pattern outlined for Greater Christchurch in Map A of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS). This map was inserted into the CRPS following the adoption of the Land Use Recovery Plan and covers the post-earthquake recovery period through to 2028.

The Partnership has previously considered the longer term growth needs of Greater Christchurch through to 2041, with the extent of planned greenfield areas around Christchurch City and the main towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri to support future housing growth delineated by the Projected Infrastructure Boundary on Map A.

Given the projected shortfalls in housing development capacity in Selwyn and Waimakariri to meet their future needs, a change to the CRPS is proposed to allow Chapter 6 and Map A the flexibility to respond to identified medium term capacity needs. Additional capacity will be directed in the first instance to the key towns of Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi in support of the public transport enhancement opportunities mentioned elsewhere in this Update. This is likely to identify future development areas in the two districts that are within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary. Such a change would be prepared subsequent to this Update and would likely be notified in 2019. These new areas will provide much of the capacity required over both the medium and long term. A 2019 change to the CRPS would ensure that land can be rezoned to meet medium term capacity needs, and the longer term will be further considered as part of a comprehensive review of the CRPS scheduled for 2022. While it is intended Our Space provides direction to inform future Resource Management Act processes, Figure 16 is indicative only.

To most efficiently utilise land within identified future development areas, consideration will also be given to appropriate residential densities. An evaluation of the appropriateness of existing minimum densities specified in the CRPS for each territorial authority including a review of what has been achieved to date, constraints and issues associated with achieving these minimum densities, and whether any changes to minimum densities is likely to be desirable and achievable across future development areas will be undertaken in 2019.

Additional housing development in Rolleston has already been enabled through two Special Housing Areas.

The Partnership is investigating whether to request using the new streamlined planning provision in the Resource Management Act 1991 to make this targeted change to the Regional Policy Statement.
The tables below show the density scenarios and anticipated yields from future development areas should density be managed differently in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts.

**Table 5: Selwyn: Long term shortfall : 5,475**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical additional capacity enabled in existing urban areas*</th>
<th>Density scenarios and anticipated yields from FDAs^</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Density 10 hh/ha</td>
<td>Density 12 hh/ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>5,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>6,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>6,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>7,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>7,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ This is derived from a total 'gross' hectare and does not take into account infrastructure requirements and structure planning that may reduce the developable area and total dwelling count.

* Subject to enabling this additional capacity via the District Plan Review and using other mechanisms outside of the District Plan to encourage infill/intensification development. Whilst more theoretical capacity may be enabled through District Plan Reviews, robustly calculating feasibility is also limited by a lack of comparable development that provides data (e.g, house sales) within zoned areas.

*This expectation is that a minimum net density of at least 12 households per hectare will be achieved.

The housing demand figures in Table 1 captures some additional growth from rural areas. This is from area units that are either part rural or all rural zoned being included in the demand figures. However, most of this rural future demand will continue to be met by rural developments in rural zones with some moving to urban areas.

In the meantime, it is expected that new urban housing in Waimakariri and Selwyn will achieve a minimum net density of 12 households per hectare, where any Future Development Area is subsequently zoned. For this purpose, net density has the same meaning as set out in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. This will also provide strong guidance for the development of District Plans for both Waimakariri and Selwyn districts.

The housing demand figures in Table 1 captures some additional growth from rural areas. This is from area units that are either part rural or all rural zoned being included in the demand figures. However, most of this rural future demand will continue to be met by rural developments in rural zones with some moving to urban areas.

Selwyn District and Waimakariri District are undertaking reviews of their respective District Plans. Both reviews will also assess additional provisions to encourage and enable redevelopment within existing urban areas and close to town centres. This is in response to the projected changes in housing demand over the next thirty years, and the role that redevelopment plays to deliver smaller, more affordable housing types that will increasingly be needed to meet future demand. Until these reviews are complete, an understanding of whether any remaining development capacity shortfalls remain is uncertain and can be better understood as part of future capacity assessments in 2020 and every three years thereafter.

24 Some potential yields from different development scenarios were investigated as part of the options assessment outlined in Section 5.7.
For Selwyn, this Update supports the purpose and direction of Selwyn 2031 by promoting a sustainable, consolidated centres-based urban growth pattern that supports the changing population and their housing needs. This, in turn, allows for greater public transport usage. The District Plan Review is supporting this by not actively seeking to rezone additional land for living or business outside of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary. This Update will help provide a further evidence base for updates to Selwyn 2031 and other strategic documents to accommodate long-term growth through high quality urban environments. Any potential additional provision of business and housing land within the Greater Christchurch area in Selwyn will be strongly guided by this evidence and the current structure plans and town centre studies, ongoing market indicator monitoring and the evolution of the policy framework through the district plan review process.

For Waimakariri, the Council is at the early stages of planning to develop Structure Plans for east and west Rangiora and east Kaiapoi to identify how best to respond to the residential shortfall in capacity for the medium to long term. This is along with considering the long term capacity requirements of Ravenswood/Pegasus and Woodend, outlined in Waimakariri 2048: District Development Strategy.

The Council is also focusing on adopting the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan and updating the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy to continue to improve the self-sufficiency of these townships. Once these planning documents have been completed, additional zoning requirements to meet capacity shortfalls in both residential and commercial will be considered as part of the District Plan Review. This will be supported by monitoring ongoing market indicators and detailed commercial assessments.

Figure 15: Proposed Future Development Areas in Rolleston, Kaiapoi and Rangiora
Figure 16: Proposed locations of future development areas in Greater Christchurch. While it is intended Our Space provides some direction to inform future RMA processes, Figure 16 is indicative only.
5.4 Land for cultural purposes

Important for mana whenua is the future ability to establish kāinga nohoanga settlements on their ancestral land. The concept of kāinga nohoanga embodies the following types of residential activities:

- Provision for whānau where extended families can live in close proximity to one another and build strong networks and relationships;
- Allowance for the construction of a mixture of housing types and densities;
- Provision for dwellings to be located in close proximity to traditional structures, such as marae, and the enablement of customary activities.

Kāinga nohoanga is not only about creating housing opportunities on tribal land. It is also about providing the commercial, social and community facilities and opportunities that allow Ngāi Tahu whānui to fully occupy and use ancestral land, recognising and enabling the principles for which the land was originally set aside.

Historically, there have been many barriers to the development of Māori customary land, including rural zoning (thereby preventing more intensive residential developments) and the lack of provision of services.
Substantial changes were made to the Waimakariri District Plan following the statutory directions included in the Land Use Recovery Plan. Further work between mana whenua and local authorities is creating a more permissive environment for the creation of kāinga nohoanga, although much work remains to be done.

Additional challenges facing the development by mana whenua of their ancestral land are the issues of climate change and sea level rise. It is likely over coming years that some Māori customary land will be more difficult to service with some areas becoming inundated, rendering them unusable for customary purposes. In these circumstances, it will be necessary for new land to be acquired and classified as Māori land under the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.

Recently, significant progress has been made in both the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, the Christchurch District Plan and the review of the Selwyn District Plan towards creating a planning framework that is better equipped to enable kāinga nohoanga to be developed on Māori customary land, provided any adverse effects are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated (particularly those effects that have the potential to emanate beyond the boundary of the kāinga nohoanga development/zone).

At present, there are only two parcels of land within the existing greater Christchurch urban area that are classified as Māori customary land (in accordance with the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993); namely, MR873 at Tuahiwi and MR875 at Rāpaki. In the future, however, it is possible that new areas within the Greater Christchurch urban area may be classified as Māori customary land, provided such land has been appropriately designated as such under the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.

While it is not anticipated that future kāinga nohoanga developments would be a major contributor to the overall housing capacity within greater Christchurch, they are nonetheless viewed by Ngāi Tahu whānui as playing an important future role in enabling mana whenua to live, work and play on their ancestral land in a manner that is consistent with the purposes for which such land was originally set aside pursuant to Kemp’s Deed of 1848.

It is anticipated that an integrated and collaborative approach between district councils and Ngāi Tahu whānui would be taken to any necessary upgrades of infrastructure that are deemed necessary to service future kāinga nohoanga developments, including reticulated sewerage, wastewater disposal and the supply of drinking water.

5.5 Sequencing and staging of growth

At a local level the Capacity Assessment outlined which areas signalled for growth are already supported by trunk infrastructure. This primarily relates to wastewater networks. Infrastructure strategies associated with the recent completed 2018–2028 Long Term Plans have documented the planned infrastructure works scheduled to be completed over the medium and long term to unlock remaining growth areas. These integrate and align with structure plans for main towns covering the development phasing associated with the efficient roll-out of infrastructure.

At a Greater Christchurch level sequencing is important to align with cross-boundary investments, especially those relating to the transport network. Collaborative planning undertaken when developing infrastructure strategies and regional land transport plans will be the mechanism to address and resolve any potential misalignment.

Future growth areas identified in Figure 15 and 16 will require more detailed planning, technical assessments and consultation with landowners to determine more specific staging of development. Existing policies in Chapter 6 of the CRPS already provide clear direction which these detailed planning processes must give effect to, particularly Policies 6.3.2 to 6.3.7. They ensure the staging of development considers how to support good urban design, align with infrastructure needs and integrate with existing urban areas. Associated policy wording is proposed to complement a change to the CRPS Map A. This will enable District Plan reviews for Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts to, over the medium term, zone and otherwise enable development capacity in accordance with meeting the medium term housing targets incorporated in the CRPS. Reviews of targets and the sufficiency of development capacity are part of periodic capacity assessments and enable the CRPS and district plans to remain responsive to demonstrated need and consider areas for future growth necessary for the intended life of such plans but include principles or triggers to establish a robust case for rezoning additional land.

26 Outlined in Section 4.2 and 8.3 of the Capacity Assessment and further detailed in supporting technical reports.
All greenfield growth areas within Christchurch City are already zoned. Redevelopment is largely not constrained by infrastructure so the location and timing of development will be principally governed by the market. The role of the City Council and other influencers is therefore to encourage and support the market to respond to opportunities most likely to support Central City and suburban centre growth and increase the scale and range of housing available close to key public transport routes.
5.6 Transport and other infrastructure

Integrated land use and transport planning

Over the next 30 years, Greater Christchurch is projected to see significant population growth, meaning more people will be making more trips across the transport network. If traffic volumes increase at the same rate as the population, there will be more congestion and longer journey times. Further major investment in the road network is not scheduled. For Greater Christchurch to remain productive, the integration of land use and transport planning is therefore essential to managing our future urban growth.

Transport infrastructure, services and mode choices are important for enabling and supporting population and housing growth in new and existing urban areas, while the location of growth affects how well the transport system performs. Given transport and land use are so strongly connected, all decisions need to consider their impact on the other.

In this context, the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) has provided new opportunities for how we can plan for growth as it represents a fundamental shift in the strategic direction for transport in New Zealand. It seeks to transition to a more holistic, mode-neutral approach to transport investment, with an increased focus on achieving a range of social and environmental outcomes. It also places more emphasis on the crucial role of transport in shaping urban form, creating liveable cities and reducing the need to travel by private vehicle.

It will be important to ensure that transport is integrated with land use but also that all the components of the network are joined in a way that makes it easier to make choices on how to travel. Greater Christchurch already has a well-integrated network that has very high accessibility. This means that for a majority of areas there is a choice of options for walking, cycling, public transport or using a private car, with strong integration between these different modes of travel.

Recent investments in the cycleway network have provided more opportunities to encourage safer cycling trips around Christchurch City and between centres, while technological advances through electric bikes will mean that this mode will become increasingly accessible as a means of travel.

However, with significant population growth within the City and in the surrounding districts, the current freedom and independence we enjoy in travelling around will in future become more difficult unless there is a significant shift in how we think about and approach transport.

Transport business cases underway will consider the multi-modal transport programme that will address such matters. These include specific investigations to determine the appropriate investment required to support an enhanced public transport system and improvements along key transport corridors, including those that are part of the strategic transport network and support freight movements. The development of a business case for how the vision for an enhanced public transport system could be achieved is a key element of a wider multi-modal transport programme being considered for Greater Christchurch. This programme would be developed on the basis of the strategic directions from the UDS, and would contribute to the strategic goals related to an integrated and managed urban development.
In particular, it would help create a more efficient, reliable, safe and resilient transport system that promotes the use of active and public transport, and improves accessibility for all people in Greater Christchurch. Integrating land use and transport is particularly important for rapid transit and supporting an efficient public transport network. Each can have a positive influence on the others by improving the accessibility of an area and supporting growth and housing density around rapid transit corridors and stations. This is essential to maximise the benefits from the large investment required to build and operate rapid transit.

**Future of public transport**

The strategic priorities underpinning the GPS align with the work being undertaken by the Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee to deliver a step change in Greater Christchurch’s public transport, as described in the Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP). The RPTP contains an ambitious vision to fully integrate the public transport system with the wider transport system and urban form, thereby increasing mobility and accessibility across Greater Christchurch.

**Vision for Greater Christchurch’s public transport system**

Public transport is innovative and successful and sits at the heart of a transport network that supports a thriving, liveable Greater Christchurch. The public transport system is accessible and convenient, with high quality, zero emission vehicles and facilities. The system gets people where they want to go – as a result it is well used and valued by the people of Greater Christchurch.

As part of achieving this vision by 2048, the RPTP envisions two rapid transit corridors that will offer high speed public transport services to the north and south-west of Christchurch City, significantly enhancing links with the growing towns of Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. By investing in rapid transit services (such as light rail, rapid bus ways or automated trackless trains) and encouraging higher density development along high demand corridors, more people will be able to access jobs, services, recreation and education without necessarily having to rely on a private vehicle. Ensuring public transport is increasingly usable for all people has major social, environmental and economic benefits.

The improvements outlined in the RPTP include service enhancements across the network, infrastructure improvements on key routes, on-demand services (such as demand responsive transport, bike sharing, ride sharing and car sharing) and being well equipped to adopt new opportunities arising in information technology, intelligent transport systems, zero-emission vehicles and autonomous vehicles.

Realising this vision for our public transport system will require an increase in investment. The Government has signalled through the GPS that the overall level of capital investment available for public transport will be greater, reflecting the strategic focus of shifting trips in New Zealand’s cities from private vehicles to more efficient, low cost modes of transport.
Further conversations with the Government will explore how additional funding could help us to achieve our vision for public transport more quickly, supporting our aspirations for a consolidated urban form and multi-modal journeys.

**Freight transport**

Greater Christchurch is also a major freight hub for Canterbury and the South Island, with two inland ports, the Port of Lyttleton and Christchurch International Airport, acting as major gateways for produce and people. The strategic road and rail networks in Greater Christchurch also play a significant role in the distribution of freight within the sub-region, as well as to neighbouring regions and the rest of New Zealand.

An important part of managing the transport network is to ensure that freight can be moved efficiently to and through Greater Christchurch and this will require effective management of congestion on the main freight routes. It is crucial that the strategic infrastructure and networks across Greater Christchurch are able to meet future demand and are protected from any adverse effects of growth. This is a key aspect of the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) and transport business cases to support future transport investments.

**Future programme and investment**

While the Partnership is working towards improving transport choice, more work is needed to get people thinking about how they travel differently, whether it be by public transport, walking, cycling or as a passenger in a private car.

Such a transport programme would include:

- Improved public transport network and services including mass transit corridors;
- Development of walking and cycling networks;
- Travel demand management initiatives;
- Completion of funded strategic road network improvements, including the Northern Corridor and Southern Motorway;
- Embracing new technology changes

How to improve integrated land use and transport planning was a key deliberation when deciding how future urban development should be accommodated in Greater Christchurch. Part of the rationale for the proposed locations for growth was therefore to ensure future growth is appropriately aligned with long term transport planning and investment, meaning more people will be living in areas that are accessible to a mix of transport modes.

The existing and future Christchurch transport network is shown in Figure 18. Investment in this future will be considerable (approximately $1.56b capital and additional annual operating costs) over the next 30 years and needs to be well aligned to supportive land use. It will require collaboration and investment by the Greater Christchurch Partnership and Central Government as well as the community to achieve this outcome.

Reduced reliance on private vehicles as a result of increased land use and transport integration will have associated congestion, safety, access, environmental and cost benefits for people and communities across Greater Christchurch.
Routes for proposed rapid transit, other public transport services and cycling are all indicative unless already adopted in relevant Council plans.
The strategic priorities underpinning the GPS align with the work being undertaken by the Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee to deliver a step change in Greater Christchurch’s public transport, as described in the draft Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP). The draft RPTP proposes an ambitious vision to fully integrate the public transport system with the wider transport system and urban form, thereby increasing mobility and accessibility across Greater Christchurch.

Vision for Greater Christchurch’s public transport system

Public transport is innovative and successful and sits at the heart of a transport network that supports a thriving, liveable Greater Christchurch. The public transport system is accessible and convenient, with high quality, zero emission vehicles and facilities. The system gets people where they want to go — as a result it is well used and valued by the people of Greater Christchurch.

As part of achieving this vision by 2048, the draft RPTP envisions two rapid transit corridors that will offer high speed public transport services to the north and south-west of Christchurch City, significantly enhancing links with the growing towns of Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. By investing in rapid transit services (such as light rail, rapid bus ways or automated trackless trains) and encouraging higher density development along high demand corridors, more people will be able to access jobs, services, recreation and education without necessarily having to rely on a private vehicle. Ensuring public transport is increasingly usable for all people has major social, environmental and economic benefits.

The improvements proposed outlined in the draft RPTP include service enhancements across the network, infrastructure improvements on key routes, on-demand services (such as demand responsive transport, bike sharing, ride sharing and car sharing) and being well equipped to adopt new opportunities arising in information technology, intelligent transport systems, zero-emission vehicles and autonomous vehicles.

Realising this vision for our public transport system will require an increase in investment. The Government has signalled, through the GPS that the overall level of capital investment available for public transport will be greater, reflecting the strategic focus of shifting trips in New Zealand’s cities from private vehicles to more efficient, low cost modes of transport.

Further conversations with the Government will explore how additional funding could help us to achieve our vision for public transport more quickly, supporting our aspirations for a consolidated urban form and multi-modal journeys.

Other development infrastructure

Infrastructure networks required to enable new development principally relate to transport and the three waters: water supply, wastewater and stormwater. Based on extensive strategic planning undertaken through the Partnership over the last decade to identify future locations for housing and business growth, the constituent partner councils have been able to plan for and invest in the infrastructure needed to support development in these areas. This means most areas proposed in this Update for future development are already sufficiently serviced to be considered ‘shovel ready’.

Most of the areas not currently serviced with sufficient infrastructure network capacity will be following the completion of planned upgrades. Some industrial zoned land in Christchurch City is not proposed to be serviced.

Councils’ infrastructure strategies outline how sufficient infrastructure network capacity will be provided for to ensure future growth is effectively and efficiently accommodated. Although Christchurch City Council’s Infrastructure Strategy is based on a lower projected growth for the next 30 years than is considered in this Update, the Council has processes, plans and initiatives that can appropriately manage infrastructure capacity requirements to ensure that the housing growth targets proposed in this Update are met. More detailed infrastructure modelling of areas proposed for commercial redevelopment will follow once specific locations are identified.

---

29 The draft Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan was released for public consultation in September 2018.
30 Some industrial zoned land in Christchurch City is not proposed to be serviced.
In the same way, the Selwyn Infrastructure Strategy also uses a lower projected growth for the next 30 years than is considered in this Update. However, all zoned land as well as land within the Proposed Infrastructure Boundary and Special Housing Areas have been factored into the strategy. Further, any additional up-zoning or greenfield capacity to cater for projected growth, will need to be factored into the infrastructure works programme once the next phase of strategic planning has been undertaken.

Discussions with other infrastructure providers indicate that the availability of such infrastructure as electricity and telecommunications is either available or will be available to service all housing and business growth needs in Greater Christchurch over the next 30 years. The provision of social and community facilities, including schools, healthcare and community halls, have also been well planned for as part of the post-earthquake recovery planning for Greater Christchurch, and are therefore not considered to represent a constraint on future development. Existing planning provisions in the CRPS and district plans ensure growth does not compromise the efficient operation of strategic infrastructure.

It will be important that constituent partner councils continue to engage with infrastructure providers to ensure growth is effectively and efficiently supported over the next 30 years by delivery of necessary infrastructure.
5.7 Why is this our proposed approach?

Aligning with the strategic growth directions from the UDS

This Update furthers the achievement of economic, social, environmental and cultural wellbeing outcomes outlined in the UDS and summarised in Section 2.3. It sets out a settlement pattern and a consolidation approach to urban development that is more sustainable than might result from a more laissez faire scenario. It responds to anticipated changes in demand while supporting wider programmes of action to address challenges, such as climate change, that require solutions beyond just urban planning.

The locations for growth outlined in Section 5, Our Plan and the housing targets (detailed in Section 3.2) reflect a balanced approach to achieving the consolidated growth directions of the UDS while responding to current and projected market demands. The proposed settlement pattern supports a key aim of the UDS to create a vibrant and thriving Central City.

It fosters an increasing Central City population and enables the Central City and surrounding business land to transition over time to provide for increased office and retail floor space, maximising the existing public and private investments made throughout a period of recovery.

This approach meets the requirements of the NPS-UDC, being informed by the Capacity Assessment and having had particular regard to NPS-UDC Policy PA1, but has also been guided by the UDS, CRPS, District Plans and the Long Term Plan and Infrastructure Strategies required under the LGA. The Partnership is conscious of the need to balance the certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development. Ongoing requirements in the NPS-UDS for evidence and monitoring to support planning decisions will enable periodic review and consider any required adjustments to this approach.

Consolidated growth enables towns and centres to more easily provide the local facilities and services that communities need and maximises the efficiency of key transport routes and other infrastructure services. Supporting the growth and vitality of key activity centres is engrained in the UDS and the CRPS Chapter 6 gives strong policy direction to territorial authority plans. Figure 19 encapsulates this concept and outlines the types of services, amenities and factors that councils and other agencies can provide for in these areas.

The proposed settlement pattern enables around two-thirds of new households to be accommodated within the Christchurch City area and allows for the larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts to continue to grow.

Figure 19: Concept of a 10-minute neighbourhood for key centres
This provides a good level of housing choice across Greater Christchurch and recognises that within a single housing market there are many and varied reasons for where and how people choose to live.

Taken together, new subdivisions in greenfield locations across all three council areas will account for around 55% of the identified housing capacity. ‘Intensification’, being development in existing urban areas through infill and redevelopment, is expected to provide for the remaining 45%, primarily in Christchurch City but not exclusively. This broadly corresponds with intensification targets already outlined in the CRPS and Christchurch District Plan.

As outlined in Section 3, Our Growth Needs, much of this housing capacity is already provided for in District Plans. The proposal responses outlined in this document centre on the remaining housing shortfalls shown in Table 3 (around 15,464,500 dwellings) for Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts to meet housing targets being considered in context with wider strategic planning.

Directing future housing growth to development capacity already signalled by the Projected Infrastructure Boundary in Map A of the CRPS represents the most efficient and effective option for accommodating these shortfalls. For some time now the Councils have factored these areas into respective 30 year infrastructure strategies associated with Long Term Plans. These plans have already benefited from extensive community input, as did the earlier UDS engagement and subsequent resource management and recovery consultation processes that led to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

Further more detailed assessment of these future growth areas will be required, and undertaken as part of district plan reviews, and can address any new requirements relating to managing risks of natural hazards and mitigating impacts on versatile soils.

Reflecting changing housing needs

As outlined in Sections 2, 3 and 4 demographic change will mean an increasing percentage of our population will be over 65 and average household size will continue to decline. The cost of housing, both home ownership and renting, will continue to represent a significant component of household expenditure.

New households will have different housing preferences and affordability constraints, but to better align the total housing stock across Greater Christchurch with the overall household composition, new development would need to favour smaller and more affordable housing types.

Smaller and multi-unit dwellings that take advantage of more efficient building construction techniques and adopt new home ownership and rental models can aid the provision of more affordable homes. Housing should meet the needs of our population at all stages of life. Locating new development closer to the provision of local facilities and community services can also improve access to the health needs of an aging population that is both aging and has increasing long term conditions and disabilities, and reduce the transport costs associated with overall household expenditure.

Increasingly more households are also beginning to take advantage new technology and on demand services to enable a more inner-city lifestyle, closer to the social and cultural amenities offered in and around the centre of Christchurch. The implementation of the 2011 Central City Housing Programme will determine the scale of demand in this market segment and the role public agencies and private sector developers can play to provide for this housing type.

These trends have therefore informed the transitional approach adopted when setting housing targets in Table 2.

Supporting future public transport investment

The future investment in our public transport system highlighted in Section 5.6 will influence and be influenced by how our City and surrounding towns accommodate future growth. For such investment to be sustainable it needs to foster significant increases in public transport patronage.

A settlement pattern approach that encourages greater urban densities, particularly along key public transport corridors provides the greatest opportunity for people to live in close proximity to proposed new rapid transit routes, increasing the likelihood and attractiveness for people to adopt these transport modes.
What about other options?

In arriving at this the proposed settlement pattern, three alternative options were investigated.

One option investigated providing for growth based directly on the population and household projections derived from Statistics NZ data (Option A). Another option considered a scenario whereby a greater proportion of additional household growth was directed to the Christchurch City area over the next 10 years, anticipating a more rapid return to the levels of redevelopment in the City experienced prior to the earthquakes (Option B).

Compared to the option proposed in this Update (Option C), Option A would require increased capacity to be provided in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts for the period 2028-2048, totalling nearly 10,000 additional dwellings.

Compared to our proposed plan (Option C), Option B would reduce the housing provision necessary to be identified in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts over the next 10 years by around 5,500 dwellings (resulting in a total of 15,000 dwellings less than Option A over the 30 year period), relying on the range of housing options available in Christchurch City to meet housing demand not able to be accommodated in the main towns of the Districts.

Aside from further mitigating many of the local effects identified for Option A, assessment of Option B focused on the significant departure from current market housing conditions.

Option B would require average annual building consents for additional dwellings to be 1750/yr for Christchurch City with an increasing proportion met through redevelopment. While consents for new housing in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts appear to have softened over the last year (partly due to a general decrease in the level of building consents across Greater Christchurch during 2018), in Selwyn they are still tracking closer to the high growth rate.

Further explanation and assessment of these options, and the reasons why Option C was considered the preferred selected option, is covered in a supporting separate options assessment document.
6. Our Next Steps

6.1 Responsive planning

With many of the primary drivers and influencers of urban development in Greater Christchurch being in a state of change, a responsive approach to planning is necessary to ensure that future opportunities to shape our urban areas and achieve our desired outcomes are realised. This will require monitoring and evaluation, continued relationship building and commitment to this partnership. Key drivers of change at the local, national and global level include:

- Shifting post-earthquake trends in the residential, commercial and industrial markets, as well as the development sector, as the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch continues to mature;
- Emerging Government policy in relation to urban growth and development, transport, regional economic growth, and local government funding and financing, which will provide new opportunities for our approach to planning;
- Changing population and household profiles, and composition of the local economy, which will influence the type of housing and employment that is required in the future to meet the needs and preferences of residents;
- Evolving technologies (such as mass automation, digital workspaces) and their increasing adoption, which will influence how our urban areas function, especially in terms of how people work and travel (such as autonomous vehicles);
- Delivering large-scale regeneration projects that will significantly affect surrounding local areas and communities, and Greater Christchurch overall, including for the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor, Kaiapoi area and Central City;
- Growing need to manage and adapt to the natural hazard risk facing our coastal communities given the anticipated sea level rise, and related coastal inundation and groundwater level effects, over the next 30 years and beyond.

Given these drivers of change, this Update has been prepared to provide greater certainty over the medium term in regard to how development capacity issues will be addressed (Section 4, Our Challenges) and more flexibility over the long term to enable the Partnership to further consider the most appropriate planning directions and responses.

Following the adoption of this response to this Update, the Regional Council and District Councils will insert the relevant housing targets directly into their respective plans, in accordance with NPS-UDC Policies PCs to PC11.

Figure 20: Scheduled implementation and review process 2019-2022
6.2 Further work and implementation

The Partnership is committed to undertaking further work to assess, consider and address some of the priority growth issues for Greater Christchurch. These actions include workstreams already planned by constituent partners and those that are now proposed to respond to the priorities identified in this Update. The aim of this future work is to ensure our long term planning directions for Greater Christchurch are appropriately investigated and implemented.

The key actions from this Update have been grouped under three broad themes:
- Strengthen our partnership approach;
- Improve our tools and evidence base;
- Build on our planned direction for growth.

Many of the actions that will be undertaken to implement this Update are linked to pre-arranged planning processes, in that they will be undertaken as part of these processes or help inform them. Such processes include the district plan reviews underway for Selwyn and Waimakariri, the full review of the CRPS scheduled for notification in 2022, and the statutory requirement from the NPS-UDC for another Capacity Assessment to be prepared in 2020.

### Schedule of future work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead Partners</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Work with the Government to further explore opportunities to develop an agreement on the priority actions and investments that will contribute towards an agreed set of growth and wellbeing outcomes for Greater Christchurch.  
| 2   | Work with Government and social and affordable housing providers to better address current and future housing needs across Greater Christchurch, developing an action plan to increase provision, and investigate the most suitable locations and opportunities for new housing ownerships models (such as shared ownership, co-housing, etc.). This would be prepared in accordance with the following timeframes:  
- an MOU with the GCP and Network July 2019  
- A project plan and project lead resource August 2019  
- A good practice and/or barriers research component October 2019  
- A forum and or consultation component December 2019  
- A draft action plan February 2020  
- Integration and alignment with District Plan Reviews April 2020  
- Integration and alignment with Annual Plans June 2020  
Linked processes: Next Capacity Assessment, Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews and Council’s Long Term Plans | CCC, SDC, WDC         | 2019 - 2020   |
| 3   | Undertake an evaluation of the appropriateness of existing minimum densities specified in the CRPS for each territorial authority including a review of what has been achieved so far, constraints and issues associated with achieving these minimum densities, and whether any changes to minimum densities is likely to be desirable and achievable across future development areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri districts.  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Linked processes</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Develop and agree a single growth model for Greater Christchurch that evaluates the demand, supply, feasibility and sufficiency of residential and business development capacity.</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan</td>
<td>2019 - 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Review and recalibrate the Christchurch Transport Model and Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic Model.</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan, NZTA</td>
<td>2019 - 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Prepare a new Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment that provides up-to-date information on current and future housing and business trends.</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan, Ngai Tahu</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUILD ON OUR PLANNED DIRECTION FOR GROWTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Linked processes</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Insert relevant housing targets directly into the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and District Plans, in accordance with NPS-UDC Policies PCS to PC11.</td>
<td>ECan, CCC, SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Improve the alignment and integration of constituent partner council’s infrastructure strategies through a coordinated approach that is guided by an overarching sub-regional approach to infrastructure planning and delivery.</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019 - 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>a. Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to undertake structure planning and review of District Plans over the next year for identified Future Development Areas in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and District Plans, in accordance with NPS-UDC Policies PCS to PC11. The policy will sit within the existing objective and policy framework of Chapter 6 of the CRPS which applies to all local authorities in the Greater Christchurch Area, and which, in relation to the integration of land use and transport, includes policies 6.3.3, 6.3.4 and 6.3.5.</td>
<td>ECan, SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Policy 6.3.3 requires that development proceed in accordance with an outline development plan. In addition, Policy 6.3.4 promotes transport effectiveness, and Policy 6.3.5 relates to the achievement of land-use and transport integration by “ensuring that the nature, timing and sequence of development are co-ordinated with development, funding, implementation and operation of transport and other infrastructure...”
consider the appropriateness of including revised minimum densities for future development areas.
- ensure the quantum of additional development capacity sequenced by territorial authorities for each town is in accordance with meeting the medium term housing targets.
- enable territorial authorities to respond to changes in the sufficiency of development capacity over the medium term on a rolling basis as part of periodic capacity assessments, address any need for additional housing development capacity over the medium term.

Linked processes: Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead Body</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10A</td>
<td>Undertake detailed planning work (in accordance with directions outlined in CRPS Chapter 6 and the proposed change identified in Action 9) for the Greater Christchurch towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri, including:</td>
<td>SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019-2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Evaluating zoning options to further promote consolidated townships;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Investigating opportunities to encourage the provision and uptake of a range of housing typologies to meet future demands, including considering options for redevelopment, intensification and kāinga nohoanga;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reviewing town centre masterplans and strategies, and exploring options to increase land supply for existing key activity centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linked processes: Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11A</td>
<td>Facilitate the redevelopment of existing urban areas in Christchurch City through the:</td>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>2019-2028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implementation of the 8011 Central City Residential Programme;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Development and implementation of a redevelopment programme for medium density housing areas around key activity centres and along public transport corridors;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Investigation of opportunities for transition of brownfield land for commercial and mixed use redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linked processes: Christchurch City Council’s Long Term Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12A</td>
<td>Undertake a review of Chapter 6 (Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch) of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement as part of the scheduled full review, being informed by further planning work being undertaken by Councils and responding to any identified needs in the next Capacity Assessment due to be completed in 2020. Environment Canterbury will, prior to notification, engage with submitters on Our Space who sought the inclusion of land for business or housing development in relation to the appropriateness of including the subject land within Map A of Chapter 6.</td>
<td>ECan</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linked processes: Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to Action 12, the following schedule of work is proposed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Plan and agreed scope for review</th>
<th>Relevant Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>Completion of efficiency and effectiveness (RMA s35) review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>Completion of efficiency and effectiveness (RMA s35) review</td>
<td>Additional technical evidence completed (if required) – for chapter 6 specifically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collation of existing evidence base and identification of information gaps (based on District Plan reviews and structure planning completed)</td>
<td>- Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Natural Hazards – including climate change and additional land areas required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from Southshore project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.3 Collaborative partnerships

Opportunities and challenges facing Greater Christchurch in relation to how we will achieve our desired urban growth outcomes cross the administrative boundaries of Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri, and encompass a range of economic, social, cultural and environmental matters. Collaboration between local and regional councils, government agencies and Te Rūnanga o Ngai Tahu will therefore continue to be essential to successfully plan for growth.

The Partnership is committed to showing visible leadership and using a collaborative approach to address the growth issues identified for Greater Christchurch. Governance and implementation of this Update will be coordinated through groups at various levels of the Partnership, with the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee responsible for its overall delivery. Although the implementation of this Update will principally be the domain of the constituent partner councils, other government agencies, mana whenua, the private sector, the third sector and the community also have a key role to play in ensuring we realise our shared vision for the future.

Coordinated action between public and private sector infrastructure providers, and the development sector, will be of particular importance to enabling the type and scale of development needed to accommodate our growth needs. It will be crucial that future investments are aligned with our planned direction for growth, which will require strong working relationships between constituent partner councils, infrastructure providers, developers and the property sector.

Building on the close ties already developed through the earthquake recovery, a strong working partnership with the Government will also be pivotal to unlocking the opportunities and addressing the challenges for Greater Christchurch. The Partnership will work closely with relevant agencies and ministries to explore how the Government could support urban development in Greater Christchurch in a way that both aligns with our future aspirations and the Government’s bold intentions for New Zealand’s cities, as signalled in the Urban Growth Agenda.

Partnering with the Government will include exploring the opportunity for developing an agreement on transport’s role in shaping the future of Greater Christchurch, recognising that transport can be a key place-maker for urban areas. This partnership opportunity has already been signalled in the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport.
6.4 Research and monitoring

The Partnership has produced an extensive evidence base to better understand housing and business trends in Greater Christchurch, and inform the planning decisions set out in this Update. This has included monitoring a range of urban development indicators and preparing a Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment.

It will be critical that the data and information used as the basis for future strategic planning continues to be refined to support a robust and up-to-date evidence base.

Examples of matters that will require further investigation include:

- Reviewing the 2018 Census results to identify any changes to the population, including to demographic and household profiles, and consider the suitability of the population projections used to underpin our strategic planning;
- Examining the key demand and supply-side factors influencing the housing market, such as preferences by location, constraints on the redevelopment market and the extent of interactions between local housing market areas;
- Interrogating the factors influencing the relative feasibility of developments in different local housing market areas, including testing these factors with local experts and considering how they may change over time;
- Investigating the key drivers for business and employment development in relevant towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri, and the viable options for increasing the self-sufficiency of these growing towns.

The Partnership publishes quarterly monitoring reports to track a series of core urban development indicators for Greater Christchurch. To improve our understanding of local market trends, the scope of these monitoring reports will be reviewed and expanded where appropriate to incorporate additional indicators. Monitoring trends and changes in Greater Christchurch’s residential, commercial and industrial markets are particularly important given the disruptions caused by the earthquakes, and the new normal that is being established as the recovery and regeneration effort progresses. It is important that this monitoring integrates with other monitoring processes at local and regional levels that will collectively help assess the achievement of the strategic goals of the UDC.
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He muka harakeke, he whītau tangata.
The harakeke is woven with the human strand – binding people and places together.
BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL

UNDER Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002

AND

IN THE MATTER of hearings on Our Space: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update 2018-2048

MINUTE 1 OF THE HEARINGS PANEL
Dated 8 February 2019

INTRODUCTION

1 As set out in the note to submitters dated 10 December 2018, the Greater Christchurch Partnership (GCP) Committee established a hearings panel for the Our Space 2018-2048 Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update comprising the following representatives:
   (a) Bill Wasley, GCP Independent Chair (Chair)
   (b) Councillor Peter Skelton, Canterbury Regional Council
   (c) Councillor Sara Templeton, Christchurch City Council
   (d) Deputy Mayor Malcolm Lyall, Selwyn District Council
   (e) Councillor Neville Atkinson, Waimakariri District Council
   (f) Gail Gordon, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (Ngāti Wheke)
   (g) Ta Mark Solomon, Canterbury District Health Board
   (h) Jim Harland, New Zealand Transport Agency.

2 The Hearings Panel is a subcommittee of the GCP Committee. Its role it to consider public submissions and the advice contained in an
Officers’ Report and make recommendations to the GCP Committee on the draft document released for public consultation throughout 2018.

3 The Hearings Panel has reviewed a list of submitters and have identified those submitters with whom the Hearing Panel have had current or previous associations:

(a) Councillor Sara Templeton
   (i) Councillor of Christchurch City Council

(b) Ta Mark Solomon
   (i) Deputy Chair of Canterbury District Health Board

**Christchurch City Council and Canterbury District Health Board**

4 The Hearings Panel has carefully considered the role of Councillor Sara Templeton and Ta Mark Solomon on the Hearings Panel in light of the submissions lodged by Christchurch City Council and the Canterbury District Health Board. The Panel has sought legal advice on this matter to confirm that there is no conflict of interest arising. This has been provided as an attachment to the Officers’ Report.

5 Both Councillor Templeton and Ta Mark Solomon have confirmed that they were not involved in the preparation or subsequent approval of the submissions lodged by their respective organisations. In particular, the CCC submission has been lodged under delegated authority and has not been the subject of a council resolution. Therefore, the Hearing Panel is satisfied that there is a sufficient degree of separation between Councillor Templeton and Ta Mark Solomon and the submissions lodged by CCC and CDHB.

6 Councillor Templeton and Ta Mark Solomon, together with the other Hearing Panel Members, have also confirmed that they do not have a personal interest in the final form of the Our Space document.

7 Each member of this Hearings Panel is committed to approaching the hearing and consideration of submissions with an open mind and giving the views presented due consideration.

8 The Panel also notes in relation to the Officers’ Report that CCC and CDHB staff have not been involved in dealing with matters raised in
their respective submissions and that CCC and CDHB staff involvement in matters not raised in their submissions has also been limited to officers who had not been involved in the preparation of their organisation’s submission.

**Conclusion**

9  The Hearings Panel is satisfied, subject to any matter submitters might raise, that any perceived conflicts of interest can be dealt with by this disclosure, and there is no need for any Panel member to recuse themselves from considering and determining any of the submissions.

10  If any submitter takes a different view, or wishes to raise additional matters, they are to alert the Hearings Panel as a matter of urgency.

**DATED** this 8th day of February 2019

[Signature]

Bill Wasley  
Hearing Panel Chair
BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL

UNDER Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002

AND

IN THE MATTER of hearings on Our Space: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update 2018-2048

MINUTE 2 OF THE HEARING PANEL
Dated 7 March 2019

INTRODUCTION

1 The Hearing Panel would like to thank all those who have attended the hearing on Our Space 2018-2048 Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update and acknowledge the work that has gone into the preparation of presentations.

2 Officers will be presenting their Reply Report on Monday, 11 March 2019. This will be held in public and submitters are welcome to attend and hear the presentation from the Officers.

3 This Minute seeks specific consideration in the Officers’ Reply of a number of matters of particular interest to the Panel. It is not an exhaustive list and should not be taken to in any way limit the scope of the Officers’ Reply, or any further questions that the Panel may wish to pose to the Officers. There may also be questions of any Partner Officers.

HEARING PANEL QUESTIONS

4 In light of the additional information and presentations from submitters and the discussion as part of the hearing of submitters, we would like
Council Officers to consider whether any changes are required to Our Space on the following matters:

(a) The approach to sequencing in Our Space, including whether to show, if required, any FDA land as being GPA land on Figures 15 and 16.

(b) The assessment of commercial and industrial land underpinning Our Space, and any subsequent changes resulting, including in relation to the anticipated demand at the inland ports at Rolleston. In addition, advice on the appropriateness or otherwise regarding the methodology used for determining industrial and commercial land requirements, given concerns raised by submitters.

(c) The assessment of feasible development underpinning Our Space, and any subsequent changes resulting, especially in relation to land in GPAs and FDAs which might be TC2/3 land and the possibility that this might not be developed.

(d) The extent of monitoring and review outlined in Our Space and how this might relate to other related monitoring undertaken through other processes, including how this might inform a future understanding of whether Our Space outcomes are being achieved.

(e) The approach taken to assess rural residential and large lot demand and sufficiency and the rationale for the approach adopted.

(f) The approach to determining appropriate densities for GPA and FDA land in Our Space and any subsequent processes.

(g) The extent to which Our Space covers and addresses freight needs, including appropriate identification and protection of the strategic transport network and mitigation of potential increased congestion on this network arising from the proposals outlined in Our Space.

(h) The extent to which the proposed social and affordable housing action plan is outlined in Our Space, including the timeframe for its development.
(i) The coverage of the 10-minute neighbourhood concept and how this is explained in Our Space and implemented through subsequent actions, including its relation to the “8-80” concept promoted at the hearings.

(j) To simplify Our Space to ‘strip out’ any content not specifically relating to meeting NPS-UDC objectives.

(k) The extent to which natural hazards information is covered in Our Space and included as part of assessing the proposed directions outlined.

(l) The manner in which Figure 16 identifies proposed future growth areas and the potential for confusion of this Figure with Map A in the CRPS.

(m) How matters not addressed in the proposed Our Space approach might be identified and further detailed in relation to further investigation and resolution ahead of the planned CRPS full review in 2022.

(n) The role and scope of Our Space having regard to the requirements of the NPS-UDC.

5 The Panel would also like Officers to address any other matters that they wish to raise in relation to further amendments to Our Space or reasons why Officers do not believe relief sought by submitters should not be provided.

6 The Panel would also be assisted by further information with regard to the assertion by Christchurch International Airport and Lyttelton Port Company that they were not approach or consulted during the Our Space project.

OFFICER REPLY DAY

7 The presentation of the Officers’ Reply is scheduled for:

Time: 10am

Date: 11 March 2019

Location: Committee room 1, Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch
ISSUED by the Hearing Panel

DATED this 7th day of March 2019

Bill Wasley
Hearing Panel Chair
on behalf of the Hearing Panel
BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL

UNDER Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002

AND

IN THE MATTER of hearings on Our Space: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update 2018-2048

MINUTE 3 OF THE HEARING PANEL

Dated 11 March 2019

Introduction

1 In our Minute 2, we requested that the authors of the Officers’ Report respond to a number of questions from the Hearing Panel following the hearing of submissions. We heard from Officers who presented their responses to us this morning and we are grateful for the work that has been done in preparation of that response.

2 We are mindful that Our Space is a collaborative document of the Greater Christchurch Partnership and that differing views have been expressed on behalf of the local authority partners in relation to some of the key issues for our consideration. These views have been expressed through written comments by Selwyn and Waimakariri District Council staff and the submission lodged by Christchurch City Council (CCC).

3 In light of submitter presentations and the final recommendations of Officers in response to our questions, we would like to understand whether these differing views remain.
Joint Statement

4 We request that the Chief Executives of each of the local authority partners liaise, and if possible, produce a Joint Statement that records their views on the Officer recommendations and where there is a difference of views, identifies how those outstanding matters may be addressed, for example, through further workstreams or other actions.

5 We would be assisted if those Chief Executives who are available could present that Joint Statement to us in the afternoon of Monday 11, March 2019 or during the morning of 12 March 2019. The Panel will accommodate the Chief Executives’ availability.

6 This will be a public session in Committee Room 1, Christchurch City Council Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch and submitters are welcome to attend.

ISSUED by the Hearing Panel

DATED this 11th day of March 2019

Bill Wasley
Hearing Panel Chair
on behalf of the Hearing Panel
APPENDIX 4 - Addendum to the Report and Recommendations of the Hearings Panel
OUR SPACE 2018-2048

GREATER CHRISTCHURCH SETTLEMENT PATTERN

Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga

A strategy prepared under the Local Government Act 2002 to give effect to the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016

Addendum to Report and Recommendations of the Hearings Panel

Hearings Panel:
Bill Wasley (Chair)
Gail Gordon
Councillor Sara Templeton
Deputy Mayor Malcolm Lyall
Councillor Peter Skelton
Councillor Neville Atkinson
Jim Harland
INTRODUCTION


[2] Following receipt of the Hearing Panel’s recommendations, the GCP Committee requested that the Hearings Panel provide clarification on its recommendations in relation to the following matters:

a. The scope and intention of the change to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2019 referred to in Action 9 of the ‘Schedule of future work’ in Schedule 6.2 of Our Space and whether it is intended that only land required to meet an identified medium term shortfall in capacity will be rezoned in district plans.

b. The timeframe for the commencement of the evaluation of minimum densities referred to in the ‘Schedule of future work’ in Schedule 6.2 of Our Space and whether it is intended that this work inform the district plan reviews.

c. The Hearing Panel’s response to the Christchurch City Council (CCC) submission in relation to the robustness of the Capacity Assessment.

d. The Hearing Panel’s response to the CCC submission in relation to the sequencing of development and the management of downstream effects within the transport network.

[3] In relation to the sequencing of development and the management of downstream effects within the transport network, the GCP Committee sought further clarification as to how these matters are intended to be addressed in Action 9 of Our Space.

[4] The Hearings Panel met on 31 May and 5 June 2019 to consider these requests. This addendum report provides the Hearing Panel’s clarification in respect of these matters. We have not reconsidered the conclusions reached as part of our deliberations. Rather, we have reflected on whether our recommendations, and reasons for those recommendations, are clearly articulated in Our Space and our Recommendations Report and if not, whether further clarification is required.

[5] We address each of the four requested matters of clarification below. Where we have recommended changes to Our Space for the purposes of clarification, we have set these out in Appendix A.

1. The scope and intention of the change to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2019 referred to in Action 9 of the ‘Schedule of
future work’ in Schedule 6.2 of Our Space and whether it is intended that only land required to meet an identified medium term shortfall in capacity will be rezoned in district plans.

[6] We have reviewed the relevant sections of Our Space that refer to the change to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) that is scheduled to be progressed by Environment Canterbury at the earliest opportunity this year.

[7] Our understanding from the material presented to us during the hearing is that the change will involve amendments to Map A to identify the Future Development Areas shown on Figure 15 in Our Space. These Future Development Areas are intended to meet both medium and long-term capacity needs. However, the change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS will also include an associated policy to ensure that only land required to meet an identified medium-term shortfall in capacity will be rezoned in district plans.

[8] The change will enable Selwyn District Council and Waimakariri District Council to rezone land within the Future Development Areas to meet identified medium term capacity needs only. This means that Waimakariri District Council would be able to rezone land within the Future Development Areas in their upcoming district plan review to meet the medium-term capacity shortfall identified in Table 3 of Our Space. Land would not be rezoned to meet long term capacity needs. The policy is also intended to enable Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to rezone land in response to medium term capacity shortfalls identified in future periodic Capacity Assessments without needing to first seek a change to Map A of the CRPS.

[9] We consider that this could be clarified further in Our Space, particularly in relation to the policy mechanism that is intended to accompany the identification of Future Development Areas on Map A.

[10] We recommend making amendments to the following sections of Our Space to provide this clarification:

   a. Section 3.2 Housing, page 24
   b. Section 5.1 Greater Christchurch’s settlement pattern, page 33
   c. Section 5.3 Selwyn and Waimakariri Towns, page 39
   d. Section 6.2, Further work and implementation, Schedule of future work, Action 9, p 58

[11] These recommended amendments are set out in full in Appendix A.
2. The timeframe for the commencement of the evaluation of minimum densities referred to in the ‘Schedule of future work’ in Schedule 6.2 of Our Space and whether it is intended that this work inform the district plan reviews.

[12] It is our understanding from the material presented to us throughout the hearing, including the Joint Statement of the Chief Executives, that the evaluation of minimum densities referred to in the ‘Schedule of future work’ in Schedule 6.2 of Our Space is intended to commence this year. Whilst that work is unlikely to be completed in time for the change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS scheduled for this year, the work will inform the district plan reviews for Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts and the full review of the CRPS.

[13] We note that Action 3 of the ‘Schedule of future work’ refers to a timeframe of 2022. We recommended that this be amended to 2019 to 2022 to more accurately reflect our understanding of the timeframe set out in the paragraph above. We also recommended that the linked processes be amended to include the district plan reviews.

[14] This recommended amendment is set out in full in Appendix A.

[15] We have also reflected on our recommended amendment to Section 5.3 on page 40 of Our Space where it states:

In the meantime, it is expected that new urban housing in Waimakariri and Selwyn will achieve a minimum net density of 12 households per hectare in Green Field Priority Areas, or where any further development area is subsequently zoned.

[16] We wish to reiterate that the expectation is that new urban housing in Waimakariri and Selwyn will achieve a minimum net density of 12 households per hectare. We have also identified an error in the above statement and recommend that it is amended to clarify our intention that the statement applies only to Future Development Areas that are subsequently zoned.

[17] This recommended amendment is set out in full in Appendix A.

3. The Hearing Panel’s response to the CCC submission in relation to the robustness of the Capacity Assessment.

[18] We addressed the Capacity Assessment throughout our Recommendations Report and in particular, addressed the CCC’s concern in relation to a misalignment in Our Space between the figures used for housing development capacity over the
medium term and the need for intervention.¹ We referred to the Officers Recommendations and recommended amendments to Table 3 to address these concerns.

[19] We consider that the uncertainties associated with feasible development capacity figures will be further addressed by further and ongoing refinement of the feasibility tools and the use of a common methodology in the next Capacity Assessment which is scheduled to be completed by December 2020. This is provided for by the following actions in Our Space:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Linked processes:</th>
<th>Responsible Bodies</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Investigate the opportunity for a single growth model for Greater Christchurch that evaluates the demand, supply, feasibility and sufficiency of residential and business development capacity.</td>
<td>Next Capacity Assessment and Council’s Long Term Plans</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan</td>
<td>2019 - 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Review and recalibrate the Christchurch Transport Model and Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic Model.</td>
<td>Next Capacity Assessment and Council’s Long Term Plans</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan, NZTA</td>
<td>2019 - 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prepare a new Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment that provides up-to-date information on current and future housing and business trends.</td>
<td>National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity, and Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan, Ngai Tahu</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[20] This was supported by the Greater Christchurch Chief Executives who in their advice to the Hearings Panel recommended that the partners agree to a consistent methodology being used by all Greater Christchurch local authorities when completing required capacity assessments. For clarification an amendment has been made to Action 4 by the deletion of ‘investigate the opportunity for’ and replacement with ‘Develop and agree’. This was an agreed position of the Panel however the change was not made in Our Space.

[21] Ongoing improvements to the evidence base provided by the Capacity Assessment and ongoing monitoring are anticipated by the NPS-UDC. On that basis, we are satisfied with the Officer’s recommendations and consider that the Capacity Assessment is adequate for the present purpose, noting that if future Capacity Assessments show a shortfall in capacity, the local authorities will be required to respond by providing further development capacity and enabling development.

¹ Paragraphs [111] to [124]
Given the CRPS policy mechanism described above that will ensure that land within Future Development Areas is only rezoned in district plans to meet medium term capacity needs we consider the planning response to the Capacity Assessment to be appropriate.

4. The Hearing Panel’s response to the CCC submission in relation to the sequencing of development and the management of downstream effects within the transport network.

[22] The management of downstream effects within the transport network was raised in the CCC submission in the context of sequencing land. Officers addressed the provision of greater certainty on sequencing of housing development in Appendix F of their report. They identified three options for consideration by the Panel with regard to sequencing:

a. Retain the current approach as outlined in Our Space, or
b. Provide additional direction in the final Our Space without the benefit of detailed structure planning and/or outline development plans of proposed future development urban areas), and/or

c. Provide additional direction in the proposed 2019 change to the CRPS (with or without the benefit of detailed structure planning and/or outline development plans of proposed future development areas).

[23] We accepted the Officers’ recommended amendments to Our Space to:

a. Section 3.2, paragraph 5, p 12 to be clearer that the medium term targets represent the development capacity to be zoned or otherwise enabled by each territorial authority and that unless already enabled, additional development capacity required over the long term only need be identified, in order to provide greater planning certainty and ensure efficient infrastructure planning and delivery across Greater Christchurch.

b. Section 5.5, p26 and Section 6 Action 9 p 34 to make it clear that detailed structure planning to determine the sequencing of future development areas will need to have regard to existing CRPS policy provisions to ensure a consolidated urban form, proximity to activity centres, efficient infrastructure, and cohesion of new development with existing communities.

c. Section 5.5, p 26 and Section 6, Action 8 p 34 to outline the intent of draft policy provisions to be considered as part of a proposed change to the CRPS to demonstrate how future development areas are sequenced by territorial authorities in accordance with housing targets incorporated in the CRPS and sufficiency conclusions agreed as part of periodic capacity assessments.

[24] As set out above, we recommend further changes to further clarify the intent of the policy to be considered as part of the change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS.

[25] We agreed with Officers that Our Space should not determine the sequencing priority between future development areas and existing undeveloped greenfield areas or identify those parts of the future development areas to meet medium term
housing targets as this is best considered as part of the detailed structure planning and development infrastructure servicing to be undertaken by relevant territorial authorities.

[26] We note that there is a suite of CRPS polices that apply to new development in Greater Christchurch regarding any off site effects and requiring the integration of land-use and transport matters. Policy 6.3.3 requires that development proceed in accordance with an outline development plan. In addition, Policy 6.3.4 promotes transport effectiveness, and Policy 6.3.5 relates to the achievement of land-use and transport integration by “ensuring that the nature, timing and sequencing of new development are co-ordinated with development, funding, implementation and operation of transport and other infrastructure…” in order to, among other things, “ensure new development does not occur until provision for appropriate infrastructure is in place.”

[27] We further note that the review and recalibration of the Christchurch Transport Model and Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic Model is scheduled for 2019 to 2020 and will inform the next Capacity Assessment and the Council’s Long Term Plans.² We have also recommended a number of amendments to Our Space in relation to the specific transport challenges faced by the Greater Christchurch local authorities.

[28] We are satisfied that the approach in Our Space is appropriate given the evidence presented to us at the hearing, the actions identified in the ‘Schedule of future work’ and the requirement for local authorities to address this matter in subsequent resource management and local government act processes. However, we do consider that further clarification could be made to Action 9 to ensure that readers are clear that the down stream effects on the Greater Christchurch transport network will be considered as part of district council structure planning and that the new policy will sit within the existing objective and policy framework of Chapter 6 of the CRPS which already addresses the sequencing of development and its co-ordination with the development, funding, implementation and operation of transport and other infrastructure.

[29] As a further point of clarification, we recommend that the definition of ‘development infrastructure’ be included in Section 3.2 in relation to housing targets on page 24 to make it clear that the development infrastructure required to service additional

---

² Our Space, Action 5.
capacity that will be identified in each council’s infrastructure strategy includes land transport.

For the Hearing Panel:

Bill Wasley
Chair

Gail Gordon
Panel member

Cr Sara Templeton
Panel member

Deputy Mayor Malcom Lyall
Panel member

Cr Peter Skelton
Panel member

Cr Neville Atkinson
Panel member

Jim Harland
Panel member (non-voting)

Jim Harland is a non-voting member of the Hearing panel. His signature acknowledges that he has participated in deliberations as a non-voting member of the Panel and supports the recommendations set out in this Report.

5 June 2019
APPENDICES

[30] **Appendix A:** Hearing Panel recommended amendments to Our Space to provide clarification on matters requested by Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee
1. The scope and intention of the change to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2019 referred to in Action 9 of the ‘Schedule of future work’ in Schedule 6.2 of Our Space and whether it is intended that only land required to meet an identified medium term shortfall in capacity will be rezoned in district plans.

Section 3.2 Housing, page 24:

In this context, the targets set out in Table 2 for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri represent the development capacity that each council will, over the medium term, zone and otherwise, seek to enable through their relevant planning processes and mechanisms (district plans, structure plans, outline development plans and infrastructure strategies) and over the long term, identify in relevant plans and strategies, to meet the demand for housing in Greater Christchurch over the medium and long term. \(^{14}\) A change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2019 will include a policy that will enable land required to meet an identified medium term capacity need to be rezoned in district plans. Unless already enabled, additional development capacity required over the long term will only be shown on Map A of the Regional Policy Statement as a Future Development Area, identified in relevant plans and strategies, and the development infrastructure required to service it will be identified in each council’s infrastructure strategy.

\(^{14}\) Table 2 will be inserted in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in Chapter 6 (Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch). Relevant local authority targets will also be inserted into the district plans for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri.

Section 5.1 Greater Christchurch’s settlement pattern, page 33:

To implement this plan, the Partnership proposes considers that some new greenfield housing areas should be released or otherwise identified in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi to help address projected housing capacity shortfalls for Selwyn and Waimakariri over the medium to long term.

Section 5.3 Selwyn and Waimakariri Towns, page 39:

Given the projected shortfalls in housing development capacity in Selwyn and Waimakariri to meet their future needs, a change to the CRPS is proposed to allow Chapter 6 and Map A the flexibility to respond to identified medium term capacity needs. Additional capacity will be directed in the first instance to the key towns of Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi in support of the public transport enhancement opportunities mentioned elsewhere in this Update. This is likely to identify future development areas in the two districts that are within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary. Such a change would be prepared subsequent to this Update and would likely be notified in 2019.\(^{23}\) These new areas will provide much of the capacity required over both the medium and long term. A 2019 change to the CRPS would ensure that land can be rezoned to meet medium term capacity needs, and the longer term will be further considered as part of a comprehensive review of the CRPS scheduled for 2022. While it is intended Our Space provides direction to inform future Resource Management Act processes, Figure 16 is indicative only.

\(^{23}\) The Partnership is investigating whether to request using the new streamlined planning provision in the Resource Management Act 1991 to make this targeted change to the Regional Policy Statement.
### Section 6.2, Further work and implementation, Schedule of future work, Action 9, p 59

**a.** Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to undertake a structure planning and review of District Plans over the next year for identified Future Development Areas in the 2019 CRPS Change set out in Action 9b below, at a minimum residential density of 12 households per hectare, informed by the evaluation undertaken as Action 3 above.

**b.a.** Prepare a Proposed Change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS for notification by September 2019 at the earliest opportunity to:

- Modify Map A to identify the Future Urban Development Areas shown in Figure 15, and include a policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS that enables land within the Future Development Areas to be rezoned in District Plans for urban development if there is a projected shortfall in housing development capacity in Table 3 of Our Space, or if the capacity assessment referred to in Action 6 (or subsequent periodic capacity assessments) identifies a projected shortfall in feasible development capacity.

- Enable territorial authorities to respond to changes in the sufficiency of development capacity over the medium term on a rolling basis as a result of periodic capacity assessments.

**b.** Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to undertake a structure planning (including the consideration of development infrastructure and the downstream effects on the Greater Christchurch transport network) and review of District Plans over the next year for the identified Future Development Areas in the 2019 CRPS Change set out in Action 9a above, to provide for the projected medium term shortfall shown in Table 3 or the capacity assessment referred to in Action 6 (or subsequent periodic capacity assessments), at a minimum residential density of 12 households per hectare, informed by the evaluation undertaken as Action 3 above.

The policy will sit within the existing objective and policy framework of Chapter 6 of the CRPS which applies to all local authorities in the Greater Christchurch Area, and which, in relation to the integration of land use and transport, includes policies 6.3.3, 6.3.4 and 6.3.5.1

### 2. The timeframe for the commencement of the evaluation of minimum densities referred to in the ‘Schedule of future work’ in Schedule 6.2 of Our Space and whether it is intended that this work inform the district plan reviews.

### Section 6.2, Further work and implementation, Schedule of future work, Action 3, p 57

| 3 | Undertake an evaluation of the appropriateness of existing minimum densities specified in the CRPS for each territorial authority including a review of what has been achieved to date, constraints and issues associated with achieving these minimum densities, and whether any changes to minimum densities is likely to be desirable and achievable across future development areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri districts. | SDC, WDC, CCC, ECan. | 2019-2022 |

Linked processes: Canterbury Regional Policy Statement review, Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews

---

1 Policy 6.3.3 requires that development proceed in accordance with an outline development plan. In addition, Policy 6.3.4 promotes transport effectiveness, and Policy 6.3.5 relates to the achievement of land-use and transport integration by “ensuring that the nature, timing and sequencing of new development are co-ordinated with development, funding, implementation and operation of transport and other infrastructure...”
Section 5.3, Selwyn and Waimakariri Towns, page 40:
Amend Section 5.3 as follows:
In the meantime, it is expected that new urban housing in Waimakariri and Selwyn will achieve a minimum net density of 12 households per hectare\[x\] in Green Field Priority Areas, or where any Future Development Area is subsequently zoned.
[x] This expectation is that a minimum density of at least 12 households per hectare will be achieved.

3. The Hearing Panel’s response to the CCC submission in relation to the robustness of the Capacity Assessment.
Section 6.2, Further work and implementation, Schedule of future work, Action 4, p 58
Amend Action 4 as follows:

| 4 | Investigate the opportunity for Develop and agree a single growth model for Greater Christchurch that evaluates the demand, supply, feasibility and sufficiency of residential and business development capacity. | CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan | 2019 - 2020 |

- Further clarification also provided in addendum to Hearing Panel Recommendations Report.

4. The Hearing Panel’s response to the CCC submission in relation to the sequencing of development and the management of downstream effects within the transport network.
Section 6.2, Further work and implementation, Schedule of future work, Action 4, p 58
Amend Action 9 as set out above in response to recommendation 1.

Section 3.2 Housing, Targets, page 24:
Insert definition of ‘development infrastructure’ as a footnote:

Development infrastructure means network infrastructure for water supply, wastewater, stormwater, and land transport as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003, to the extent that it is controlled by local authorities, and including the New Zealand Transport Agency.

- Further clarification also provided in addendum to Hearing Panel Recommendations Report.
OUR SPACE

Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update

Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga

Endorsed by the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee on 14 June 2019 and Recommended for Council Adoption
Mihi

Hārō ana te kāhu i te ipukarea o Tahu Pōtiki
Tau atu rā ki te tihi o tōku pou tīpua
Aoraki Matatū, Aoraki Mataoho
Ka mihi ki ngā maunga, ka mihi ki ngā awa
Tīhei Mauri Ora

Tēnei te mihi ki ngā tātaitanga o te takiwa nei
Kia tākina te hono kia puawai te kaupapa
me ngā hua o te Mātāpono ki ū, kia mau
hui e! Tāiki e

The Kāhu soars the lands of Tahu Pōtiki
And settles on the summit of my ancestral mountain
Aoraki Steadfast, Aoraki Vigilant
It acknowledges all the mountains and rivers
Behold the essence of life

We acknowledge those with a vested connection to the land,
who ensure this bond on the collaboration of this document
and the values within to ensure its longevity
Together in Unity!
Message from the Strategy Partners

The Greater Christchurch Partnership continues to demonstrate the cross-agency collaboration and leadership required to effectively plan for and manage urban development across the Greater Christchurch area; working together to address those key strategic issues that span council and political boundaries. Te Tira Tū Tahi - One Group, Standing Together.

Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga represents a further building block to ensure our partnership approach to planning takes account how things have changed in recent years, and what demands and trends might shape the future of our urban areas during the next thirty years. Its particular focus is how best to accommodate housing and business land use needs in a way that integrates with transport and other infrastructure provision, building greater community resilience, and contributing to a sustainable future for Greater Christchurch that meets the needs and aspirations of our existing communities and future generations.

We first recognised the need to undertake this work when we adopted an update to the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy in 2016. This was then reinforced by the development of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity, which requires councils with high growth urban areas to produce a ‘future development strategy’ demonstrating there will be sufficient development capacity to meet future needs. Our Space has been collaboratively prepared to satisfy this requirement for Greater Christchurch’s councils.

The strategic planning directions contained in this document have been strongly guided by the vision, goals and principles enshrined in the Urban Development Strategy, which continue to provide the roadmap for growth planning in Greater Christchurch. Our Space therefore does not seek to replace this comprehensive strategy, but rather builds on it by considering and updating many of our key settlement pattern matters. Other plans, strategies and initiatives referred to in this document also complement Our Space; helping provide a broader wellbeing approach that ensures Greater Christchurch remains an attractive place for people to live, learn, work, visit and invest.

We would like to acknowledge and thank those that have helped shape this document, and would encourage all to contribute to its implementation and the realisation of our shared vision for the future of Greater Christchurch.
Executive Summary

Greater Christchurch has responded to the initial challenges following the earthquakes of 2010 and 2011 and is now embracing the opportunities that lie ahead to help us realise our long term vision - mō tātou, ā, mō kā uri ā muri ake nei, for us and our children after us.

A growing urban area can bring future prosperity and enrich our lives and communities, but only if it is managed so we protect and enhance the aspects we value the most and that make it a unique place for people to choose to live, learn, work, visit and invest. Greater Christchurch is growing, with the population expected to grow to about 640,000 by 2048, some 150,000 more people than today.

Planning for future urban growth in Greater Christchurch must also be informed and guided by the principles that are relevant to the exercise by mana whenua of kaitiakitanga. Integral to the exercise of kaitiakitanga are the values of respect, reciprocity and sustainability. For mana whenua, it is vital that the effects associated with urban growth are managed so as to avoid the degradation of the natural environment – including our coastal environment, waterways and landscapes.

The Greater Christchurch Partnership has worked collaboratively for more than a decade on planning and managing urban growth and development across Greater Christchurch. This Partnership brings together the leadership roles of local government, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, the district health board and government agencies and is guided by the vision, principles and strategic goals outlined in the Urban Development Strategy (UDS).

This Update to the UDS addresses various aspects of that Strategy as it:

- focuses on the critical role of how our urban areas accommodate growth and how efficient infrastructure planning can support and guide development decisions;
- reaffirms and builds on existing plans that show we are already well-placed for future development over the next 30 years;
- balances the projected future demands of housing and business markets with the urban form that will best enable sustainable growth;
- recognises that how we live today will be quite different to 30 years from now, so we need to be responsive to these changes, grasping the opportunities afforded by Government policy and emerging technologies to make this transition.

In so doing, this Update demonstrates that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term while maintaining an urban form that helps achieve the UDS vision and strategic goals. Two challenges stand out in this regard:

1. *How can future housing provision be affordable, high quality and cater for an aging population that is linked to a more general trend for more one-person and couple-only households?*

2. *And how can our urban areas grow, through redevelopment and new greenfield subdivisions, without increasing the congestion that would ensue if our current travel patterns remain?*

The solutions to these and other challenges will come from a wide range of responses from public agencies, the private sector and communities. Many drivers of change are uncertain, so regular monitoring and review is critical.

This Update outlines the planning framework that integrates and guides other work and demonstrates the commitment of the partners to achieving its strategic goals. It has been informed by an assessment of where we are

---

1 Development capacity refers to the amount of land for development enabled in plans and supported by infrastructure. This development capacity can be provided either ‘outwards’ on greenfield land or ‘inwards’ by redeveloping existing urban areas (infill and intensification).
now and anticipated future demands, and aligns with recently adopted Long Term Plans and infrastructure strategies of the constituent councils. Specifically it:

- sets out how targets for housing for the next 30 years will be met, accommodating an additional 150,000 people;
- identifies locations for housing growth, encouraging Central City and suburban centre living while providing for township growth in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi;
- reinforces the role of key centres in providing additional retail and office floorspace as required, in particular the Central City and, if needed, a transition of its surrounding light industrial zones;
- promotes a compact urban form, which provides for efficient transport and locates development in a manner that takes into account climate change and sea level rise;
- recognises the existing industrial land provision as sufficient to cater for industrial growth for some time yet;
- outlines a series of implementation actions and further work required to give effect to the Update.

It responds to the new Government Policy Statement on Land Transport, which has increased funding for mass public transit schemes, and meets the requirement of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) 2016 to prepare a future development strategy.

Many other plans, strategies and initiatives will complement this Update in improving our wider social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing. The Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP) contains an ambitious vision to fully integrate the public transport system with the wider transport system and urban form, thereby increasing mobility and accessibility across Greater Christchurch. Development and implementation of recovery and regeneration plans for central Christchurch, the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor (currently being developed) and Kaiapoi address the future land uses of areas most affected by the earthquakes. Coastal hazards, climate change and Carbon Zero projects are underway to better understand the resilience and adaptation needs of Greater Christchurch. And economic and social enterprise strategies help position the City and the region to thrive and show we are open for business and innovation.

This Update is therefore an important piece of the jigsaw that provides certainty for the sustained and collective investment we can all make to the wellbeing of Greater Christchurch, Our Space.
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SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS Ngā Puka Taunaki

A. Greater Christchurch Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment
1. Introduction

The Greater Christchurch Partnership has worked collaboratively for more than a decade on planning and managing urban growth and development in Greater Christchurch to support the long term needs of people and communities. This includes the development of the Urban Development Strategy (UDS) in 2007, and the crucial role the Partnership and its constituent partners played coordinating and facilitating rebuild and recovery activities after the earthquakes.

The Partnership has now reviewed the settlement pattern for Greater Christchurch. This review (referred to as the Settlement Pattern Update or the Update) has been undertaken to satisfy the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) for high growth councils to produce a ‘future development strategy’ that shows there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity to support housing and business growth needs over the medium (next 10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years) (see Section 2.4 for further detail on the NPS-UDC).

A collaborative approach makes sense because the urban areas and the transport networks across Greater Christchurch function as one interconnected system. Rather than developing an entirely new strategy the Update builds on the existing UDS to meet the NPS-UDC requirements, and this is encouraged in supporting guidance on implementing the NPS-UDC.

This Update comprises a review of the land use framework outlined for Greater Christchurch in the Land Use Recovery Plan and in key resource management documents, such as the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans. It considers how best to accommodate our future housing and business needs based on the comprehensive strategic planning framework that already exists for Greater Christchurch, being guided by the vision, principles and strategic goals established in the UDS and informed by a Capacity Assessment and relevant Long Term Plans and infrastructure strategies.

Our plan for supporting housing and business growth in Greater Christchurch has been shaped by key considerations relating to planning for sustainable urban development, including how we can:

- achieve our desired urban form while supporting our increasing housing and business needs;
- provide for the diversity of housing that meets the needs of a changing resident population;
- integrate land use and transport planning to ensure we create safe, accessible and liveable urban areas.

To ensure that the processes, priorities and outcomes of this Update align with Ngāi Tahu cultural aspirations for Greater Christchurch, both Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (as a member of the Partnership) and Ngā Papatipu Rūnanga have been closely involved with the preparation of this document. Particularly significant from a cultural perspective is the need to ensure adequate provision is made for the establishment of kāinga nohoanga settlements in which Ngāi Tahu whānau can live and work on customary Māori land. The Partnership recognises the need for the future role of kāinga nohoanga developments to be important considerations in our planning and decision making processes.

In this context, this Update outlines the Partnership’s planning directions for supporting urban growth in Greater Christchurch through to 2048. It highlights the key issues in terms of meeting our growth needs, and sets out the Partnership’s responses to these issues, with the aim of ensuring that Greater Christchurch remains an attractive place for people to live, learn, work, visit and invest, both now and in the future.

---

2 The Greater Christchurch Partnership has evolved to comprise Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council, Environment Canterbury, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, Canterbury District Health Board, New Zealand Transport Agency, Regenerate Christchurch and the Greater Christchurch Group of the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.

3 The medium term in this Update includes both the short (next three years) and medium term (between three and 10 years) periods defined by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.

4 Having particular regard to Policy PA1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.
The remainder of this document covers the following:

- **Section 2, Our Place**, provides the context in which this Update has been developed;
- **Section 3, Our Growth Needs**, outlines the anticipated housing and business demands, and the extent to which this demand is already provided for in district plans;
- **Section 4, Our Challenges**, sets out the key issues and challenges that exist when considering our planning responses;
- **Section 5, Our Plan**, identifies the planning directions and responses that we believe are required to address the key land use and infrastructure issues for Greater Christchurch;
- **Section 6, Our Next Steps**, signals further work required to implement our planning responses and support our future decision making.
Figure 1: Greater Christchurch area
2. Our Place

2.1 Context and trends

Greater Christchurch is a defined geographical area that includes and surrounds Christchurch City, New Zealand’s second largest city and the largest city in the South Island (Figure 1).

Greater Christchurch currently has a population nearing half a million residents. Just under 80% of the Canterbury regional population and about 40% of the South Island population live in Greater Christchurch, emphasising its importance as a strategic regional centre and the primary economic hub of the South Island. Canterbury is the fastest growing region in New Zealand outside Auckland and more population growth is projected in Greater Christchurch over the next 30 years than other high growth cities, such as Hamilton, Tauranga, Wellington and Queenstown.

Administratively, Greater Christchurch comprises parts of three territorial authorities: Christchurch City, Selwyn District and Waimakariri District. The communities and economies in these areas are intrinsically linked environmentally by the rivers, groundwater systems, coastal and other natural features that cross territorial authority boundaries, and by infrastructure, with large numbers of people commuting to work in the City, and facilities and services provided in one district often benefitting neighbouring communities.

The larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri that fall within Greater Christchurch include Rolleston, Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Lincoln, while smaller settlements include West Melton, Prebbleton, Tai Tapu, Springston, Tuahiwi, Woodend and Pegasus. Lyttelton and its harbour, Whakaraupō, also fall within the defined boundaries for Greater Christchurch, although the rest of Banks Peninsula does not.

The Canterbury earthquake sequence in 2010 and 2011 had a significant impact on Greater Christchurch’s population and employment. As shown in Figure 2, the population in Christchurch City dropped sharply in the first two years after the earthquakes and recovered to its pre-earthquake population only in 2017. In contrast, Selwyn and Waimakariri have experienced strong population growth since the earthquakes, augmenting the high growth rates seen in the two districts prior to the earthquakes.

The widespread earthquake damage to infrastructure networks and housing areas, especially in the Central City, the eastern areas of the City and in the Kaiapoi area, required many households to find new places to live. Much of this post-earthquake demand was supported by opening new housing areas that had been planned to meet longer term growth needs. Although the development around the urban fringes of the City and the larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri has occurred at a faster rate than anticipated at the time the UDS was conceived, it has still been consistent with the longer term growth strategy for Greater Christchurch.

The earthquakes also damaged business premises in Greater Christchurch, especially in the central and eastern parts of the City, with many businesses forced to relocate either temporarily or, in some cases, permanently. Continued momentum behind the Central City recovery has meant businesses and workers are returning to this area, helping to
restore the central business district as the principal commercial hub for the region. Employment levels in the Central City continue to increase but are not yet back to levels that existed prior to the earthquakes.

Changes to the spatial distribution of housing and business activities in Greater Christchurch, coupled with the damage to roads and other infrastructure from the earthquakes, have had substantial impacts on the transport network. This includes altered travel patterns that have resulted in increased traffic volumes originating from the west of the City, as well as from Selwyn and Waimakariri. This has placed more demand on the road network along the western corridor, as well as on the northern and southern approaches to the Central City. Over the past decade there has been significant investment in the Greater Christchurch roading network, which has helped accommodate this demand. Investment has included the building of the Christchurch Southern Motorway Stage 1, Western Belfast Bypass and four-laning of the State Highway 1 Western Corridor (between Hornby and Belfast). The Christchurch Southern Motorway Stage 2 (between Halswell Junction Road and Rolleston), and the Christchurch Northern Corridor are under construction and expected to be fully operational by 2021.

Disruptions to land use, the transport network, and travel patterns have led to increased travel by car and contributed to reduced public transport patronage in Greater Christchurch. However, with a growing number of businesses and workers returning to the Central City, the share of trips taken by public transport in Greater Christchurch is expected to grow, while major investment in the urban cycleway network continues to encourage active transport choices.

2.2 Cultural values and aspirations

The Greater Christchurch area is an outstanding cultural landscape for Ngāi Tahu whānui. It is the hapū of Te Ngāi Tūahuriri, Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) and Taumutu Rūnanga who hold mana whenua over this cultural landscape. Integral to its role as mana whenua is the inherited responsibility bestowed upon mandated individuals to act as kaitiaki, and to ensure that the principles of respect, reciprocity and sustainability are adhered to when making decisions that affect the environment in the area.

Central to the role and responsibilities of kaitiakitanga is the holistic concept known as Ki Uta Ki Tai (from the mountains to the sea). The concept of Ki Uta Ki Tai maintains that each of the constituent components of the natural environment are interconnected, and that an action in one location will have a flow on effect and impact on another location.

The concept of Ki Uta Ki Tai can apply equally to the built environment whereby decisions that we make about future urban growth will have repercussions for associated infrastructure and service requirements. Accordingly, this Update has sought to adopt an integrated and holistic approach that recognises the interconnected nature of the Greater Christchurch environment.

Contained within the Greater Christchurch cultural landscape is a mosaic of values, many of which date back to time immemorial and which serve as tangible reminders of the intergenerational relationship that Ngāi Tahu Whenua share with the natural environment. In preparing this Update, the Partnership recognizes that decisions we make about the future spatial distribution of housing and business activities in Greater Christchurch must align with traditional and contemporary cultural values. These values include:

- Wāhi ingoa (place names), which often represent people, historical events, geographical features and Natural flora and fauna;
- Ara tawhito (traditional trails), which were the arteries of important social and economic relationships;
- Ngā wai, which are the freshwater resources that are the life blood of Papatūānuku (Earth Mother) and the life giver of all things;
- Mahinga kai, which encompasses the customary (and contemporary) gathering of food and natural materials, and the places where these are gathered from;
- Mauri, which encompasses the essence that binds the physical and spiritual elements of all things together, generating and upholding life;
- Wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga sites, which includes both archaeological sites and natural features, and species that are sacred, treasured and revered by Ngāi Tahu whānui.
The key principles that govern the manner in which these values are to be managed are set out in the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan. The Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan is an expression of kaitiakitanga and rangatiratanga, and contains detailed policies that reflect the kaupapa of Ngāi Tahu whānui in respect of the management of natural and physical resources.

Although much of the cultural landscape that encompasses the Greater Christchurch area is now highly modified, its significance to Ngāi Tahu whānui is in no way diminished. The many traditional values that attach themselves to the cultural landscape maintain a contemporary significance. To this end, the preparation of this document has been undertaken in close partnership with both Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (as a member of the Partnership) and Ngā Papatipu Rūnanga who hold mana whenua over Greater Christchurch.

It is important to record that, for Ngāi Tahu, subdivision and land use change can increase the potential for effects on sites and areas of cultural significance. These effects may be concerned with land disturbance and the introduction of activities which are inappropriate in close proximity to, or causing the displacement or loss of wāhi tapu or wāhi taonga values. In addition, intensification of the built environment may increase demand for water supply, wastewater and stormwater disposal, adversely affecting surface and groundwater resources.

2.3 Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy

The Urban Development Strategy (UDS) was produced by the Partnership in 2007 to provide the strategic direction for urban growth in Greater Christchurch. It promotes an integrated and intergenerational approach to planning for urban growth, and seeks to ensure that development is managed in a manner that protects environments, improves transport links, creates liveable areas and sustainably manages population growth. Formed after extensive consultation, the UDS seeks to consolidate development in and around well-defined urban and rural town centres.

The vision, principles and strategic goals in the UDS continue to guide the Partnership’s approach to enabling future growth, and have helped to shape the planning directions proposed in this Update.

---

An update of the UDS in 2016 retained the vision for Greater Christchurch but revised the principles and strategic goals from the 2007 UDS to reflect the changes that had occurred since the earthquakes.

**Vision (kaupapa)**

*Greater Christchurch has a vibrant inner city and suburban centres surrounded by thriving rural communities and towns, connected by efficient and sustainable infrastructure.*

*There is a wealth of public spaces ranging from bustling inner city streets to expansive open spaces and parks, which embrace natural systems, landscapes and heritage.*

*Innovative businesses are welcome and can thrive, supported by a wide range of attractive facilities and opportunities.*

*Prosperous communities can enjoy a variety of lifestyles in good health and safety, enriched by the diversity of cultures and the beautiful environment of Greater Christchurch.*
Principles and strategic goals (whainga)

The principles and strategic goals of the UDS expand on the vision by describing the key outcomes we seek to achieve under four themes: healthy communities, enhanced natural environments, prosperous economies and integrated and managed urban development. Given the emphasis of this Update on spatial planning matters, particular regard has been given to the strategic goals related to ‘integrated and managed urban development’, while also recognising the broader contribution that quality urban environments can bring to our overall quality of life.

*Figure 3: UDS principles, themes and relevant strategic goals*
2.4 National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity

The National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) came into effect in December 2016, providing direction to decision-makers under the Resource Management Act 1991 in respect of planning for urban environments. It requires all councils that have part, or all, of a medium or high growth urban area within their district or region to produce a future development strategy which demonstrates that sufficient, feasible development capacity is available to support future housing and business growth. This includes over the medium (next 10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years) periods.

The Christchurch urban area⁶ was defined by Statistics NZ in 2016 as a high growth urban area. Given the strategic planning arrangements that already exist between councils in Greater Christchurch through the Partnership, it was agreed that a review of Greater Christchurch’s settlement pattern should be done collaboratively, and in doing so, meet the statutory requirements of the NPS-UDC. Accordingly, the Partnership has determined that the Greater Christchurch area shown in Figure 1 should be the geographic area of focus for the Update and the relevant urban environment for the purposes of the NPS-UDC requirements. This Update therefore meets the requirements of Policies PC12 and PC13 of the NPS-UDC (related to producing a ‘future development strategy’) by:

- demonstrating that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity over the medium and long term;
- identifying the broad location, timing and sequencing of future development capacity in new urban environments and intensification opportunities within existing urban environments;
- balancing the certainty regarding the provision of future development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development;
- being informed by a Capacity Assessment, the relevant Long Term Plans and Infrastructure Strategies required under the Local Government Act 2002, and any other relevant strategies, plans and documents;
- having particular regard to NPS-UDC Policy PA1.

To inform the spatial planning decisions outlined in this Update, the Partnership has developed an evidence base that provides information about current and future housing and business trends in Greater Christchurch. This has included monitoring urban development indicators and preparing a Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment⁷, which are both required by the NPS-UDC.

---

⁶ The Christchurch urban area is identified by Statistics NZ as including the towns of Prebbleton in Selwyn and Kaiapoi in Waimakariri.
⁷ The Urban Development Indicators Monitoring Reports and Capacity Assessment produced by the Partnership can be accessed at [www.greaterchristchurch.org.nz](http://www.greaterchristchurch.org.nz).
The Capacity Assessment estimates the demand for and supply of housing and business land to indicate whether there is sufficient, feasible development capacity currently planned in Greater Christchurch to meet our growth needs for the next 30 years.

In undertaking this work, the NPS-UDC requires councils to estimate the sufficiency of development capacity to meet future demand taking into account relevant regional and district plan provisions, actual and likely availability of development infrastructure, the current feasibility and rate of take up of capacity, and the market response in terms of what has been built, where this has occurred and at what price.8

This Update summarises the findings of the Capacity Assessment, identifies any sufficiency issues and provides our planning and policy response.

Figure 5: Aspects of development capacity

2.5 Where does this Update fit?

National context

This Update has been prepared within the legislative context of the Resource Management Act 1991, Local Government Act 2002 and Land Transport Management Act 2003. It has also been undertaken at a time when the Government is strengthening its approach to urban development and regional economic growth, and reviewing the mix of instruments available to effect change in New Zealand’s cities. This includes a review of how local government can effectively finance infrastructure improvements to support future growth, which is a critical challenge facing most high growth urban areas.

The Urban Growth Agenda is the Government’s response to the challenges confronting New Zealand’s cities, especially in terms of worsening housing affordability. It seeks to address the fundamentals of land supply, development capacity and infrastructure provision by removing any undue constraints, with the initial focus of the programme on:

- enabling responsive infrastructure provision and appropriate cost allocation;
- enabling strategic planning to increase development opportunities and support quality built environments;

8 Requirement of Policy PB3 of the NPS-UDC.
building stronger partnerships between local and central government as a means to undertaking pro-growth and integrated spatial planning;

- ensuring the price of transport infrastructure promotes access to the network and efficient urban form; and
- ensuring the regulatory, institutional and funding settings under the Resource Management Act, Local Government Act and Land Transport Management Act are collectively supporting the objectives of the Urban Growth Agenda.

The Government’s commitment to this Urban Growth Agenda has been reinforced by the creation of a new Ministry of Housing and Urban Development. There are also important interdependencies between the Urban Growth Agenda and other Government initiatives, such as establishing a national Urban Development Authority, the Kiwibuild programme to build 100,000 affordable homes for first time buyers, the Housing First programme to house and support people who have been homeless for a long time and face multiple needs, the Public Housing Plan to increase the supply of social housing and proposed changes to the Residential Tenancies Act 1986 to improve the conditions for people renting.

The new Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) has also influenced this Update. The GPS makes clear that the transformation of the land transport system is a priority for the Government, signalling its commitment to:

- a mode neutral approach to transport planning and investment;
- incorporating technology and innovation into the design and delivery of land transport investment;
- integrating land use and transport planning and delivery.

Future updates to the GPS are likely to seek to establish local and central government agreements on transport’s role in the future development of metropolitan areas such as Greater Christchurch. It will consider the role of transport as an enabler, connector and shaper of New Zealand’s cities, and opportunities for investment in rapid transit options (e.g. light rail and dedicated bus routes) to support transit-oriented development in major urban areas.

Other considerations at the national level include the emerging National Policy Statement on Versatile Land and High Class Soils and the Zero Carbon Bill, with the latter aiming to achieve net zero emissions in New Zealand by 2050.
Local and regional context

A range of plans, strategies and programmes have been developed, or are being developed, at the local and regional level that will influence how Greater Christchurch grows and changes in the future. It is important this Update aligns and integrates with these initiatives to support a cohesive approach to planning. Key considerations encompass transport plans, regeneration plans and strategies, health programmes, climate change and hazard management programmes, and other plans, strategies and programmes being delivered by councils and iwi in relation to growth management.

The implementation of some of the planning responses in this Update will also require changes to resource management documents, including to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri. This will involve, at a minimum, the insertion of housing targets for each local authority.

*Figure 6: National, regional and local context for the Settlement Pattern Update*
3. Our Growth Needs

Guidance produced by the Ministry for the Environment and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment to help councils meet the evidence and monitoring policies of the NPS-UDC acknowledges that the ‘future is inherently uncertain and impossible to accurately predict, especially over the long term’. 9

3.1 Population and household growth

The risks associated with planning for an uncertain future can be managed by utilising the most up-to-date and robust population and household projections, and considering possible growth scenarios. In this way, Statistics NZ provides three possible projection scenarios: low, medium and high growth. As shown in Figure 7, the variances in these scenarios are relatively high for the territorial authorities in Greater Christchurch, partly due to the disruptions and associated uncertainties created by the Canterbury earthquake sequence in 2010 and 2011.

Statistics NZ’s projection scenarios were considered against historic trends and local circumstances to determine the most appropriate scenario to adopt for each territorial authority, and consequently for Greater Christchurch. These provide estimates of the demand for housing (and indirectly for business land) over the medium (next 10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years).

![Figure 7: Population growth scenarios for Greater Christchurch](image)

To reflect the recent growth trends in Greater Christchurch, the Partnership agreed to adopt the medium projection for Christchurch City, and the medium-high projection for both Selwyn and Waimakariri, as the basis for the Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment. This approach sought to balance a desire to be ‘ahead of the curve’ when planning for growth, with ensuring that the financing and provision of new infrastructure is timely to support future growth needs. It is possible, should local trends and circumstances change, that subsequent Capacity Assessments adopt different projection scenarios for Greater Christchurch.

---

9 National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, June 2017, p26
Based on the adopted scenario, the population in Greater Christchurch is projected to grow to about 640,000 by 2048, being 150,000 more residents than in 2018. As outlined in Table 1, this population growth translates to about 74,000 new households in Greater Christchurch by 2048, with 54% of this growth in Christchurch City, 28% in Selwyn and 18% in Waimakariri.

Although not specifically planned for as part of this Update, the Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy suggests the need for net migration in the Canterbury region to be higher than historic rates to help sustain a strong regional economy. Should new policy settings be adopted by the Government in the effort to achieve more aspirational population growth either nationally or regionally, the Partnership would need to consider the implications of an even higher growth scenario as part of future updates and reviews of the UDS.

### 3.2 Housing

#### Demand

Based on the adopted growth scenario for Greater Christchurch, projected population and household growth will generate demand for about 74,000 new dwellings over the next 30 years. When the margins (or buffers) required by the NPS-UDC are added to this housing demand, the number of new dwellings that need to be planned for in Greater Christchurch increases to almost 87,000, as set out in Table 2.10 These margins provide flexibility to allow for situations when developments are not brought to the market, meaning extra development capacity is required to ensure future needs are met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medium Term (2018 - 2028)</th>
<th>Long Term (2028 - 2048)</th>
<th>Total 30 Year Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>14,500 (17,400)</td>
<td>25,200 (29,000)</td>
<td>39,700 (46,400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>7,200 (8,600)</td>
<td>13,500 (15,600)</td>
<td>20,700 (24,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>5,200 (6,300)</td>
<td>8,400 (9,700)</td>
<td>13,600 (16,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
<td>26,900 (32,300)</td>
<td>47,100 (54,300)</td>
<td>74,000 (86,600)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bracketed numbers include the additional planning margins required by NPS-UDC Policies PC1 to PC4. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100.

A comprehensive assessment of the future housing demand profile for Greater Christchurch was commissioned as part of the Capacity Assessment11, and revealed common trends likely for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri over the next 30 years. Of significance are the projected increases in the elderly population and decreases in the average household sizes across Greater Christchurch, and the implications of these changes for the types of dwellings required to meet future needs.

While standalone homes on large sections will continue to make an important contribution towards meeting future housing demand, the shifting demographic and household profile in Greater Christchurch means a growing share of demand is expected to be met by smaller housing types, such as apartments and townhouses. Much of the growing demand for smaller housing types will be focused in the City and provided through the private rental market, while some demand for such housing types will also be evident in the larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri by 2048.

Due to the close location of Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri, these local housing markets share a number of similarities, for example three to four bedroom dwellings make up about two thirds of the overall housing stock for each territorial authority.12 Although some demand for housing will be transferable between these local markets, this is not always the case given individuals and families make decisions on where they want to live based on their own needs and wants at the time of buying a house. Such factors include lifestyle, and proximity to amenities, education

---

10 Margins include an additional 20% over the medium term and 15% over the long term as outlined in Policies PC1 to PC4 of the NPS-UDC.
11 Livingston Associates, Housing Demand in Greater Christchurch, November 2017
12 Census 2013: Number of bedrooms for occupied private dwellings in Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri.
and employment. In the future, these factors are also likely to alter due to demographic changes, meaning the three housing markets will need to adapt to the changing profile of future housing demand.

Figure 8: Housing demand by Council area and housing type across Greater Christchurch

What key factors will influence our future and changing housing demand profile?

- **Increase in the share of households with aged 65 years +**
  Projected to grow from currently 24% to 35% in 2048

- **Growth in multi-person households**
  Number of households projected to increase by 30% by 2048

- **Growth in single person households**
  Number of households projected to increase by 50% by 2048

- **Decrease in home ownership rates**
  71% of housing demand in the City will be met by private rentals, 33% in Selwyn and 36% in Waimakariri

- **Smaller average household sizes**
  Household sizes projected to decrease from 2.5 to 2.4 in the City, 2.9 to 2.6 in Selwyn and 2.6 to 2.4 in Waimakariri

- **Share of housing demand likely to be met by multi-unit dwellings**
  60% of housing demand in the City, 7% in Selwyn and 25% in Waimakariri

- **Increase in share of households with a long term health condition or disability**

Targets

The NPS-UDC directs councils to set minimum targets for housing development capacity for both the medium and long term periods. These targets are informed by the projected demands for housing identified in the Capacity Assessment. Through this Update, Councils need to demonstrate how sufficient, feasible development capacity will be provided and serviced to accommodate the number of new dwellings planned for each territorial authority over these periods and set out how these targets will be met.

Having considered the most appropriate housing targets for Greater Christchurch, the Partnership believes that targets that simply duplicate the projected demands for each territorial authority would not take account of our unique post-earthquake circumstances, and over the longer term, may not align with the strategic goals of the UDS to increasingly support growth by redeveloping and intensifying existing urban areas.

However, the development trends that currently characterise Greater Christchurch will also not change overnight, with the market and people’s preferences needing time to respond to the new opportunities being created by...
regeneration and place-making initiatives underway in the Central City, suburban centres and surrounding local neighbourhoods in Christchurch City.

The targets for housing development capacity therefore represent a transitional approach that align with projected demands over the medium term, but allow for a greater share of new households in Greater Christchurch to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term. The regional targets for Greater Christchurch correspond to projected demand, it is only the territorial authority apportionment of these targets over the long term that represents a transitional approach.

In this context, the targets set out in Table 2 for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri represent the development capacity that each council will, over the medium term, zone and otherwise, enable through their relevant planning processes and mechanisms (district plans, structure plans, outline development plans and infrastructure strategies) and over the long term, identify in relevant plans and strategies, to meet the demand for housing in Greater Christchurch over the medium and long term. A change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2019 will include a policy that will enable land required to meet an identified medium term capacity need to be rezoned in district plans. Unless already enabled, additional development capacity required over the long term will only be shown on Map A of the Regional Policy Statement as a Future Development Area, identified in relevant plans and strategies, and the development infrastructure required to service it will be identified in each council’s infrastructure strategy.

These targets will need to be revisited every 3 years following the completion of scheduled Capacity Assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medium Term (2018 - 2028)</th>
<th>Long Term (2028 - 2048)</th>
<th>Total 30 Year Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>17,400 (54%)</td>
<td>38,550 (71%)</td>
<td>55,950 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>8,600 (27%)</td>
<td>8,690 (16%)</td>
<td>17,290 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>6,300 (19%)</td>
<td>7,060 (13%)</td>
<td>13,360 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
<td><strong>32,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>86,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures included in the table represent number of dwellings. Bracketed figures represent the share of dwellings for that period.

**Sufficiency**

Collectively, the district plans for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri already allow for a substantial number of new dwellings to be built in and around their urban areas. This development capacity is provided through greenfield housing areas (new subdivisions) and the redevelopment of existing housing areas. Some additional capacity also exists in rural locations surrounding the main towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri. Most of the capacity in Greater Christchurch is currently provided in the City, with only about 13% provided in Selwyn and 6% in Waimakariri.

The Capacity Assessment included extensive work to assess the commercial feasibility of housing development capacity in Greater Christchurch. This work highlighted that assessing feasibility can be extremely complex and that further work is required to better understand and then respond to the challenges of improving feasibility, especially in relation to the redevelopment market. Key areas for further investigation include understanding the influences on and of land values, sales prices and build and land development costs, and how these factors could change over time to improve the relative feasibility of housing developments.

---

13 The longer term share of new households to be provided within Christchurch City reflects those outlined in the UDS 2007.
14 Table 2 will be inserted into the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in Chapter 6 (Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch). Relevant local authority targets will also be inserted into the district plans for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri.
15 Development infrastructure means network infrastructure for water supply, wastewater, stormwater, and land transport as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003, to the extent that it is controlled by local authorities, and including New Zealand Transport Agency.
In this context, the feasibility tests undertaken as part of the Capacity Assessment produced a wide range of results for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri depending on the adopted set of assumptions and inputs. Further work to improve the modelling tools used for Capacity Assessment findings will occur as part of the next assessment in 2020.

Based on the housing targets, the overall amount of feasible housing development capacity in Greater Christchurch is sufficient to meet demand over the medium term. However there is insufficient development capacity in certain locations within Greater Christchurch in the medium term and overall when you consider the long term housing demand.

At the territorial authority level, given the range of reported feasibility, capacity in Selwyn and Waimakariri may not be sufficient to meet demand over the medium term, while the significant capacity in the City is expected to be sufficient over the next 30 years, even with a higher share of growth apportioned to the City over the long term period (see Table 3).

These projected shortfalls in housing development capacity must be resolved to enable our urban areas to develop and change, and respond to the needs of both current and future generations. How the Partnership will respond to the projected capacity shortfalls in Greater Christchurch is addressed in Sections 5 and 6.

Table 3: Sufficiency of Housing Development Capacity in Greater Christchurch against Housing Targets, 2018 - 2048

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Development Capacity</th>
<th>Housing Target</th>
<th>Sufficiency of Housing Development Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium Term (2018 - 2028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium and Long Term (2018 - 2048)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>59,950 *</td>
<td>+ 38,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55,950</td>
<td>+ 4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>9,725 **</td>
<td>+1,825 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17,290</td>
<td>‐5,475 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>4,200 **</td>
<td>‐1,600 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,360</td>
<td>‐7,675 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
<td>73,875</td>
<td>+39,100 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86,600</td>
<td>‐9,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Capacity figures included in the table represent number of dwellings (numbers have been rounded to the nearest 25).

In the medium term, capacity for around 3,500 dwellings in Christchurch is constrained by the provision of necessary infrastructure.

Sufficiency of housing development capacity will be reviewed and published as further feasibility modelling and investigation is completed.

These housing targets include the additional capacity margins required by the NPS-UDC as shown in Table 1.

* Alternative modelled scenarios documented in the Capacity Assessment, which are based on less favourable assumptions, identified development capacity for approximately 52,675 or 36,400 dwellings.

** These capacity figures are derived from a qualitative assessment of greenfield land only. An alternative modelled scenario, including existing zoned land and incorporating changes in prices and costs over time, identified development capacity for the long term of approximately 9,200 dwellings in Selwyn and 6,100 dwellings in Waimakariri.

*** These sufficiency figures have been adjusted to discount the demand over the medium and long term likely to be met through uptake of development in rural zoned areas (averaging 70 dwellings/year for Selwyn and 50 dwellings/year for Waimakariri). Demand met through capacity in rural areas will be reviewed following the review of rural zoning as part of respective District Plan Reviews in Selwyn and Waimakariri.

Further and ongoing refinement of the feasibility tools will be undertaken by constituent partner councils and incorporated as part of the next capacity assessment due in 2020. This assessment will also benefit from more up-to-date data and can be used as the basis for making any zoning changes to address development capacity shortfalls as part of the District Plan Reviews for Selwyn and Waimakariri.
3.3 Business

Demand

Significant business growth is projected in Greater Christchurch over the next 30 years. This increase is driven predominantly by population and household growth and consequently the highest growth sectors are those providing retail goods (contributing 17% of employment growth), health/education (contributing 42% of growth) and services (19% of growth)\(^{16}\). Given the strong population growth driver, the structure and quantum of employment growth projected by the Capacity Assessment could be different if the population growth projected by Statistics NZ does not eventuate.

The tourism sector is also expected to contribute to a significant proportion of the growth over the period (accommodation contributing 16% of growth) whilst employment in the primary and industrial sectors is expected to remain relatively stable, contrasting with historic negative trends observed for these sectors.

In total, an additional 67,000 employment opportunities are projected by 2048, with most of these located within Christchurch City (89%) and creating additional demands for land and floorspace.

\(^{16}\) Greater Christchurch Housing and Business Capacity Assessment (2018)
Sufficiency

The Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri district plans already make generous provision for meeting the long term needs for industrial land, and future commercial space is also mostly provided for, at least over the medium term. Over the longer term, the Capacity Assessment identifies potential shortfalls in commercial space, notably in areas projected to experience significant residential growth, including the Central City, the south-west and north-west parts of the City, and the main centres in Selwyn and Waimakariri.

The sufficiency of industrial and commercial development capacity to meet projected demand is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Sufficiency of Industrial and Commercial Development Capacity in Greater Christchurch, 2018 – 2048

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sufficiency of Industrial Development Capacity</th>
<th>Sufficiency of Commercial Development Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>+ 665</td>
<td>+ 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>+ 205 to + 220</td>
<td>+ 190 to + 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>+ 60 to + 110</td>
<td>+ 45 to + 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
<td>+ 930 to + 1,010</td>
<td>+ 420 to + 505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures included in the table represent land in hectares (rounded to the nearest 5 hectares from the Capacity Assessment). Ranges reflect the uncertainty that additional demand for business land and floorspace can be accommodated by under-utilised business land. Commercial development capacity includes both commercial office land and commercial retail land.

Business land is inherently more flexible than housing land, with a wide range of business uses enabled on most business sites. As a consequence, the Capacity Assessment identified that most industrial and commercial zoned land in Greater Christchurch was commercially feasible for at least one type of business use. Given that longer term demands for business space can be affected by a wide range of factors, regular monitoring and review of uptake and other market indicators, as well as sensitivity testing of modelled assumptions, will be important to confirm actual levels of demand and ensure appropriate planning responses are made at the necessary times.

Reference to commercial space includes both commercial office space and commercial retail space.
4. Our Challenges

4.1 Key growth issues for Greater Christchurch

Arising from the context outlined in Section 2 and the evidence base from the Capacity Assessment summarised in Section 3, the Partnership recognises that there are some key issues that need to be considered as part of our planning directions and responses. These key issues for Greater Christchurch are discussed below.

Delivering new dwellings through redevelopment and intensification

Delivering higher density housing is essential to supporting the needs and preferences of a growing share of the population, and for achieving the consolidated urban form that most effectively accommodates growth. Although the uptake of redevelopment opportunities in Greater Christchurch is not yet back to pre-earthquake levels, the scale of redevelopment has started to trend upwards and is getting close to the intensification targets set in the UDS and Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. To unlock further redevelopment opportunities, the new Christchurch District Plan has ‘up-zoned’ areas to allow for medium and high density housing redevelopments, and streamlined consenting approval processes. However, there are challenges to delivering redevelopment in Greater Christchurch requiring the development sector to be appropriately supported to help bring such developments to the market and ensure the rate of new dwellings delivered through intensification strengthens.

Meeting housing needs and preferences for current and future residents

In comparison to other New Zealand cities, the cost of housing in Greater Christchurch is relatively affordable, however the provision of social and affordable housing will become an increasingly critical issue. Enabling higher density housing developments at different price points will be vital to meeting the projected increase in demand for smaller, more affordable dwellings. District plan provisions play an important role in helping to deliver a broad range of housing types, while other targeted programmes by constituent partner councils aim to support the development sector in delivering higher density housing to the market. Public sector investment can also play a role in boosting the attraction of areas for such developments, especially in the Central City, key activity centres and district town centres.

Recognising post-earthquake trends and anticipating future drivers

Since the earthquakes in 2010 and 2011, the location and pace of housing and population growth have been different to that anticipated at the time the UDS was produced in 2007. The increasing uptake of redevelopment in Christchurch City during the 2000s has since slowed, while development of greenfield land enabled by the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP) has been advanced rapidly. These trends partly reflect the unique situation in which a significant number of households had to be urgently reaccommodated following the earthquakes. A key challenge is therefore to understand whether the demands driving these trends will continue in the future or shift back to pre-earthquake trends, and whether any policy intervention will be required. This highlights the importance of both monitoring, to understand any key changes, and the role of planning and policy directions in this Update to enable the market to meet future demands.

Integrating land use and transport planning to shape desired urban form

Integrated land use and transport planning is a key principle that underpins the strategic direction for urban growth in Greater Christchurch. However, the key challenge of achieving sufficient and equitable infrastructure funding remains. In this context, the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) has offered new opportunities for investing in our transport system, with the possible development of a local and central government agreement on transport’s role in the future development of Greater Christchurch signaled in the GPS. Discussions with the Government and infrastructure providers will be important in delivering the types of improvements to our transport network that will help enable our desired urban form. Aligning development with good access to a range of transport modes will reduce the reliance on private vehicles, and provide associated social, environmental and economic benefits for all people and communities.
Living with, and mitigating climate change impacts

The way we plan Greater Christchurch has a big impact on how we use and consume resources, including those that have an impact on climate change, and also how we respond to effects associated with climate change. Providing opportunities for modal shift to active forms of transport, increased uptake of public transport, reducing trip distances, and promoting new non-fuel burning transport technologies all minimise the impact the residents have in terms of their contribution to greenhouse gas emissions. How we enable carbon offsetting activities to work towards zero net carbon emissions also needs to be a consideration in our planning frameworks. Planning for development in the right places ensures that as a wider community, the adverse effects from the impacts of climate change can be appropriately avoided or mitigated, and potentially lead to long term resilience and security for food production. This includes making the right choices that take into account sea-level rise, as well as changing weather patterns and their contribution to severe weather events, including flooding and drought, so that future generations do not bear the cost of our decision-making.

Valuing the relationship between our urban areas and the environment

Greater Christchurch’s settlement pattern principles from the UDS promote a sustainable urban form that protects our natural environment, rural character and versatile soils. They also align with the Ngāi Tahu value of kaitiakitanga, and recognise the mauri of waterways and cultural landscapes. Where new greenfield development will be required to help meet our future needs, there are constraints as to where development can and should occur across Greater Christchurch. Coastal and flood hazards areas, groundwater aquifers, outstanding natural landscapes, versatile soils and airport noise contours all create limitations on where new development can be located. Figure 10 outlines some of these relevant constraints (some data layers are currently being refined as part of District Plan Reviews). Other constraints exist but some can and have been mitigated ahead of development occurring, such as ground improvements in areas with geotechnical constraints or requiring raised floor levels in areas with lower flood risk. In this context, it is important to ensure that our plan for growth recognises that the vitality of our urban areas is intrinsically linked to that of our environment, and that our urban areas need to be increasingly resilient to changes in our natural environment and better integrate natural systems within the urban landscape.18

Fostering an equitable planning approach across our communities

Although the focus of this Update is to demonstrate sufficient development capacity for growth, the wider strategic goals of the UDS will not be realised without considering the needs of more disadvantaged areas and communities. One key element of Christchurch City Council and Regenerate Christchurch’s work programme is supporting regeneration in eastern Christchurch, with the post-earthquake movements of people and businesses westward heightening some pre-existing disparities. Targeted place-making investments by the public sector can give confidence to private sector housing redevelopment which typically favours more affluent neighbourhoods, driven by the more attractive returns from higher sales prices.

Underlying all these challenges will be how Greater Christchurch responds to known or potential shocks and stresses to the economy, society and our environment. For example, understanding, preparing, mitigating and adapting to climate change is a central part of the Partnership’s Resilient Greater Christchurch plan. Furthermore, global financial fluctuations and the pervasive impact of new technology can fundamentally change growth projections, labour force requirements and how we function as a society. This Update is conscious of the role settlement planning can contribute to a more sustainable and resilient future but recognises that, to be effective, change needs to be a shared responsibility across all sectors and appropriately supported nationally and internationally.

18 The Resilient Greater Christchurch Plan sets out how Greater Christchurch can be stronger, smarter and more resilient to the physical, social and economic challenges that are a growing part of the 21st century. It can be accessed at http://greaterchristchurch.org.nz/projects/resilient-greater-christchurch/
Figure 10: Example constraints on development across Greater Christchurch
4.2 Priorities for this Update

This Update focuses on those key strategic planning directions that need to be undertaken collaboratively through the Partnership to address the land use and infrastructure issues identified in the Capacity Assessment. It recognises that providing development capacity is not just about land supply so also considers other more detailed planning and policy actions that will need to be implemented to realise our broader growth aspirations.

The priority areas for the Update include:

- Achieving the desired urban form and principles of the UDS, and the coordinated planning and decision-making required under the NPS-UDC, and addressing:
  - Projected shortfalls of housing development capacity in Selwyn and Waimakariri;
  - Projected shortfalls of commercial development capacity across Greater Christchurch;
- Unlocking redevelopment opportunities across Greater Christchurch, but especially in the central city, key activity centres, district town centres and along core transport corridors;
- Ensuring that future housing provides a range of dwelling types to meet the changing demand profile in Greater Christchurch, including the projected higher demand for smaller, more affordable units, and the future demand of Ngāi Tahu whānau to establish kāinga nohoanga settlements on their ancestral land;
- Integrating land use and transport planning to ensure future urban growth is effectively and efficiently supported by the transport network, including delivering a significantly enhanced public transport system;
- Ensuring public and private investments support the desired pattern of urban growth.

Our response to these priorities for Greater Christchurch is described in Section 5, Our Plan. Further actions to be undertaken by constituent partners following this Update are set out in Section 6, Our Next Steps, recognising that although the long term is addressed in this Update, additional work is required to ensure our planning directions for the longer term are appropriately investigated and implemented, and effectively respond to emerging drivers of change for Greater Christchurch.
5. Our Plan

5.1 Greater Christchurch’s settlement pattern

The Partnership’s plan for supporting urban growth over the next 30 years is strongly guided by the vision and strategic goals from the UDS, and the extensive planning framework that has already been developed for Greater Christchurch to support long term growth. It focuses on responding to the priorities detailed in Section 4, Our Challenges, and seeks to provide greater certainty over the medium term (next 10 years) than the long term (10 to 30 years). This will allow the Partnership to further consider the most appropriate planning directions and responses to our longer term issues.

Our plan aims to maintain the UDS principle of consolidating urban development in and around Christchurch City, and the larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri. It balances the strong demand for housing in towns outside the City with the anticipated return to stronger levels of demand for higher density housing in the City. To deliver new housing of the right type and location to meet demand, both now and in the future, it is important that a suitable range of greenfield and redevelopment opportunities are provided to the market.

This takes into account the need to provide for efficient movement of people and goods, so that transport efficiency is optimised. This in turn will have an impact on Christchurch’s overall contribution to greenhouse gas emissions and the efficient use of energy resources. The impact of having a compact urban form increases the ability to contribute to the uptake of public transport opportunities, as well as reduced trip distances that enable active modes of transport. Choices also need to be made to ensure that development takes place in the right places, so that we contribute to intergenerational equity and ensure that our future generations inherit a city that functions efficiently and is resilient to future impacts from climate change and resource scarcity.

In this context, the Partnership identifies that, by setting the housing targets shown in section 3.2, 65% of Greater Christchurch’s housing growth through to 2048 should be supported in Christchurch City, with the remaining 20% in Selwyn and 15% in Waimakariri.

This settlement pattern approach features a slightly lower share of growth in the City than envisaged by the UDS, with the higher share in the districts a reflection of the strong housing demand that has characterised these areas. Our plan seeks to ensure that sufficient housing capacity is provided in both Selwyn and Waimakariri to enable growth in district towns, while also transitioning to more growth being provided through redevelopment in the City over the longer term.

To implement this plan, the Partnership considers that some new greenfield housing areas should be released or otherwise identified in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi to help address projected housing capacity shortfalls for Selwyn and Waimakariri over the medium to long term. The location of these greenfield areas is consistent with the long term growth strategy from the UDS. Increasing take up of redevelopment opportunities will also be essential to achieve the housing targets for the City and realise the consolidated urban form aspirations for Greater Christchurch. Christchurch City Council is developing programmes to support redevelopment in the City, with the initial focus on the Central City.

Our plan for supporting business growth over the next 30 years is to focus on boosting the self-sufficiency of growing areas and respond to the needs of different commercial and industrial sectors.

While industrial space requirements are already well catered for in Greater Christchurch, new commercial space is required to support the needs of our growing population. The Partnership will continue to focus commercial developments predominately in the Central City, reinforcing it as the principal commercial hub of the Canterbury region, while also supporting developments in key activity centres, town centres and neighbourhood centres as part of supporting thriving local communities. Opportunities to facilitate redevelopment of brownfield land will continue to be investigated.19

19 Brownfield land refers to abandoned or underutilised business land with potential for redevelopment.
Underpinning this settlement pattern approach is the vision for a transformation of the transport network that fosters much greater public and active transport usage, and reduced reliance on the private vehicle.

Achieving this vision will require commitment from the Government to invest in the necessary improvements to our transport system, which could include investing in rapid transit services, recognising the key role of transport in shaping urban form and creating liveable urban areas.

Figure 11: Where will housing growth be located?

How will the range of housing needs be met?

As well as providing for overall projected household growth this Update encourages a balance between new housing enabled through redevelopment opportunities within existing urban areas and development capacity, in greenfield locations in Christchurch, Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts. The approximate breakdown between these different locations for the period 2018 to 2048 is shown in Figure 12.

Figure 12: Meeting housing demand through redevelopment and in greenfield locations
How will we address housing affordability challenges?

Housing need relates to more than just ensuring our district plans provide sufficient development capacity. As outlined in Section 3, Our Needs, and Section 4, Our Challenges, an increasing number of households will face affordability pressures in either renting or owning their home.

Many of the potential initiatives to provide affordable housing choices across a housing continuum will need to be advanced outside of the land use focus of this Update. The Partnership is however committed to working collaboratively to develop an action plan and establish partnerships to enable social and affordable housing provision across Greater Christchurch.

Figure 13: Potential components of a social and affordable housing action plan for Greater Christchurch
What will urban growth look like in different areas of Greater Christchurch?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHRISTCHURCH CITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central City</strong></td>
<td>Continued investment in the central city significantly advances its regeneration and renewal, and improves its attraction as a vibrant and thriving Central City area. Its vitality as the main commercial hub for Greater Christchurch and the Canterbury region is bolstered by the completion of anchor projects and public realm improvements. Older industrial areas located in and around the central city are available to transition to meet demand for retail and office space, while commercial areas are remodelled and used more efficiently to maximise floorspace. New residential developments that enable 20,000 people to live in the central city are facilitated by a comprehensive programme of support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Activity Centres</strong></td>
<td>New residential and commercial opportunities become available in and around the key activity centres in Papanui, Shirley, Linwood, New Brighton, Belfast/Northwood, Riccarton, North Halswell, Spreydon and Hornby, meeting the demands arising from the growing population. Brownfield sites are increasingly redeveloped to support new land uses linked to the surrounding neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suburbs and Outer Urban Areas</strong></td>
<td>The wellbeing and resilience of communities in the eastern suburbs are greatly improved as a result of major regeneration projects, including the restoration, enhancement and development of the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor. New communities become established in the northern and southwestern parts of the City, especially in and around the Halswell area. Industrial developments are mainly taken up along core freight routes to Lyttelton Port, Christchurch Airport and the rest of the South Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rolleston and Lincoln</strong></td>
<td>Rolleston continues to grow as the principal centre in Selwyn, with a range of new developments supporting a vibrant town centre and the choice of housing broadening to reflect the changing demand profile of the growing town. Industrial and large format retail expand around the I-Zone Southern Business Hub, benefitting from improved connections across State Highway 1. Lincoln develops while retaining its village and university character, with opportunities emerging from new academic and business partnerships through the Lincoln Hub initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rangiora and Kaiapoi</strong></td>
<td>Rangiora remains the principal centre in Waimakariri, continuing its town centre rejuvenation and expanding mostly eastwards to support household growth. Greenfield developments are balanced with opportunities to redevelop some of the town’s older housing stock. New commercial space integrates with the existing town centre, while new industrial developments are focused in the Southbrook area. Mixed use business areas identified through regeneration planning integrate with a growing town centre in Kaiapoi, with new housing supported by extending the town to the north. New housing and business developments in Ravenswood enables growth and better connections between Woodend and Pegasus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customary Maori Lands</strong></td>
<td>Kāinga nohoanga settlements on customary Māori land build stronger Ngāi Tahu networks and relationships, enabling more Ngāi Tahu whānau to live in more traditional housing arrangements, including clusters of housing with a range of housing types, linked to marae, social and community facilities and locally appropriate customary employment activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Christchurch City

By 2048, over half a million people will call Christchurch City home, and the City will provide over 85% of the employment opportunities in Greater Christchurch. The Christchurch District Plan, supported by the Christchurch City Council’s Long Term Plan, provides substantial opportunities to redevelop and intensify existing urban areas to meet both housing and business needs. This includes in and around the Central City, key activity centres, larger neighbourhood centres and nodes located along core public transport corridors.

The Council is developing programmes to support investment and housing redevelopment, with the initial focus on the Central City. A Central City Action Plan developed together with those who already live and do business in the Central City, provides support over the next two to three years as anchor projects and major attractions are being completed and opened. Another priority action of the Council is the Central City Residential Programme which aims to increase the residential population of the Central City from 6,000 in 2018 to 20,000 in 2028. More people means more activity and more spending which will build confidence in Christchurch's city centre. This in turn will stimulate new investment, attract residents and deliver on the city’s post-earthquake potential. The Programme is a long term commitment to achieve six overall goals:

- More people - More people choose to live within the Central City;
- Housing choice - There is housing choice that meets the diverse needs of a wide range of households;
- Liveable neighbourhoods - Central City neighbourhoods are rated highly liveable by their residents.
- Encourage delivery - The risks of development are reduced, feasibility is improved;
- Support delivery - Effective support and advice is provided to and used by Central City housing developers;
- Accelerate delivery - Delivery of Central City housing is accelerated and sustained.

Priority actions have been identified for the first three years of the Programme. These actions will put in place the processes, tools and mechanisms to increase and sustain housing delivery for the full 10 years of the Programme, and identify the early, high-potential opportunities to increase housing delivery. The geographical focus for the Programme is the Central City, however it is expected that key programme learnings and initiatives will apply to other Key Activity Centres and along transport corridors targeted for medium density development. A focus of the Council will be working with developers and local communities to support new development that is both commercially viable and of a quality to achieve high standards of liveability.

The new greenfield areas zoned in the District Plan have been carefully chosen to avoid and protect areas of value, such as the Port Hills, the protection of our drinking water sources from unconfined aquifers, efficient operation of our airport (noise contours), preservation of productive rural land and avoidance of risk from natural hazards.

A further focus of the Council will be to advance appropriate elements of the social and affordable housing action plan outlined in Section 5.1, through partnership with central government, housing developers and community housing providers.

There will also be growth in employment opportunities. Over the next 30 years the central city will gain an additional 40,000 jobs, resulting in over 75,000 people working in the central city, many more than pre-quake. Employment is concentrated in a select number of areas – existing industrial and commercially zoned land and expansion of existing centres in the long term if required. Surplus industrial land is available to transition to commercial uses, particularly if needed to support central city growth.

Half of all the jobs in Christchurch are and will likely continue to be located in the corridor between the Central City and Hornby, and nearby suburbs, including Sydenham, Addington, Riccarton, Ilam, Sockburn, and Wigram. Providing rapid transit (busways or light rail) along this corridor will make it easier for people to reach these employment opportunities and also catalyse housing development, so more people can have the opportunity to live closer to where they work. The Northern Corridor (between the Central City and Belfast via Papanui) is another opportunity where the provision of rapid transit could stimulate redevelopment. Over time other corridors such as to the airport, to Linwood and Cashmere could be considered for rapid transit to stimulate redevelopment. Outside these corridors

---

20 The significant commercial shortfall identified by the capacity assessment for the long term, will be further sensitivity tested in the next capacity assessment.
commercial activity will continue to be located within the existing network of commercial centres particularly key activity centres\textsuperscript{21}.

\textbf{Figure 14: Christchurch Spatial Plan}

Christchurch City is the principal centre of Greater Christchurch and contains most of the population, but the surrounding districts have also been growing quickly. Less than half of the residents of the surrounding districts work within the districts, resulting in significant commuter flows from the surrounding districts into Christchurch City. Over 100,000 vehicle trips each day travel between the districts and the City, putting pressure on the City’s transport network.

As our region grows this will increase the delays on the transport network. Encouraging more of the growth to occur in Christchurch City, where the employment opportunities are, will be vital to manage the effects of growth and reduce transport network pressures. The city will work to reduce the number of vehicles that travel into the city, particularly single occupancy vehicles, but improve transport options such as active and public transport, to enable people to move around the city easily. Improvements to public transport services and infrastructure, along with associated demand management and road pricing are being considered as part of transport planning and development of business cases.

\textsuperscript{21} Riccarton, Hornby, Northlands/Papanui, Linwood/Eastgate, North Halswell, Belfast/Northwood, New Brighton and Barrington/Spreydon.
5.3 Selwyn and Waimakariri towns

The current district plans for Selwyn and Waimakariri provide for greenfield housing areas in alignment with the settlement pattern outlined for Greater Christchurch in Map A of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS). This map was inserted into the CRPS following the adoption of the Land Use Recovery Plan and covers the post-earthquake recovery period through to 2028.

The Partnership has previously considered the longer term growth needs of Greater Christchurch through to 2041, with the extent of planned greenfield areas around Christchurch City and the main towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri to support future housing growth delineated by the Projected Infrastructure Boundary on Map A.

Given the projected shortfalls in housing development capacity in Selwyn and Waimakariri to meet their future needs, a change to the CRPS is proposed to allow Chapter 6 and Map A the flexibility to respond to identified medium term capacity needs. Additional capacity will be directed in the first instance to the key towns of Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi in support of the public transport enhancement opportunities mentioned elsewhere in this Update. This is likely to identify future development areas in the two districts that are within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary. Such a change would be prepared subsequent to this Update and would likely be notified in 2019. These new areas will provide much of the capacity required over both the medium and long term. A 2019 change to the CRPS would ensure that land can be rezoned to meet medium term capacity needs, and the longer term will be further considered as part of a comprehensive review of the CRPS scheduled for 2022. While it is intended Our Space provides direction to inform future Resource Management Act processes, Figure 16 is indicative only.

To most efficiently utilise land within identified future development areas, consideration will also be given to appropriate residential densities. An evaluation of the appropriateness of existing minimum densities specified in the CRPS for each territorial authority including a review of what has been achieved to date, constraints and issues associated with achieving these minimum densities, and whether any changes to minimum densities is likely to be desirable and achievable across future development areas will be undertaken in 2019.

---

22 Additional housing development in Rolleston has already been enabled through two Special Housing Areas.
23 The Partnership is investigating whether to request using the new streamlined planning provision in the Resource Management Act 1991 to make this targeted change to the Regional Policy Statement.
The tables below show the density scenarios and anticipated yields from future development areas should density be managed differently in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts.

Table 5: Selwyn: Long term shortfall : 5,475

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical additional capacity enabled in existing urban areas*</th>
<th>Density 10 hh/ha</th>
<th>Density 12 hh/ha</th>
<th>Density 15 hh/ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>7,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>7,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>8,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>7,150</td>
<td>8,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>9,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Waimakariri: Long term shortfall : 7,675

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical additional capacity enabled in existing urban areas*</th>
<th>Density 10 hh/ha</th>
<th>Density 12 hh/ha</th>
<th>Density 15 hh/ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>7,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>7,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>8,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>9,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Subject to enabling this additional capacity via the District Plan Review and using other mechanisms outside of the District Plan to encourage infill/intensification development. Whilst more theoretical capacity may be enabled through District Plan Reviews, robustly calculating feasibility is also limited by a lack of comparable development that provides data (e.g. house sales) within zoned areas.

^ This is derived from a total ‘gross’ hectare and does not take into account infrastructure requirements and structure planning that may reduce the developable area and total dwelling count.

In the meantime, it is expected that new urban housing in Waimakariri and Selwyn will achieve a minimum net density of 12 households per hectare24 where any Future Development Area is subsequently zoned. For this purpose, net density has the same meaning as set out in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. This will also provide strong guidance for the development of District Plans for both Waimakariri and Selwyn districts.

The housing demand figures in Table 1 captures some additional growth from rural areas. This is from area units that are either part rural or all rurally zoned being included in the demand figures. However, most of this rural future demand will continue to be met by rural developments in rural zones with some moving to urban areas.

Selwyn District and Waimakariri District are undertaking reviews of their respective District Plans. Both reviews will also assess additional provisions to encourage and enable redevelopment within existing urban areas and close to town centres. This is in response to the projected changes in housing demand over the next thirty years, and the role that redevelopment plays to deliver smaller, more affordable housing types that will increasingly be needed to meet future demand. Until these reviews are complete, an understanding of whether any remaining development capacity shortfalls remain is uncertain and can be better understood as part of future capacity assessments in 2020 and every three years thereafter.25

For Selwyn, this Update supports the purpose and direction of Selwyn 2031 by promoting a sustainable, consolidated centres-based urban growth pattern that supports the changing population and their housing needs. This, in turn, allows for greater public transport usage. The District Plan Review is supporting this by not actively seeking to rezone additional land for living or business outside of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary. This Update

---

24 This expectation is that a minimum density of at least 12 households per hectare will be achieved.
25 Some potential yields from different development scenarios were investigated as part of the options assessment outlined in Section 5.7.
will help provide a further evidence base for updates to Selwyn 2031 and other strategic documents to accommodate long-term growth through high quality urban environments. Any potential additional provision of business and housing land within the Greater Christchurch area in Selwyn will be strongly guided by this evidence and the current structure plans and town centre studies, ongoing market indicator monitoring and the evolution of the policy framework through the district plan review process.

For Waimakariri, the Council is at the early stages of planning to develop Structure Plans for east and west Rangiora and east Kaiapoi to identify how best to respond to the residential shortfall in capacity for the medium to long term. This is along with considering the long term capacity requirements of Ravenswood/Pegasus and Woodend, outlined in Waimakariri 2048: District Development Strategy.

The Council is also focusing on adopting the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan and updating the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy to continue to improve the self-sufficiency of these townships. Once these planning documents have been completed, additional zoning requirements to meet capacity shortfalls in both residential and commercial will be considered as part of the District Plan Review. This will be supported by monitoring ongoing market indicators and detailed commercial assessments.

*Figure 15: Proposed Future Development Areas in Rolleston, Kaiapoi and Rangiora*
While it is intended Our Space provides some direction to inform future RMA processes, Figure 16 is indicative only.
5.4 Land for cultural purposes

Important for mana whenua is the future ability to establish kāinga nohoanga settlements on their ancestral land. The concept of kāinga nohoanga embodies the following types of residential activities:

- Provision for whānau where extended families can live in close proximity to one another and build strong networks and relationships;
- Allowance for the construction of a mixture of housing types and densities;
- Provision for dwellings to be located in close proximity to traditional structures, such as marae, and the enablement of customary activities.

Kāinga nohoanga is not only about creating housing opportunities on tribal land. It is also about providing the commercial, social and community facilities and opportunities that allow Ngāi Tahu whānui to fully occupy and use ancestral land, recognising and enabling the principles for which the land was originally set aside.

Historically, there have been many barriers to the development of Māori customary land, including rural zoning (thereby preventing more intensive residential developments) and the lack of provision of services.

Substantial changes were made to the Waimakariri District Plan following the statutory directions included in the Land Use Recovery Plan. Further work between mana whenua and local authorities is creating a more permissive environment for the creation of kāinga nohoanga, although much work remains to be done.

Additional challenges facing the development by mana whenua of their ancestral land are the issues of climate change and sea level rise. It is likely over coming years that some Māori customary land will be more difficult to service with some areas becoming inundated, rendering them unusable for customary purposes. In these circumstances, it will be necessary for new land to be acquired and classified as Māori land under the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.

Recently, significant progress has been made in both the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, the Christchurch District Plan and the review of the Selwyn District Plan towards creating a planning framework that is better equipped to enable kāinga nohoanga to be developed on Māori customary land, provided any adverse effects are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated (particularly those effects that have the potential to emanate beyond the boundary of the kāinga nohoanga development/zone).

At present, there are only two parcels of land within the existing greater Christchurch urban area that are classified as Māori customary land (in accordance with the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993); namely, MR873 at Tuahiwi and MR875 at Rāpaki. In the future, however, it is possible that new areas within the Greater Christchurch urban area may be classified as Māori customary land, provided such land has been appropriately designated as such under the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.

While it is not anticipated that future kāinga nohoanga developments would be a major contributor to the overall housing capacity within greater Christchurch, they are nonetheless viewed by Ngāi Tahu whānui as playing an important future role in enabling mana whenua to live, work and play on their ancestral land in a manner that is consistent with the purposes for which such land was originally set aside pursuant to Kemp’s Deed of 1848.

It is anticipated that an integrated and collaborative approach between district councils and Ngāi Tahu whānui would be taken to any necessary upgrades of infrastructure that are deemed necessary to service future kāinga nohoanga developments, including reticulated sewerage, wastewater disposal and the supply of drinking water.
5.5 Sequencing and staging of growth

At a local level the Capacity Assessment outlined which areas signalled for growth are already supported by trunk infrastructure. This primarily relates to wastewater networks. Infrastructure strategies associated with the recent completed 2018-2028 Long Term Plans have documented the planned infrastructure works scheduled to be completed over the medium and long term to unlock remaining growth areas. These integrate and align with structure plans for main towns covering the development phasing associated with the efficient roll-out of infrastructure.

At a Greater Christchurch level sequencing is important to align with cross-boundary investments, especially those relating to the transport network. Collaborative planning undertaken when developing infrastructure strategies and regional land transport plans will be the mechanism to address and resolve any potential misalignment.

Future growth areas identified in Figure 15 and 16 will require more detailed planning, technical assessments and consultation with landowners to determine more specific staging of development. Existing policies in Chapter 6 of the CRPS already provide clear direction which these detailed planning processes must give effect to, particularly Policies 6.3.2 to 6.3.7. They ensure the staging of development considers how to support good urban design, align with infrastructure needs and integrate with existing urban areas. Associated policy wording is proposed to complement a change to the CRPS Map A. This will enable District Plan reviews for Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts to, over the medium term, zone and otherwise enable development capacity in accordance with meeting the medium term housing targets incorporated in the CRPS. Reviews of targets and the sufficiency of development capacity are part of periodic capacity assessments and enable the CRPS and district plans to remain responsive to demonstrated need.

All greenfield growth areas within Christchurch City are already zoned. Redevelopment is largely not constrained by infrastructure so the location and timing of development will be principally governed by the market. The role of the City Council and other influencers is therefore to encourage and support the market to respond to opportunities most likely to support Central City and suburban centre growth and increase the scale and range of housing available close to key public transport routes.

5.6 Transport and other infrastructure

Integrated land use and transport planning

Over the next 30 years, Greater Christchurch is projected to see significant population growth, meaning more people will be making more trips across the transport network. If traffic volumes increase at the same rate as the population, there will be more congestion and longer journey times. Further major investment in the road network is not scheduled. For Greater Christchurch to remain productive, the integration of land use and transport planning is therefore essential to managing our future urban growth.

Transport infrastructure, services and mode choices are important for enabling and supporting population and housing growth in new and existing urban areas, while the location of growth affects how well the transport system performs. Given transport and land use are so strongly connected, all decisions need to consider their impact on the other.

In this context, the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) has provided new opportunities for how we can plan for growth as it represents a fundamental shift in the strategic direction for transport in New Zealand. It seeks to transition to a more holistic, mode-neutral approach to transport investment, with an increased focus on achieving a range of social and environmental outcomes. It also places more emphasis on the crucial role of transport in shaping urban form, creating liveable cities and reducing the need to travel by private vehicle.

It will be important to ensure that transport is integrated with land use but also that all the components of the network are joined in a way that makes it easier to make choices on how to travel. Greater Christchurch already has a well-integrated network that has very high accessibility. This means that for a majority of areas there is a choice of

---

26 Outlined in Section 4.2 and 8.3 of the Capacity Assessment and further detailed in supporting technical reports.
options for walking, cycling, public transport or using a private car, with strong integration between these different modes of travel.

Recent investments in the cycleway network have provided more opportunities to encourage safer cycling trips around Christchurch City and between centres, while technological advances through electric bikes will mean that this mode will become increasingly accessible as a means of travel.

However, with significant population growth within the City and in the surrounding districts, the current freedom and independence we enjoy in travelling around will in future become more difficult unless there is a significant shift in how we think about and approach transport.

Transport business cases underway will consider the multi-modal transport programme that will address such matters. These include specific investigations to determine the appropriate investment required to support an enhanced public transport system and improvements along key transport corridors, including those that are part of the strategic transport network and support freight movements. This programme will be developed on the basis of the strategic directions from the UDS, and would contribute to the strategic goals related to an integrated and managed urban development.

In particular, it will help create a more efficient, reliable, safe and resilient transport system that promotes the use of active and public transport, and improves accessibility for all people in Greater Christchurch. Integrating land use and transport is particularly important for rapid transit and supporting an efficient public transport network. Each can have a positive influence on the others by improving the accessibility of an area and supporting growth and housing density around rapid transit corridors and stations. This is essential to maximise the benefits from the large investment required to build and operate rapid transit.

Future of public transport

The strategic priorities underpinning the GPS align with the work being undertaken by the Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee to deliver a step change in Greater Christchurch’s public transport, as described in the Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP). The RPTP contains an ambitious vision to fully integrate the public transport system with the wider transport system and urban form, thereby increasing mobility and accessibility across Greater Christchurch.

Vision for Greater Christchurch’s public transport system

Public transport is innovative and successful and sits at the heart of a transport network that supports a thriving, liveable Greater Christchurch. The public transport system is accessible and convenient, with high quality, zero emission vehicles and facilities. The system gets people where they want to go – as a result it is well used and valued by the people of Greater Christchurch.

As part of achieving this vision by 2048, the RPTP envisions two rapid transit corridors that will offer high speed public transport services to the north and south-west of Christchurch City, significantly enhancing links with the growing towns of Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. By investing in rapid transit services (such as light rail, rapid bus ways or automated trackless trains) and encouraging higher density development along high demand corridors, more people will be able to access jobs, services, recreation and education without necessarily having to rely on a private vehicle. Ensuring public transport is increasingly usable for all people has major social, environmental and economic benefits.
The improvements outlined in the RPTP include service enhancements across the network, infrastructure improvements on key routes, on-demand services (such as demand responsive transport, bike sharing, ride sharing and car sharing) and being well equipped to adopt new opportunities arising in information technology, intelligent transport systems, zero-emission vehicles and autonomous vehicles.

Realising this vision for our public transport system will require an increase in investment. The Government has signalled through the GPS that the overall level of capital investment available for public transport will be greater, reflecting the strategic focus of shifting trips in New Zealand’s cities from private vehicles to more efficient, low cost modes of transport.

Further conversations with the Government will explore how additional funding could help us to achieve our vision for public transport more quickly, supporting our aspirations for a consolidated urban form and multi-modal journeys.

Freight transport

Greater Christchurch is also a major freight hub for Canterbury and the South Island, with two inland ports, the Port of Lyttleton and Christchurch International Airport acting as major gateways for produce and people. The strategic road and rail networks in Greater Christchurch also play a significant role in the distribution of freight within the sub-region, as well as to neighbouring regions and the rest of New Zealand.

An important part of managing the transport network is to ensure that freight can be moved efficiently to and through Greater Christchurch will require effective management of congestion on the main freight routes. It is crucial that the strategic infrastructure and networks across Greater Christchurch are able to meet future demand and are protected from any adverse effects of growth. This is a key aspect of the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) and transport business cases to support future transport investments.

Future programme and investment

While the Partnership is working towards improving transport choice, more work is needed to get people thinking about how they travel differently, whether it be by public transport, walking, cycling or as a passenger in a private car.

Such a transport programme would include:
- Improved public transport network and services including mass transit corridors;
- Development of walking and cycling networks;
- Travel demand management initiatives;
- Completion of funded strategic road network improvements, including the Northern Corridor and Southern Motorway;
- Embracing new technology changes

How to improve integrated land use and transport planning was a key deliberation when deciding how future urban development should be accommodated in Greater Christchurch. Part of the rationale for the locations for growth was therefore to ensure future growth is appropriately aligned with long term transport planning and investment, meaning more people will be living in areas that are accessible to a mix of transport modes.

The existing and future Christchurch transport network is shown in Figure 18. Investment in this future will be considerable (approximately $1.56b capital and additional annual operating costs) over the next 30 years and needs to be well aligned to a supportive land use. It will require collaboration and investment by the Greater Christchurch Partnership and Central Government as well as the community to achieve this outcome.

Reduced reliance on private vehicles as a result of increased land use and transport integration will have associated congestion, safety, access, environmental and cost benefits for people and communities across Greater Christchurch.
Figure 18: Greater Christchurch transport network – existing, planned or proposed routes and modes.

Routes for proposed rapid transit, other public transport services and cycling are all indicative unless already adopted in relevant Council plans.
Other development infrastructure

Infrastructure networks required to enable new development principally relates to transport and the three waters: water supply, wastewater and stormwater. Based on extensive strategic planning undertaken through the Partnership over the last decade to identify future locations for housing and business growth, the constituent partner councils have been able to plan for and invest in the infrastructure needed to support development in these areas. This means most areas proposed in this Update for future development are already sufficiently serviced to be considered ‘shovel ready’.

Most of the areas not currently serviced with sufficient infrastructure network capacity will be following the completion of planned upgrades. This includes in parts of the northern, south-western and eastern areas of Christchurch City. These capacity constraints are addressed in Christchurch City Council’s Long Term Plan and will be resolved by 2028.

Councils’ infrastructure strategies outline how sufficient infrastructure network capacity will be provided for to ensure future growth is effectively and efficiently accommodated. Although Christchurch City Council’s Infrastructure Strategy is based on a lower projected growth for the next 30 years than is considered in this Update, the Council has processes, plans and initiatives that can appropriately manage infrastructure capacity requirements to ensure that the housing growth targets proposed in this Update are met. More detailed infrastructure modelling of areas proposed for commercial redevelopment will follow once specific locations are identified.

In the same way, the Selwyn Infrastructure Strategy also uses a lower projected growth for the next 30 years than is considered in this Update. However, all zoned land as well as land within the Proposed Infrastructure Boundary and Special Housing Areas have been factored into the strategy. Further, any additional up-zoning or greenfield capacity to cater for projected growth, will need to be factored into the infrastructure works programme once the next phase of strategic planning has been undertaken.

Discussions with other infrastructure providers indicate that the availability of such infrastructure as electricity and telecommunications is either available or will be available to service all housing and business growth needs in Greater Christchurch over the next 30 years. The provision of social and community facilities, including schools, healthcare and community halls, have also been well planned for as part of the post-earthquake recovery planning for Greater Christchurch, and are therefore not considered to represent a constraint on future development. Existing planning provisions in the CRPS and district plans ensure growth does not compromise the efficient operation of strategic infrastructure.

It will be important that constituent partner councils continue to engage with infrastructure providers to ensure growth is effectively and efficiently supported over the next 30 years by delivery of necessary infrastructure.

5.7 Why is this our proposed approach?

Aligning with the strategic growth directions from the UDS

This Update furthers the achievement of economic, social, environmental and cultural wellbeing outcomes outlined in the UDS and summarised in Section 2.3. It sets out a settlement pattern and a consolidation approach to urban development that is more sustainable than might result from a more laissez faire scenario. It responds to anticipated changes in demand while supporting wider programmes of action to address challenges, such as climate change, that require solutions beyond just urban planning.

The locations for growth outlined in Section 5, Our Plan and the housing targets (detailed in Section 3.2) reflect a balanced approach to achieving the consolidated growth directions of the UDS while responding to current and projected market demands. The settlement pattern supports a key aim of the UDS to create a vibrant and thriving Central City.

29 Some industrial zoned land in Christchurch City is not proposed to be serviced.
It fosters an increasing Central City population and enables the Central City and surrounding business land to transition over time to provide for increased office and retail floorspace, maximising the existing public and private investments made throughout a period of recovery.

This approach meets the requirements of the NPS-UDC, being informed by the Capacity Assessment and having had particular regard to NPS-UDC Policy PA1, but has also been guided by the UDS, CRPS, District Plans and the Long Term Plan and Infrastructure Strategies required under the LGA. The Partnership is conscious of the need to balance the certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development. Ongoing requirements in the NPS-UDS for evidence and monitoring to support planning decisions will enable periodic review and consider any required amendments to this approach.

Consolidated growth enables towns and centres to more easily provide the local facilities and services that communities need and maximises the efficiency of key transport routes and other infrastructure services. Supporting the growth and vitality of key activity centres is engrained in the UDS and the CRPS Chapter 6 gives strong policy direction to territorial authority plans. Figure 19 encapsulates this concept and outlines the types of services, amenities and factors that councils and other agencies can provide for in these areas.

The settlement pattern enables around two-thirds of new households to be accommodated within the Christchurch City area and allows for the larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts to continue to grow.

*Figure 19: Concept of a 10-minute neighbourhood for key centres*
This provides a good level of housing choice across Greater Christchurch and recognises that within a single housing market there are many and varied reasons for where and how people choose to live.

Taken together, new subdivisions in greenfield locations across all three council areas will account for around 55% of the identified housing capacity. ‘Intensification’, being development in existing urban areas through infill and redevelopment, is expected to provide for the remaining 45%, primarily in Christchurch City but not exclusively. This broadly corresponds with intensification targets already outlined in the CRPS and Christchurch District Plan.

As outlined in Section 3, Our Growth Needs, much of this housing capacity is already provided for in District Plans. The responses outlined in this document centre on the remaining housing shortfalls shown in Table 3 (around 15,500 dwellings) for Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts to meet housing targets being considered in context with wider strategic planning.

Directing future housing growth to development capacity already signalled by the Projected Infrastructure Boundary in Map A of the CRPS represents the most efficient and effective option for accommodating these shortfalls. For some time now the Councils have factored these areas into respective 30 year infrastructure strategies associated with Long Term Plans. These plans have already benefited from extensive community input, as did the earlier UDS engagement and subsequent resource management and recovery consultation processes that led to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

Further more detailed assessment of these future growth areas will be required, and undertaken as part of district plan reviews, and can address any new requirements relating to managing risks of natural hazards and mitigating impacts on versatile soils.

Reflecting changing housing needs

As outlined in Sections 2, 3 and 4 demographic change will mean an increasing percentage of our population will be over 65 and average household size will continue to decline. The cost of housing, both home ownership and renting, will continue to represent a significant component of household expenditure.

New households will have different housing preferences and affordability constraints, but to better align the total housing stock across Greater Christchurch with the overall household composition, new development would need to favour smaller and more affordable housing types.

Smaller and multi-unit dwellings that take advantage of more efficient building construction techniques and adopt new home ownership and rental models can aid the provision of more affordable homes. Housing should meet the needs of our population at all stages of life. Locating new development closer to the provision of local facilities and community services can also improve access to the health needs of a population that is both aging and has increasing long term conditions and disabilities, and reduce the transport costs associated with overall household expenditure.

Increasingly more households are also beginning to take advantage new technology and on demand services to enable a more inner-city lifestyle, closer to the social and cultural amenities offered in and around the centre of Christchurch. The implementation of the 8011 Central City Housing Programme will determine the scale of demand in this market segment and the role public agencies and private sector developers can play to provide for this housing type.

These trends have therefore informed the transitional approach adopted when setting housing targets in Table 2.

Supporting future public transport investment

The future investment in our public transport system highlighted in Section 5.6 will influence and be influenced by how our City and surrounding towns accommodate future growth. For such investment to be sustainable it needs to foster significant increases in public transport patronage.

A settlement pattern approach that encourages greater urban densities, particularly along key public transport corridors provides the greatest opportunity for people to live in close proximity to proposed new rapid transit routes, increasing the likelihood and attractiveness for people to adopt these transport modes.
What about other options?

In arriving at this settlement pattern, three alternative options were investigated.

One option investigated providing for growth based directly on the population and household projections derived from Statistics NZ data (Option A). Another option considered a scenario whereby a greater proportion of additional household growth was directed to the Christchurch City area over the next 10 years, anticipating a more rapid return to the levels of redevelopment in the City experienced prior to the earthquakes (Option B).

Compared to this Update (Option C), Option A would require increased capacity to be provided in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts for the period 2028-2048, totalling nearly 10,000 additional dwellings.

Compared to our plan (Option C), Option B would reduce the housing provision necessary to be identified in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts over the next 10 years by around 5,500 dwellings (resulting in a total of 15,000 dwellings less than Option A over the 30 year period), relying on the range of housing options available in Christchurch City to meet housing demand not able to be accommodated in the main towns of the Districts.

Aside from further mitigating many of the local effects identified for Option A, assessment of Option B focused on the significant departure from current market housing conditions.

Option B would require average annual building consents for additional dwellings to be 1750/yr for Christchurch City with an increasing proportion met through redevelopment. While consents for new housing in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts appear to have softened over the last year (partly due to a general decrease in the level of building consents across Greater Christchurch during 2018), in Selwyn they are still tracking closer to the high growth rate.

Further explanation and assessment of these options, and the reasons why Option C was considered the selected option, is covered in a separate options assessment document.
6. Our Next Steps

6.1 Responsive planning

With many of the primary drivers and influencers of urban development in Greater Christchurch being in a state of change, a responsive approach to planning is necessary to ensure that future opportunities to shape our urban areas and achieve our desired outcomes are realised. This will require monitoring and evaluation, continued relationship building and commitment to this partnership. Key drivers of change at the local, national and global level include:

- Shifting post-earthquake trends in the residential, commercial and industrial markets, as well as the development sector, as the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch continues to mature;
- Emerging Government policy in relation to urban growth and development, transport, regional economic growth, and local government funding and financing, which will provide new opportunities for our approach to planning;
- Changing population and household profiles, and composition of the local economy, which will influence the type of housing and employment that is required in the future to meet the needs and preferences of residents;
- Evolving technologies (such as mass automation, digital workspaces) and their increasing adoption, which will influence how our urban areas function, especially in terms of how people work and travel (such as autonomous vehicles);
- Delivering large-scale regeneration projects that will significantly affect surrounding local areas and communities, and Greater Christchurch overall, including for the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor, Kaiapoi area and Central City;
- Growing need to manage and adapt to the natural hazard risk facing our coastal communities given the anticipated sea level rise, and related coastal inundation and groundwater level effects, over the next 30 years and beyond.

Given these drivers of change, this Update has been prepared to provide greater certainty over the medium term in regard to how development capacity issues will be addressed (Section 4, Our Challenges) and more flexibility over the long term to enable the Partnership to further consider the most appropriate planning directions and responses.

In response to this Update, the Regional Council and District Councils will insert the relevant housing targets directly into their respective plans, in accordance with NPS-UDC Policies PC5 to PC11.

Figure 20: Scheduled implementation and review process 2019-2022
6.2 Further work and implementation

The Partnership is committed to undertaking further work to assess, consider and address some of the priority growth issues for Greater Christchurch. These actions include workstreams already planned by constituent partners and those that are now proposed to respond to the priorities identified in this Update. The aim of this future work is to ensure our long term planning directions for Greater Christchurch are appropriately investigated and implemented.

The key actions from this Update have been grouped under three broad themes:
- Strengthen our partnership approach;
- Improve our tools and evidence base;
- Build on our planned direction for growth.

Many of the actions that will be undertaken to implement this Update are linked to pre-arranged planning processes, in that they will be undertaken as part of these processes or help inform them. Such processes include the district plan reviews underway for Selwyn and Waimakariri, the full review of the CRPS scheduled for notification in 2022, and the statutory requirement from the NPS-UDC for another Capacity Assessment to be prepared in 2020.

Schedule of future work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead Partners</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Work with the Government to further explore opportunities to develop an agreement on the priority actions and investments that will contribute towards an agreed set of growth and wellbeing outcomes for Greater Christchurch. <strong>Linked processes: Second stage of the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport</strong></td>
<td>All GCP Partners</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with Government and social and affordable housing providers to better address current and future housing needs across Greater Christchurch, developing an action plan to increase provision. Investigate the most suitable locations and opportunities for new housing ownerships models (such as shared ownership, co-housing, etc). This would be prepared in accordance with the following timeframes</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019 - 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- an MOU with the GCP and Network July 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A project plan and project lead resource August 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A good practice and/or barriers research component October 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A forum and or consultation component December 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A draft action plan February 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Integration and alignment with District Plan Reviews April 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Integration and alignment with Annual Plans June 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Linked processes: Next Capacity Assessment, Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews and Council’s Long Term Plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undertake an evaluation of the appropriateness of existing minimum densities specified in the CRPS for each territorial authority including a review of what has been achieved to date, constraints and issues associated with achieving these minimum densities, and whether any changes to minimum densities is likely to be desirable and achievable across future development areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri districts. <strong>Linked processes: Canterbury Regional Policy Statement review, Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews</strong></td>
<td>SDC, WDC, CCC, ECan.</td>
<td>2019-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop and agree a single growth model for Greater Christchurch that evaluates the demand, supply, feasibility and sufficiency of residential and business development capacity.</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan</td>
<td>2019 - 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Review and recalibrate the Christchurch Transport Model and Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic Model.</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan, NZTA</td>
<td>2019 - 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prepare a new Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment that provides up-to-date information on current and future housing and business trends.</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan, Ngai Tahu</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUILD ON OUR PLANNED DIRECTION FOR GROWTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insert relevant housing targets directly into the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and District Plans, in accordance with NPS-UDC Policies PCS to PC11.</th>
<th>ECAN, CCC, SDC, WDC</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Improve the alignment and integration of constituent partner council’s infrastructure strategies through a coordinated approach that is guided by an overarching sub-regional approach to infrastructure planning and delivery.</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019 - 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a. Prepare a Proposed Change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS at the earliest opportunity to:</th>
<th>ECan, SDC, WDC</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• modify Map A to identify the Future Urban Development Areas shown in Figure 15, and include a policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS that enables land within the Future Development Areas to be rezoned in District Plans for urban development if there is a projected shortfall in housing development capacity in Table 3 of Our Space, or if the capacity assessment referred to in Action 6 (or subsequent periodic capacity assessments) identifies a projected shortfall in feasible development capacity.</td>
<td>ECan, SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• enable territorial authorities to respond to changes in the sufficiency of development capacity over the medium term on a rolling basis as a result of periodic capacity assessments.</td>
<td>ECan, SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to undertake structure planning (including the consideration of development infrastructure and the downstream effects on the Greater Christchurch transport network) and review of District Plans over the next year for the identified Future Development Areas in the 2019 CRPS Change set out in Action 9a above, to provide for the projected medium term shortfall shown in Table 3 or the capacity assessment referred to in Action 6 (or subsequent periodic capacity assessments), at a minimum residential density of 12 households per hectare, informed by the evaluation undertaken as Action 3 above.</td>
<td>ECan, SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The policy will sit within the existing objective and policy framework of Chapter 6 of the CRPS which applies to all local authorities in the Greater Christchurch Area, and which, in relation to the integration of land use and transport, includes policies 6.3.3, 6.3.4 and 6.3.5. 30

**Linked processes: Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undertake detailed planning work for (in accordance with directions outlined in CRPS Chapter 6 and the proposed change identified in Action 9) the relevant Greater Christchurch towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri, including:</th>
<th>SDC, WDC</th>
<th>2019 - 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluating zoning options to further promote consolidated townships;</td>
<td>SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019 - 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

30 Policy 6.3.3 requires that development proceed in accordance with an outline development plan. In addition, Policy 6.3.4 promotes transport effectiveness, and Policy 6.3.5 relates to the achievement of land-use and transport integration by “ensuring that the nature, timing and sequencing of new development are co-ordinated with development, funding, implementation and operation of transport and other infrastructure...”
Investigating opportunities to encourage the provision and uptake of a range of housing typologies to meet future demands, including considering options for redevelopment, intensification and kāinga nohoanga;

- Reviewing town centre masterplans and strategies, and exploring options to increase land supply for existing key activity centres

**Linked processes: Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews**

Facilitate the redevelopment of existing urban areas in Christchurch City through the:

- Implementation of the 8011 Central City Residential Programme;
- Development and implementation of a redevelopment programme for medium density housing areas around key activity centres and along public transport corridors;
- Investigation of opportunities for transition of brownfield land for commercial and mixed use redevelopment

**Linked processes: Christchurch City Council’s Long Term Plan**

Undertake a review of Chapter 6 (Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch) of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement as part of the scheduled full review, being informed by further planning work being undertaken by Councils and responding to any identified needs in the next Capacity Assessment due to be completed in 2020. Environment Canterbury will, prior to notification, engage with submitters on Our Space who sought the inclusion of land for business or housing development in relation to the appropriateness of including the subject land within Map A of Chapter 6.

**Linked processes: Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>2019/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Plan and agreed scope for review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>2020/2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of efficiency and effectiveness (RMA s35) review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of efficiency and effectiveness (RMA s35) review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collation of existing evidence base and identification of information gaps (based on District Plan reviews and structure planning completed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additional technical evidence completed (if required) – for chapter 6 specifically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Density</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Natural Hazards – including climate change and additional land areas required from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Southshore project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Settlement pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial engagement with strategic partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed partner and stakeholder engagement plan – pre-notification engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>2021/2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Chapter 6 prepared for clause 3 Schedule 1 RMA consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 32 Report completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of Proposed Chapter 6 as part of full RPS review June 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>2022/2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submission and Further Submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of Officers’ Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision expected in June 2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 Collaborative partnerships

Opportunities and challenges facing Greater Christchurch in relation to how we will achieve our desired urban growth outcomes cross the administrative boundaries of Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri, and encompass a range of economic, social, cultural and environmental matters. Collaboration between local and regional councils, government agencies and Te Rūnanga o Ngai Tahu will therefore continue to be essential to successfully plan for growth.

The Partnership is committed to showing visible leadership and using a collaborative approach to address the growth issues identified for Greater Christchurch. Governance and implementation of this Update will be coordinated through groups at various levels of the Partnership, with the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee responsible for its overall delivery. Although the implementation of this Update will principally be the domain of the constituent partner councils, other government agencies, mana whenua, the private sector, the third sector and the community also have a key role to play in ensuring we realise our shared vision for the future.

Coordinated action between public and private sector infrastructure providers, and the development sector, will be of particular importance to enabling the type and scale of development needed to accommodate our growth needs. It will be crucial that future investments are aligned with our planned direction for growth, which will require strong working relationships between constituent partner councils, infrastructure providers, developers and the property sector.

Building on the close ties already developed through the earthquake recovery, a strong working partnership with the Government will also be pivotal to unlocking the opportunities and addressing the challenges for Greater Christchurch. The Partnership will work closely with relevant agencies and ministries to explore how the Government could support urban development in Greater Christchurch in a way that both aligns with our future aspirations and the Government’s bold intentions for New Zealand’s cities, as signalled in the Urban Growth Agenda.

Partnering with the Government will include exploring the opportunity for developing an agreement on transport’s role in shaping the future of Greater Christchurch, recognising that transport can be a key place-maker for urban areas. This partnership opportunity has already been signalled in the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport.

6.4 Research and monitoring

The Partnership has produced an extensive evidence base to better understand housing and business trends in Greater Christchurch, and inform the planning decisions set out in this Update. This has included monitoring a range of urban development indicators and preparing a Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment.

It will be critical that the data and information used as the basis for future strategic planning continues to be refined to support a robust and up-to-date evidence base.

Examples of matters that will require further investigation include:

- Reviewing the 2018 Census results to identify any changes to the population, including to demographic and household profiles, and consider the suitability of the population projections used to underpin our strategic planning;
- Examining the key demand and supply-side factors influencing the housing market, such as preferences by location, constraints on the redevelopment market and the extent of interactions between local housing market areas;
- Interrogating the factors influencing the relative feasibility of developments in different local housing market areas, including testing these factors with local experts and considering how they may change over time;
- Investigating the key drivers for business and employment development in relevant towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri, and the viable options for increasing the self-sufficiency of these growing towns.

The Partnership publishes quarterly monitoring reports to track a series of core urban development indicators for Greater Christchurch. To improve our understanding of local market trends, the scope of these monitoring reports will be reviewed and expanded where appropriate to incorporate additional indicators. Monitoring trends and changes in
Greater Christchurch’s residential, commercial and industrial markets are particularly important given the disruptions caused by the earthquakes, and the new normal that is being established as the recovery and regeneration effort progresses. It is important that this monitoring integrates with other monitoring processes at local and regional levels that will collectively help assess the achievement of the strategic goals of the UDS.
He muka harakeke, he whītau tangata.
The harakeke is woven with the human strand – binding people and places together.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report seeks additional membership to the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Standing Committee that will be established to discuss how $3.7m funding shortfall can be achieved prior to the 2020/21 draft Annual Plan.

Attachments:

i. Letter from Canterbury Museum requesting additional membership (Trim 190617084665)
ii. Copy of WDC submission to Canterbury Museum Annual Plan (Trim 190424059293)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190618085379.

(b) Appoints Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead (Finance portfolio holder) to the Standing Committee being established by the Canterbury Museum Trust Board to discuss how the $3.7m funding shortfall can be achieved prior to the 2020/21 draft Annual Plan.

(c) Appoints Jeff Millward, Manager Finance & Business Support to the Standing Committee being established by the Canterbury Museum Trust Board to discuss how the $3.7m funding shortfall can be achieved prior to the 2020/21 draft Annual Plan.

(d) Notes the appointments are also being requested independently from the other contributing authorities, the Christchurch City Council, Hurunui District Council and Selwyn District Council.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Council submitted to the Canterbury Museum’s 2019/20 Annual Plan in April 2019, following a deputation by the Museum to the Council.

3.2 In the submission, the Council objected, under section 16 of the Canterbury Museum Act 1993, to the Canterbury museum Trust Board’s 2019/20 Annual Plan.

3.3 The Council’s submission to the Canterbury Museum was presented by Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead on 31 May 2019.
3.4 The primary reason for the objection was it was felt that the Annual Plan proposed unreasonable changes to the funding arrangements that were previously agreed between the Canterbury Museum and contributing authorities. In particular, the changes to the funding arrangements for the Robert McDougall building, which is owned by the Christchurch City Council, and was previously agreed to be funded by the Christchurch City Council.

3.5 In summary the submission requested the Canterbury Museum to consider:

- Amend its draft 2019/20 Annual Plan to reflect the previous funding apportionments, until a more comprehensive revision of funding methodology ownership responsibilities and operational costs can be determined;
- Consult with contributing authorities that allows sufficient time for those Councils to incorporate any proposals into their draft Annual Plans;
- Secure a funding agreement with Central Government for its share of redevelopment;
- Re-consider the timing of the review of the Canterbury Museum Act 1993, including the consideration of increasing the number of contributing authorities that should be within the levy catchment area.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The proposed change to fund the Robert McDougall building almost doubles the development levy that was previously required to be funded by the WDC ratepayers. When the Canterbury Museum released their draft plan, there was no time allowed for contributing authorities to consult with their respective communities of the changes.

4.2. The Canterbury Museum Trust Board has acknowledged there was limited time for the Council to consult on the request for additional capital levy funding and have temporarily agreed to remove the $3.7m of funding from the three District Councils (Waimakariri, Hurunui and Selwyn) from the Museum’s Annual Plan.

4.3. The Museum wishes to form a standing committee to discuss how the $3.7m funding shortfall can be achieved prior to the 2020/21 draft Annual Plan, and also to consider future changes to the Museum Act.

4.4. The Museum have also indicated there is no reason the working committee cannot also start the thinking around what changes to the Act might be beneficial.

4.5. The Museum have requested one Councillor and one staff member join the standing committee. The Council already has Mayor David Ayers as the appointed member on the Trust Board representing the Hurunui and Waimakariri District Councils.

4.6. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

Nil.

5.2. **Wider Community**

Submissions to past Council’s annual plans have requested a review of the Canterbury Museum Act 1993, that this Council has also submitted and objected to the Canterbury Museum on 31 May 2019.
6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

Capital cost

The total cost of the project is $195m (Redevelopment $101m. Base Isolation and Strengthening $94m)

Funding consists of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Local Authority Contribution</th>
<th>Forecast per 2019/20 draft annual plan</th>
<th>Revised Annual % Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Government</td>
<td>72.3 million</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>62.2 million</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Museum fundraising</td>
<td>60.7 million</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital cost</td>
<td>195.2 million</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operational cost

In 2019/20 The total operating cost of the Canterbury Museum is $11.6m, projected to be $17.1m in 2025/26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Funding Sources</th>
<th>Forecast 19/20</th>
<th>As a Percent of Total</th>
<th>Forecast 25/26</th>
<th>As a Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Levy</td>
<td>9.353</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>15.235</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial activities</td>
<td>1.708</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations &amp; Grants</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating funding sources</td>
<td>11.524</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16.482</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2. Community Implications

The Canterbury Museum are forecasting the Operating levy to have annual increases between 2019/20 – 2021/22 of 5% and from 2022/23 – 2025/26 of at least 10%.

The Capital Levy in the final Canterbury Museum Plan is now proposed to be $2.075m paid over three instalments with the first instalment in 2020/21. The proposal in the draft Canterbury Museum plan was to share an additional $3.7m across the three Councils (Hunuirui, Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils), would increase WDCs contribution by about $1.742m to a total of $3.817m.

6.3. Risk Management

There is inherent risk that the redevelopment, base isolation and strengthening exceeds budget e.g. change of scope and cost escalation.

Risk still exists for funding, although the Canterbury Museum is confident that their funding requests from Central Government will be successful.

6.4. Health and Safety

There are no significant matters identified.
7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**
This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2. **Legislation**

7.3. **Community Outcomes**
There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District.

There are wide-ranging opportunities to participate in arts and cultural activities.

There are wide-ranging opportunities for people of different ages, abilities and cultures to participate in community life and recreational activities.

7.4. **Delegations**
The Council has the delegated power to appoint membership to the Canterbury Museum Board and/or its committees.
13 June 2019

Jim Palmer
Chief Executive Officer
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
RANG IORA 7440

Tena koe Jim

Canterbury Museum 2019/20 Annual Plan

As advised in our letter dated 3 May 2019, the consideration of our draft 2019/20 Annual Plan was delayed until after the meeting of Council and Board representatives to discuss the submissions/objections on 31 May 2019.

Thank you for providing representatives for that meeting who both reinforced the general warm support from all Councils for the Museum alongside expressing any concerns. The main concerns expressed were around the additional District Council capital levy funding for the Link Building/Robert McDougall Gallery and the need for a review of the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act 1993.

The Museum acknowledged that there had been limited time for the District Councils to consult on the request for additional capital levy funding and agreed to remove the $3.7m of funding from the three District Councils from the Museum’s Annual Plan. It is now shown as McDougall – Local Authorities tbc ie unfunded. Clearly we will need to bridge the gap by some means, and the formation of a working committee set out below was the suggested mechanism.

It was also acknowledged that a review of the Act pre-Museum Project could cause difficulties with progressing the Museum Project in a timely fashion. However, there is no reason the working committee can not also start the thinking around what changes to the Act might be beneficial.

So it was agreed that a Standing Committee of Council and Board representatives would be established to discuss how the $3.7m funding shortfall can be achieved prior to the 2020/21 draft Annual Plan being prepared and to commence thinking on the shape of any change to the Museum Act.

The Canterbury Museum Trust Board subsequently adopted the 2019/20 Annual Plan (copy enclosed), pursuant to section 15(4) of the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act 1993, and the establishment of the Standing Committee. The Board’s representatives will be Michael McEvedy (Board Chair), David Ayers (Board Deputy), Rod Syme (Audit & Risk Chair) and David East (Investment Chair). We ask that your Council nominate a Councillor and a staff member to join the committee.
If you have any queries or require further explanation please contact either Nigel Tecofsky or myself.

With kind regards

Nga mihi

Anthony Wright
Director

Michael McEvedy
Chair, Canterbury Museum Trust Board

cc  Mayor David Ayers, Waimakariri District Council
    Cr Kevin Feestead, Waimakariri District Council
    Jeff Millward, Manager Finance & Business Support, Waimakariri District Council
Canterbury Museum
Annual Plan

For the financial year
1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020

Adopted 10 June 2019
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OUR CONTRACT – 2019/2020

We contract with our community to deliver these great things in return for our annual funding.

Our Visitors

We are committed to continuous improvement of customer service. We will warmly welcome and engage with at least 750,000 visitors, 95% or more of whom will value us as a satisfying or very satisfying visitor experience. We will maintain a sustainable, healthy, safe and secure facility and provide person-to-person access to collections or collections expertise.

Our Programmes

We will provide access to our rich treasures and stories by delivering education programmes to 30,000 individuals, and surprise, engage and challenge our visitors with public programmes targeted at 30,000 people and 10 special exhibitions raising awareness of wide ranging aspects of the Museum’s collections and knowledge.

Our People

We will provide improved care of and connection to our fantastic collections, we will database a further 111,000 of the two million authentic objects held in trust for future generations and we will process all approved loan requests.

Our Collections

We will commission research about our visitors and their wants and needs to help shape future programming and to drive continuous improvement. We will underpin our programmes with trusted scholarship and publish 18 peer-reviewed scientific and human history papers as well as deliver 14 conference papers.

Our Research

We will provide improved access to our rich treasures and stories by delivering education programmes to 30,000 individuals, and surprise, engage and challenge our visitors with public programmes targeted at 30,000 people and 10 special exhibitions raising awareness of wide ranging aspects of the Museum’s collections and knowledge.

Operating budget 2019/2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levy</td>
<td>9,353,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial activities</td>
<td>1,707,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations and grants</td>
<td>483,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,524,428</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment remuneration</td>
<td>5,796,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections Registration &amp; Curatorial</td>
<td>1,479,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Programmes</td>
<td>2,572,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>327,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>1,393,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,568,872</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net deficit from operating activities (44,444)
1. Introduction

The Canterbury Museum Trust Board maintains, develops and operates the Canterbury Museum at Rolleston Avenue, Christchurch, New Zealand. The objectives of Canterbury Museum as expressed in the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act 1993 are:

- To collect, preserve, act as a regional repository for, research, display and otherwise make available to the people of the present and future, material and information relating to the natural and cultural heritage of New Zealanders
- To promote interest and education in the natural and cultural heritage of New Zealanders
- To place particular emphasis on those activities as they relate to the greater Canterbury region, the Antarctic and Subantarctic, and where appropriate, their relationships in a wider global context.

In 2016 the Canterbury Museum Trust Board approved a Strategic Plan to be implemented through successive annual plans.

This Annual Plan presents the Board’s operational and developmental priorities for the year 2019/20.

The Board acknowledges the ongoing major financial support of Christchurch City Council, Hurunui District Council, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council, the New Zealand Government, Mason Foundation, Marsden Fund, R S Allan Memorial Fund and Friends of the Canterbury Museum.

1.1 Executive summary

Principal activities to be carried out by the Museum during 2019/20 appear in the Performance Objectives (Section 3) and are summarised below.

Our visitors
- Achieve visitor numbers of 750,000 and maintain a highly-rated visitor experience.
- Ensure visitors remain in a safe environment with no notifiable events.

Our programmes
- Develop, deliver and evaluate 10 special exhibitions, education programmes to 30,000 individuals and public programmes to 30,000 people.
- Maintain or increase current levels of activity in other operational areas, e.g., responding to enquiries, delivering lectures and field trips, publishing articles and participating in external organisations.

Our collections
- Expand the major task of computerised databasing and verification of all two million objects held by the Museum.
- Continue to make collections more accessible by adding records and images to Collections Online.

Our research
- Research and produce papers for the Records of the Canterbury Museum and other publications.
- Present research papers at conferences and continue to maintain adjunct positions in allied research institutions.

Our people and working environment
- Project-manage planning for The Museum Project and support development of Ravenscar House.
- Retain commitment to the Investors in People International Standard, and maintain our Platinum accreditation to the standard.
1.2 Canterbury Museum Vision and Values Statement

Our Museum

Celebrating Canterbury, discovering the world. For us and our children after us.

Waitaha-kōawa-rau, ka whakanui; Te-ao-whānui, ka tūhuratia. Mā tātou ko ngā uri e whai ake nei

What we do Ko te wahi ki a mātou

Canterbury Museum acquires and cares for world-wide collections of human and natural history, with a focus on Canterbury and the Antarctic.

Access to these collections drives research, inspires learning and ignites imagination through stories that surprise and delight our visitors.

The principles we live by Ō Mātou Tikanga

We ENGAGE positively with our visitors.

We work COLLABORATIVELY with each other and with or communities.

We are ACCOUNTABLE for what we do.

We always act with INTEGRITY.
1.3 The Museum organisation

Canterbury Museum is governed by the Canterbury Museum Trust Board. The appointment of trustees and the Board’s responsibilities are set out in the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act 1993.

It is anticipated that at the beginning of the 2019/20 financial year there will be 80 full-time equivalent (FTE) establishment and fixed term staff:

- Directorate: 2.80
- Communications, Projects Office and Finance & Services: 5.60
- Public Programmes: 33.73
- Collections Registration & Curatorial: 38.30

Due to the high level of rostering in front-of-house positions the 80 FTE is represented by approximately 89 staff.
1.5 Ravenscar House

Mr Jim and Dr Susan Wakefield through the Ravenscar Trust are building a permanent house with a focus on New Zealand fine arts, sculpture, decorative arts, and designer furniture and classical antiquities at 52 Rolleston Avenue and will gift it to the people of Christchurch through Canterbury Museum. The gifting of the house complies with the objectives of the Canterbury Museum to:

- collect, preserve, act as a regional repository for, research, display and otherwise make available to the people of the present and future, material and information relating to the natural and cultural heritage of New Zealanders; and
- promote interest and education in the natural and cultural heritage of New Zealanders.

Canterbury Museum has a strong design theme in its collections and programming and will benefit from a purpose-built facility in which to exhibit and promote these in the future. The development will be an additional facility for the Museum and will enhance and complement any future redevelopment of parts of the Museum’s current site.

The Christchurch City Council has gifted the 2,450 sq. metre site at Rolleston Avenue to the Museum subject to resource consents and construction within five years of the transfer.

The Museum has agreed to contribute $1m to the capital costs of the development.

The Ravenscar House will be largely self-financing through ticketed entry, car parking revenue and other income. The Museum will support the operation from its existing staff and resources.

The Ravenscar Trust started construction in early 2019 with the building opening to the public in 2020/21.
2. Requirements of the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act 1993

Section 15 of the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act 1993 requires that:

(1) The Board shall prepare and adopt, for each financial year ending with 30 June, an annual plan which outlines:
   (a) In particular terms for the financial year in which the plan is adopted and in general terms for each of the following two financial years:
      (i) The intended significant policies and objectives of the Board
          These are outlined in Sections 1 and 5. A detailed Operating (Policy and Procedures) Manual is available for inspection at the office of the Director.
      (ii) The nature and scope of significant activities to be undertaken
          These are outlined in Section 3.
      (iii) Performance objectives together with performance targets and other measures by which performance may be judged in relation to the objectives
          These are set out in Section 3.
   (b) In particular terms for the financial year in which the report is adopted, and in general terms for each of the following two financial years, in total and for each significant activity of the Board:
      (i) The indicative costs, including an allowance for depreciation of plant
          These are set out in Section 4.
      (ii) The sources of funds and the amount of any proposed levies
          These are set out in Section 4.

(2) The plan shall include an explanation of any significant changes between policies, objectives and activities, and performance targets specified in the plan as being those for the financial year in which the plan is adopted and those specified in the plan for the immediately preceding financial year as being those for the financial year in which the plan is adopted.

There are no significant changes between the objectives, activities and performance targets specified in the plan as between those in this 2019/20 financial year and those for the immediately preceding 2018/19 financial year. The Museum will continue to fulfil the current year (2018/19) objectives.

(3) The draft annual plan shall be referred to contributing authorities for a period of six weeks concluding no later than 31 May in each year or such earlier date as agreed by mutual consultation with contributing authorities.

This draft annual plan was referred to the contributing Local Authorities for a period of six weeks from Friday 15 March 2019 concluding on Friday 26 April 2019.

(4) The Board shall consider all submissions received in respect of the draft annual plan and amend it as considered appropriate prior to adoption by the Board no later than two weeks following the period referred to in subsection (3) of section 15.

(5) A copy of the annual plan, when adopted, shall forthwith be sent to each contributing local authority.

Section 16 of the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act 1993 requires that:

(1) The levies proposed in the draft annual plan shall be deemed to have been approved by all contributing authorities and binding on them once the annual plan is adopted unless either the Christchurch City Council or 2 or more of the remaining contributing authorities give notice in writing objection to the levies proposed therein during the period referred to in section 15(3).

(2) Within 14 days of the receipt of such notice, the Board shall convene a meeting of all contributing authorities to be held not later than 1 month following that date referred to in subsection (3) of this Act.

(3) At that meeting each contributing authority may be represented by 1 delegate. The delegates attending the meeting shall hear such submissions as the Board may make in support of its budget and levy. The Christchurch City Council or not less than 3 other contributing authorities may resolve that the total levy be reduced to an amount being not less than the total levy made in respect of the previous year.
3. **2019/20 performance objectives**

Recognising our commitment to continuous improvement of customer service the following performance objectives describe the principal activities to be carried out by the Museum during the 2019/20 year.

In addition, there will be many other activities furthering the overall objectives of the Museum contained in the 2019/20 Performance Plans of individual staff members.

**Assumptions:**

- Project earliest start of detailed design of January 2020
- Earliest opening of redeveloped Museum in July 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Our visitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Achieve visitor numbers</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Achieve operational surplus for Quake City</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Achieve visitor donations</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Achieve % of visitors rating their Museum experience as satisfied or very satisfied</td>
<td>≥95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Ensure staff have completed relevant customer service training</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Ensure the Museum’s occupants remain in a safe environment where there are zero Notifiable Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Provide access to collections or collections expertise in response to 98% of requests (total number to be reported)</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Our programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Develop, deliver and evaluate 10 special exhibitions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Tour an exhibit to the three contributing district council areas to reach a visitor target of</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Achieve 30,000 individuals receiving a Museum education programme delivered either by Museum staff or their own teacher (including 16,000 school students)</td>
<td>30,000 (16,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Achieve 30,000 individuals engaging in a Museum delivered public programme</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Achieve paid admissions to Discovery and maintain 500 memberships of Museum Explorer Club</td>
<td>50,000 (500 members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Answer 100% of external written/phone/email enquiries within 5 working days (total number to be reported)</td>
<td>100% (Total number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Achieve 700 media hits (print, broadcast and on-line media)</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Actively participate in professional associations/external bodies</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Provide outreach advice &amp; support to other Canterbury museums and related organisations (number of interactions)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Our collections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 100% of newly offered objects processed, with a maximum of 9,500 acquired, added to the database and fully verified</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Create new inventory records and check and verify new and existing Vernon records</td>
<td>111,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Create and fully verify Vernon records for the Peter Johns Collection</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Process 100% of all approved loan requests (total number of objects loaned)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Make collections more accessible by adding records and images to Collections Online</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Our research**

4.1 Peer reviewed research papers accepted for publication 18
4.2 Peer review external articles or supervise theses 45
4.3 Publish one volume of Records of the Canterbury Museum 1
4.4 Present conference papers 14
4.5 Adjunct positions held in research institutions 5
4.6 Undertake professional visitor survey research to drive continuous improvement Achieve

5. **Our people and working environment**

5.1 Maintain an up-to-date project plan and project-manage planning for The Museum Project Achieve
5.2 Support the development of the Ravenscar House project Achieve
5.3 Maximise return on investment funds within the Museum’s Investment Policy 3.74%
5.4 Achieve audit with only qualification being agreed departure from accounting standards as regards valuation and capitalisation of heritage assets Achieve
5.5 Achieve an end-of-year financial result within budget Achieve
5.6 Achieve learning and development hours 3,400 Monthly
5.7 Maintain a healthy, safe and secure facility by completing all cyclical maintenance and achieving Building Warrant of Fitness
5.8 Reduce general waste by recycling at least 90% of recyclable material 90%
5.9 Retain accreditation as an Investor in People – Platinum Achieve
4. Budget

4.1 Introduction

The level of operational levy increase requested from contributing local authorities is 5%.

The net deficit forecast for the 2019/20 financial year is ($44,444).

The Museum has highlighted that due to the effect of the increasing visitor numbers (approx. 120,000 over the past three years) and the ageing facilities requiring constant maintenance or replacement, the forecast increase of 5% for 2019/20 is required. The following assumptions have also been made in the draft 2019/20 operations budget:

- An operating expense inflationary adjustment of 2.0% has been applied
- An inflationary adjustment and the standard promotion allowances made to remuneration expenses
- Additional data-entry roles for the Lottery-funded Standish and Preece project, who are documenting and cataloguing the photographic images
- Additional roles for the Inventory Team, who are documenting and cataloguing the collections in preparation for redevelopment / moving collections
- Additional repairs and maintenance budgets for ageing (and failing) building and services
- Additional allowance has been made for offsite storage and repatriation costs
- The entire Museum security system required an upgrade due to failures and inability to cope with the increased requirements, as well as the relocation and upgrade of Quake City. Both of these items were outside our normal capital expenditure budgets and resulted in significant increases to our funded depreciation budget.

A capital contribution for the Ravenscar House project has been included for 2020/21 and a provision in the following year. Operational budgets for the forecast opening in 2020/21 have not been included at this stage, however it is expected to be largely self-financing through ticketed entry, car parking revenue and other income.

Overhead and administration expenses are allocated to each division of Curatorial & Collections Registration, Public Programmes and Communications based on staff numbers.

Collection acquisitions which are funded by way of bequests and the interest income on these bequests are shown separately in the operational budget. The earthquake insurance claim income and remedial expenses are also shown as non-operating budget figures (Section 4.2).

Budgeted capital grants are recognised as the project expenditure is incurred (Section 4.3).

A detailed breakdown of revenue, expense and depreciation items is provided in the notes to the operational and capital budgets (Section 4.4).
## 4.2 Operational budget

**CANTERBURY MUSEUM TRUST BOARD**

### Operational budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Actual 2017/18</th>
<th>Budget 2018/19</th>
<th>Budget 2019/20</th>
<th>Budget 2020/21</th>
<th>Budget 2021/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating levy</td>
<td>8,306,315</td>
<td>8,908,016</td>
<td>9,353,417</td>
<td>9,821,088</td>
<td>10,312,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt servicing ex gratia</td>
<td>177,508</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total levy and ex gratia</td>
<td>8,483,823</td>
<td>8,908,016</td>
<td>9,353,417</td>
<td>9,821,088</td>
<td>10,312,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial activities</td>
<td>1,452,008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations and grants</td>
<td>463,161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating revenue and funded depreciation</td>
<td>12,479,845</td>
<td>10,768,826</td>
<td>11,524,428</td>
<td>11,576,751</td>
<td>12,003,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenses

| | | | | | |
| **Employee remuneration** | 4,642,886 | 5,265,621 | 5,796,394 | 5,944,068 | 6,213,513 |
| Collections Registration and Curatorial | 1,075,874 | 1,222,601 | 1,479,895 | 1,499,861 | 1,571,852 |
| Public Programs | 2,464,797 | 2,820,085 | 2,572,546 | 2,631,961 | 2,751,215 |
| Communications | 247,981 | 308,230 | 327,038 | 248,087 | 203,572 |
| Depreciation | 1,211,976 | 1,300,650 | 1,393,000 | 1,312,500 | 1,319,500 |
| Total expenditure | | | | | |
| net surplus/(deficit) including depreciation | 2,836,331 | (148,361) | (44,444) | (144,444) | (195,504) |

### Additional Information

- **plus capital grants**: -14,925,000, 16,025,000, 51,900,000, 50,850,000
- **bequest income**: 563,067, 285,000, 300,000, 320,000, 340,000
- **earthquake insurance claims**: 14,440,772
- **interest on trusts & bequests less bequest funded acquisitions**: 475,226, 250,000, 500,000, 500,000
- **bequest funded remuneration**: -50,000,000
- **earthquake remedial expense**: (652,188)

### Net surplus incl extra-ordinary items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Actual 2017/18</th>
<th>Budget 2018/19</th>
<th>Budget 2019/20</th>
<th>Budget 2020/21</th>
<th>Budget 2021/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital expenditure</td>
<td>663,879</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenscar House</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset replacement/gallery redevelopment reserve</td>
<td>548,097</td>
<td>600,650</td>
<td>693,000</td>
<td>(487,500)</td>
<td>419,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed asset expenditure</td>
<td>1,211,976</td>
<td>1,300,650</td>
<td>1,393,000</td>
<td>1,312,500</td>
<td>1,819,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Project works</td>
<td>14,925,000</td>
<td>16,025,000</td>
<td>51,900,000</td>
<td>50,850,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net capital budget</td>
<td>1,211,976</td>
<td>16,225,650</td>
<td>17,418,000</td>
<td>53,212,500</td>
<td>52,669,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Notes to the operational and capital budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Commercial activities (exchange transactions)</th>
<th>Actual 2017/18</th>
<th>Budget 2018/19</th>
<th>Budget 2019/20</th>
<th>Budget 2020/21</th>
<th>Budget 2021/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discovery income</td>
<td>88,734</td>
<td>91,457</td>
<td>91,457</td>
<td>93,286</td>
<td>95,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease income</td>
<td>149,114</td>
<td>151,600</td>
<td>154,100</td>
<td>156,750</td>
<td>159,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Service income</td>
<td>15,613</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>5,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitions income</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special exhibition income</td>
<td>4,544</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other trading income</td>
<td>835,518</td>
<td>503,952</td>
<td>757,294</td>
<td>772,440</td>
<td>787,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realised gain/(loss) on sale of investments</td>
<td>985,992</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealised gain/(loss) on sale of investments</td>
<td>19,747</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on operating funds</td>
<td>979,304</td>
<td>610,000</td>
<td>610,000</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends on operating funds</td>
<td>198,534</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 3,278,581 | 1,452,008 | 1,707,851 | 1,507,576 | 1,487,695

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donations admission</td>
<td>167,721</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations and bequests</td>
<td>20,086</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,220</td>
<td>11,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>529,634</td>
<td>232,801</td>
<td>282,161</td>
<td>126,867</td>
<td>102,128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 717,441 | 408,801 | 463,161 | 248,087 | 203,572

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Collections Registration &amp; Curatorial</th>
<th>Actual 2017/18</th>
<th>Budget 2018/19</th>
<th>Budget 2019/20</th>
<th>Budget 2020/21</th>
<th>Budget 2021/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collections Registration</td>
<td>477,361</td>
<td>484,512</td>
<td>699,558</td>
<td>709,642</td>
<td>740,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curatorial</td>
<td>598,513</td>
<td>738,089</td>
<td>780,337</td>
<td>790,219</td>
<td>830,983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 1,075,874 | 1,222,601 | 1,479,895 | 1,499,861 | 1,571,852

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer Experience &amp; Education</td>
<td>585,526</td>
<td>789,768</td>
<td>589,817</td>
<td>597,135</td>
<td>628,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitions</td>
<td>706,438</td>
<td>780,855</td>
<td>759,254</td>
<td>790,442</td>
<td>837,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Operations / Security</td>
<td>1,172,833</td>
<td>1,249,462</td>
<td>1,223,474</td>
<td>1,244,385</td>
<td>1,284,788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 2,464,797 | 2,820,085 | 2,572,546 | 2,631,961 | 2,751,215

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Communications</th>
<th>Actual 2017/18</th>
<th>Budget 2018/19</th>
<th>Budget 2019/20</th>
<th>Budget 2020/21</th>
<th>Budget 2021/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>247,981</td>
<td>308,230</td>
<td>327,038</td>
<td>332,805</td>
<td>342,834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 247,981 | 308,230 | 327,038 | 332,805 | 342,834

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>768,714</td>
<td>770,000</td>
<td>770,000</td>
<td>770,000</td>
<td>770,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building systems / plant</td>
<td>19,377</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>15,889</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition galleries</td>
<td>108,270</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front of house fixed facilities</td>
<td>8,686</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection stores</td>
<td>59,243</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back of house fixed facilities</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture fittings and equipment visual</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>106,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Redevelopment Project</td>
<td>118,721</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 1,211,976 | 1,300,650 | 1,393,000 | 1,312,500 | 1,319,500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capital Grants are only recognised when the project expenditure has been spent.
### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>Budget 2019/20</th>
<th>Budget 2020/21</th>
<th>Budget 2021/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levies</td>
<td>8,483,823</td>
<td>8,908,016</td>
<td>9,353,417</td>
<td>9,821,088</td>
<td>10,312,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>529,634</td>
<td>232,801</td>
<td>282,161</td>
<td>126,867</td>
<td>102,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Grants</td>
<td>14,925,000</td>
<td>16,025,000</td>
<td>51,900,000</td>
<td>50,850,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequest income</td>
<td>563,067</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations admission</td>
<td>167,721</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations and bequests</td>
<td>20,086</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,220</td>
<td>11,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading activities</td>
<td>1,096,904</td>
<td>752,008</td>
<td>1,007,851</td>
<td>1,027,576</td>
<td>1,047,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>979,304</td>
<td>610,000</td>
<td>610,000</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on trust and bequest fund</td>
<td>475,226</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends</td>
<td>196,534</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realised gain/(loss) on sale of investments</td>
<td>985,992</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealised gain/(loss) on sale of investments</td>
<td>19,747</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake insurance claims</td>
<td>14,440,772</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income</strong></td>
<td>27,958,910</td>
<td>26,228,826</td>
<td>28,349,428</td>
<td>64,296,751</td>
<td>63,693,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>Budget 2019/20</th>
<th>Budget 2020/21</th>
<th>Budget 2021/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC levies</td>
<td>12,030</td>
<td>30,998</td>
<td>34,716</td>
<td>35,410</td>
<td>36,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit fees</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>40,326</td>
<td>41,132</td>
<td>41,955</td>
<td>42,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building services</td>
<td>376,933</td>
<td>378,272</td>
<td>385,838</td>
<td>393,554</td>
<td>401,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board expenses</td>
<td>41,708</td>
<td>17,580</td>
<td>27,932</td>
<td>28,491</td>
<td>29,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books and journals</td>
<td>15,493</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>22,440</td>
<td>22,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café purchases</td>
<td>652,188</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,497</td>
<td>28,047</td>
<td>28,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning</td>
<td>269,277</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>244,800</td>
<td>249,696</td>
<td>254,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection acquisitions</td>
<td>405,534</td>
<td>829,362</td>
<td>836,150</td>
<td>805,953</td>
<td>806,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>1,211,976</td>
<td>1,300,650</td>
<td>1,393,000</td>
<td>1,312,500</td>
<td>1,319,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake remedial expenses</td>
<td>652,188</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,497</td>
<td>28,047</td>
<td>28,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>37,489</td>
<td>35,781</td>
<td>27,497</td>
<td>28,047</td>
<td>28,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition expenses</td>
<td>362,894</td>
<td>387,978</td>
<td>415,237</td>
<td>442,542</td>
<td>451,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat, light and power</td>
<td>192,180</td>
<td>232,277</td>
<td>245,923</td>
<td>250,841</td>
<td>258,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources support</td>
<td>12,175</td>
<td>32,694</td>
<td>33,348</td>
<td>34,015</td>
<td>34,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>485,543</td>
<td>521,594</td>
<td>532,026</td>
<td>552,026</td>
<td>572,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on loans</td>
<td>56,943</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT expenses</td>
<td>62,042</td>
<td>53,968</td>
<td>55,047</td>
<td>56,148</td>
<td>57,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal fees</td>
<td>12,902</td>
<td>37,894</td>
<td>38,652</td>
<td>39,425</td>
<td>39,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management expenses</td>
<td>50,795</td>
<td>50,677</td>
<td>53,891</td>
<td>54,765</td>
<td>55,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and public relations</td>
<td>239,573</td>
<td>301,112</td>
<td>307,134</td>
<td>313,277</td>
<td>285,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational expenses</td>
<td>699,107</td>
<td>677,231</td>
<td>763,436</td>
<td>778,705</td>
<td>750,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and freight</td>
<td>6,554</td>
<td>6,971</td>
<td>7,110</td>
<td>7,252</td>
<td>7,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>31,113</td>
<td>12,734</td>
<td>12,989</td>
<td>13,249</td>
<td>13,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>35,656</td>
<td>27,469</td>
<td>28,019</td>
<td>28,579</td>
<td>29,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration</td>
<td>4,563,914</td>
<td>5,159,915</td>
<td>5,736,027</td>
<td>5,882,494</td>
<td>6,133,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and maintenance</td>
<td>89,704</td>
<td>110,404</td>
<td>112,812</td>
<td>176,064</td>
<td>179,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff expenses</td>
<td>66,942</td>
<td>74,708</td>
<td>76,046</td>
<td>77,567</td>
<td>79,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training</td>
<td>115,480</td>
<td>96,887</td>
<td>98,825</td>
<td>100,801</td>
<td>102,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td>14,842</td>
<td>26,530</td>
<td>27,561</td>
<td>27,602</td>
<td>28,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic development</td>
<td>120,074</td>
<td>685,709</td>
<td>483,047</td>
<td>492,708</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone and tolls</td>
<td>15,641</td>
<td>25,464</td>
<td>25,973</td>
<td>26,493</td>
<td>27,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td>10,295,702</td>
<td>11,417,186</td>
<td>12,119,288</td>
<td>12,272,598</td>
<td>12,733,867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net surplus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget 2019/20</th>
<th>Budget 2020/21</th>
<th>Budget 2021/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17,663,208</td>
<td>14,811,639</td>
<td>16,230,161</td>
<td>52,024,153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fixed asset expenditure

The fixed asset expenditure is equal to the depreciation expense which is funded by the operating levy.
5. Summary of significant accounting policies

A) REPORTING ENTITY
The Canterbury Museum Trust Board (the "Museum") is a non-profit-making permanent institution, founded by the people of Canterbury for the service and development of their community with a particular responsibility for the natural and cultural heritage of the wider Canterbury region. The Museum is created under the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act 1993 and is a charitable organisation registered under the Charities Act 2005. It is located at Rolleston Avenue, Christchurch, New Zealand. These financial statements are for the reporting entity, Canterbury Museum Trust Board, and are prepared pursuant to Section 28 of the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act 1993.

B) MEASUREMENT BASE
The Museum followed the accounting principles recognised as appropriate for the measurement and reporting of surplus and financial position on a historical cost basis, as modified by the fair value measurement of certain items of property, plant and equipment and available-for-sale financial assets.

These financial statements have been prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting practice in New Zealand ("NZ GAAP"). They comply with Public Benefit Entity International Public Sector Accounting Standards ("PBE IPSAS") and other applicable Financial Reporting Standards as appropriate that have been authorised for use by the External Reporting Board for Public Sector entities, with the exception of PBE IPSAS 17 'Heritage Assets' as stated in Note 1(d)(viii). For the purposes of complying with NZ GAAP, the Museum is a public benefit not-for-profit entity and is eligible to apply Tier 2 Public Sector PBE IPSAS on the basis that it does not have public accountability and it is not defined as large. The financial statements have been prepared in accordance with Tier 2 PBE standards and the Museum has taken advantage of all applicable Reduced Disclosure Regime (RDR) concessions. The information is presented in New Zealand dollars, which is the Museum's functional and presentation currency.

Changes in accounting policy
The accounting policies adopted in these financial statements are consistent with those of the previous reporting period.

C) JUDGEMENT AND ESTIMATION UNCERTAINTY
The preparation of financial statements of necessity involves judgement and estimation. The estimates and associated assumptions are based on historical experience and various other factors that are believed to be reasonable. Actual results may differ from these estimates. The key sources of estimation that have had the most significant effect on the amounts recognised in the financial statements are presented in Note 18.

D) SPECIFIC ACCOUNTING POLICIES
The following specific accounting policies which materially affect the measurement of surplus and financial position have been applied consistently to both reporting periods:

i) Revenue
Revenue is recognised to the extent that it is probable that the economic benefit will flow to the Museum and revenue can be reliably measured. Revenue is measured when earned at the fair value of consideration received or receivable. The following specific recognition criteria must be met before revenue is recognised.

Revenue from non-exchange transactions
Local authority operating levies
Local authority operating levies are recognised as revenues when levied.

Grants and donations
Grants and donations, including Government grants, are recognised as revenue when received. When there are conditions attached which require repayment of the grants and donations if they are not met, revenues are recognised when the conditions for their use are met. Where there are unfulfilled conditions attached to the revenue, the amount relating to the unfulfilled condition is recognised as a liability and released to revenue as the conditions are fulfilled.

Bequests
Bequests are recognised in the income statement upon receipt. Where contributions recognised as
revenue during the reporting period were obtained on the restriction that they be expended in a particular manner or used over a particular period, and those restrictions were undischarged as at the reporting date, the amounts pertaining to those undischarged restrictions are transferred to trust and bequests reserve in equity and the nature of such restrictions are disclosed in the notes to the financial statements.

Capital donation
Capital donations are recognised as non-operating revenue when received.

Revenue from exchange transactions

Discovery income, image service income and other revenues
Discovery income, image service income and other operating revenues are recognised when services have been performed.

Lease income
Revenue is recognised on a straight-line basis over the rental period. The Museum Store lease agreement is reviewed and renewed annually. The Museum Café lease is for two years with a one year right of renewal.

Interest income
Interest is recognised in the income statement as it accrues using the effective interest rate method.

Dividends income
Dividends from investments are recognised when the shareholder's rights to receive payment have been established.

Recognition of insurance claims
Where some or all of the expenditure required to repair or replace damaged property, plant and equipment is expected to be reimbursed by another party, typically from the Museum's insurance provider, such insurance claim monies shall be recognised when, and only when, it is virtually certain that reimbursement will be received. The criteria for virtually certain is met when there is an unconditional right to receive payment.

ii) Budget figures. The budget figures are from the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Annual Plan that was approved by the Board at its meeting on 8 May 2017. Budget figures have been prepared in accordance with PBE IPSAS, using accounting policies that are consistent with those adopted by the Board in preparing these financial statements.

iii) Offsetting of income and expenses. Income and expenses are not offset unless required or permitted by an accounting standard. Items of income and expenses are offset when offsetting reflects the substance of the transaction or other event. In addition, gains or losses arising from a group of similar transactions are reported on a net basis, unless items of gains or losses are material, in which case they are reported separately.

iv) Income tax. The Museum has charitable status and accordingly no taxation expense or liability is recognised in the financial statements.

v) Cash and cash equivalents. Cash and cash equivalents include cash on hand, cash in banks and short-term deposits with original maturities of three months or less that are readily convertible to known amounts of cash and which are subject to an insignificant risk of changes in value.

vi) Debtors. Debtors are recognised initially at fair value and subsequently measured at amortised cost using the effective interest method, less provision for impairment. A provision for impairment of debtors is established when there is objective evidence that the Museum will not be able to collect all receivables. The amount of the provision is the difference between the asset's carrying amount and the present value of estimated future cash flows, discounted at the effective interest rate. The provision, if any, is recognised in the income statement.

vii) Financial instruments. Financial instruments are transacted on a commercial basis to derive an interest yield/cost with terms and conditions having due regard to the nature of the transaction and the risks involved. All financial instruments are accounted for on a settlement basis. They are classified in one of the following categories at initial recognition: loans and receivables, financial assets and financial liabilities at fair value through comprehensive income, available-for-sale financial assets, held-to-maturity investments, and other financial liabilities.
 Loans and receivables
Assets in this category are non-derivative financial assets with fixed determinable payments that are not quoted in an active market. They include:
- cash and cash equivalents (refer to item v above)
- debtors (refer to item vi above)
- accrued interest income (refer to item i above)

Available for sale financial assets
Assets and liabilities in this category are those non-derivative financial assets that are designated as available for sale or are not classified as loans and receivables, held-to-maturity investments or financial assets at fair value through surplus or deficit. Assets in this category include investments in equity instruments. The fair value of these instruments are based on quoted market prices.

Held-to-maturity investments
Assets in this category are measured at amortised cost. The Museum has classified its bank term deposits and fixed term investments as held-to-maturity investments.

Other financial liabilities
This category includes all financial liabilities other than those at fair value through comprehensive income. Liabilities in this category are measured at amortised cost. They represent:
- liabilities for goods and services provided to the Museum prior to the end of the reporting period that are unpaid and arise when the Museum becomes obliged to make future payments. These amounts are unsecured.
- term loan with determinable repayment terms and interest rate. This loan is unsecured.

Other financial liabilities include:
- creditors
- employee entitlements (refer to item ix below)
- grants received in advance (refer to item i above)
- retirement gratuity (refer to item ix below)
- term loans

viii) Property, plant and equipment. All property, plant and equipment are stated at cost less accumulated depreciation and impairment. Cost includes expenditure that is directly attributable to the acquisition of the item. Repairs and maintenance are charged against income as incurred. Depreciation is calculated on a straight-line basis, except for land, so as to write off the net cost amount of each asset over its expected useful life to its estimated residual value. Land is not depreciated.

viii) Property, plant and equipment (continued)
The Board reviews depreciation rates and adjusts them to more appropriately reflect the consumption of economic benefits. The depreciation rates applied are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, fittings and equipment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When an item of property, plant and equipment is disposed of, any gain or loss is recognised in the income statement and is calculated as the difference between the net disposal proceeds and the carrying value of the item.

Revaluation
Land and buildings are revalued on a cyclical basis at least every five years by an independent valuer. Any accumulated depreciation at the date of the revaluation is eliminated against the gross carrying amount of the asset and the net amount is restated to the revalued amount. If the asset's carrying amount is increased as a result of a revaluation, the increase is credited directly to equity under the heading "Asset Revaluation Reserve". However, the increase is recognised in surplus or deficit to the extent that it reverses a revaluation decrease of the same asset previously recognised in surplus or deficit. Revalued assets are depreciated over the remaining useful life. On the subsequent sale or retirement of a revalued property, the attributable revaluation surplus remaining in the asset revaluation reserve, net of any related deferred taxes, is transferred directly to retained earnings.

Intangible assets
Computer software are finite life intangibles and are recorded at cost less accumulated amortisation and impairment. Amortisation is charged on a straight-line basis over their estimated useful lives of 3 years and reported within the Statement of Comprehensive Revenue and Expenses. The estimated useful life and amortisation method is reviewed at the end of each annual reporting period.
Heritage assets

Heritage assets include collection items or artefacts of cultural or historical significance. The cost of acquisition of heritage assets is charged to the Statement of Comprehensive Revenue and Expenses. During the reporting period, the acquisition cost of collection items amounted to $358,470 (2017: $114,631).

It is the policy of the Museum to write off collection acquisitions and not attribute a monetary value to items gifted to the collection. The classification of the collections as a heritage asset is based on the premise that the collections are held in trust in perpetuity for the benefit of the public.

PBE IPSAS 17 requires that where an asset, eg collection item or artefact of cultural or historical significance, is acquired at no cost, or for a nominal cost, the asset is capitalised at its fair value as at the date of acquisition. PBE IPSAS 17 has not been followed because the Board considers that the fair values of the collection items cannot be measured reliably. Usually, gifts to the collection are unique items that have iconic status or are historic and irreplaceable or sacred to particular communities, with no market, so no financial value can be ascribed.

The Museum holds in excess of two million individual collection items. To comply with the requirements of PBE IPSAS 17 the value of these items would need to be assessed on an annual basis to identify possible impairment, which is required to be undertaken on an asset by asset basis.

Impairment of property, plant and equipment and intangible assets

The Museum does not hold any cash-generating assets. Assets are considered cash-generating where their primary objective is to generate a commercial return.

Non-cash generating assets

Value in use is determined using an approach based on either a depreciated replacement cost approach, restoration cost approach, or service units approach. The most appropriate approach used to measure value in use depends on the nature of impairment and availability of information.

If an asset's carrying amount exceeds its recoverable service amount, the asset is regarded as impaired and the carrying amount is written down to the recoverable amount. The total impairment loss is recognised in the surplus or deficit.

The reversal of an impairment loss is recognised in the surplus or deficit.

ix) Employee entitlements. Provision is made for benefits accruing to employees in respect of salaries and wages, annual leave, alternate leave, and long service leave when it is probable that settlement will be required and they are capable of being measured reliably.

Provisions made in respect of employee benefits expected to be settled within 12 months, are measured at their nominal values using the remuneration rate expected to apply at the time of settlement.

Provisions made in respect of employee benefits which are not expected to be settled within 12 months are measured as the present value of the estimated future cash outflows to be made by the Museum in respect of services provided by employees up to the reporting date.

x) Borrowings. Borrowings, which consist of term liabilities, are stated initially at fair values, net of transaction costs incurred. Subsequent to initial recognition, borrowings are measured at amortised cost with any difference between the initial recognised amount and the redemption value being recognised in surplus or deficit over the period of the borrowing using the effective interest rate method.

All borrowing costs are recognised as expense in the period in which they are incurred.

xi) Goods and Services Tax (GST). The financial statements have been prepared using GST exclusive figures with the exception of receivables and payables which have been shown inclusive of GST in the Statement of Financial Position.

xii) Inventories. Inventories are measured at the lower of cost and net realisable value.

xiii) Leases. Payments on operating lease agreements, where the lessor retains substantially the risk and rewards of ownership of an asset, are recognised as an expense on a straight-line basis over the lease term.
6. Seven-year forecasts

6.1 Introduction

The seven-year operational funding forecast, Section 6.2, shows the increase in operating funds (including non-project depreciation costs) of 5.0% is required for 2019/20 and for the next two years.

After consultation with the Contributing Local Authorities the Museum has agreed to spread the levy increases resulting from the depreciation of the Museum Project redevelopment as it is capitalised, over a seven year period to lessen the immediate impact on the Contributing Local Authorities. This results in operating levy increases of 10% for 2022/23 to 2023/24, 11% for 2024/25, and 10% for 2025/26 to 2027/28.

The Project depreciation has been itemised separately in Section 6.2 so that its impact can be clearly differentiated.

The seven-year capital forecast, Section 6.3, details costs and sources of funding for the Project as well as ongoing asset maintenance.

The following assumptions have been made regarding the new Project:

- Aim for a single site solution
- All buildings to be strengthened to 100% or better of code
- To conserve the 19th Century Heritage Buildings and restore heritage features
- Design within City Plan envelope and tie development into wider urban development context
- Aim for a 100 year solution to Museum’s needs incorporating as much flexibility as possible
- Undertake redevelopment and planning in as open and transparent a manner as possible
- The Museum Project is split into two separate components:
  - the pre-earthquake Project
  - the provision of Base Isolation and Earthquake Strengthening to protect the heritage collections, including the Category 1 Heritage Buildings, to reflect location in an active seismic zone
- Major options analysis identified 21 potential options leading to a preferred option
- The overall cost of the Museum Project has increased from $185m to $195m. This cost has been revalidated after several years of inflationary adjustments.
- The provision of Base Isolation and Earthquake Strengthening is $94m
- The pre-earthquake component of the Project cost is $101m (in 2022 dollars)
- The proposed funding mix for the overall project is as follows:
  - Central Government $72.3 million 37%
  - Local Government $62.2 million 32%
  - Canterbury Museum fundraising $60.7 million 31%
- Retention of the grants in advance received from Selwyn District Council and Christchurch City Council, and accrued interest until required
- Earliest start of detailed design of January 2020
- The funded depreciation on the $101m Project conceived pre-earthquakes will, as per last year, have building depreciation deferred for the first 5 years, and the remaining depreciation spread over the first 7 years.
- The costs of Base Isolation and Earthquake Strengthening of the Robert McDougall Gallery and construction of the Link Building has increased after the revalidation work to $37m.
- The funding of Base Isolation and Earthquake Strengthening of the main premises required from the Central Government is $66m
- Given the significant impact on operating expenditure and levies to fund depreciation for the additional $101m, no additional depreciation for the Base Isolation and Earthquake Strengthening works has been included in the budget. It is proposed that over time a provision in Repairs & Maintenance is created to maintain the Base Isolation and Earthquake Strengthening improvements

Details of the capital levy funding are provided in Section 6.3 and 6.4.

In Section 6.4 is a schedule showing the calculation of the operations levy in the Annual Plan. The calculations are also shown for the capital levy relating to the Project, including the payments that have been made and held in trust. For the purpose of apportioning levies the population figures are those provided by Statistics New Zealand as at 30 June 2018.
### 6.2 Seven-year forecast – operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Authority levy</strong></td>
<td>8,483,823</td>
<td>8,908,016</td>
<td>9,353,417</td>
<td>9,821,088</td>
<td>10,312,142</td>
<td>11,343,356</td>
<td>12,477,692</td>
<td>13,850,238</td>
<td>15,235,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial activities</strong></td>
<td>3,278,581</td>
<td>1,452,008</td>
<td>1,707,851</td>
<td>1,507,576</td>
<td>1,487,695</td>
<td>656,938</td>
<td>862,310</td>
<td>967,829</td>
<td>981,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donations and grants</strong></td>
<td>717,441</td>
<td>408,801</td>
<td>463,161</td>
<td>248,087</td>
<td>203,572</td>
<td>150,407</td>
<td>221,794</td>
<td>243,218</td>
<td>264,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenue</strong></td>
<td>12,479,845</td>
<td>10,768,826</td>
<td>11,524,428</td>
<td>11,576,751</td>
<td>12,003,410</td>
<td>12,150,702</td>
<td>13,561,796</td>
<td>15,061,286</td>
<td>16,481,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation (existing assets)</td>
<td>(1,211,976)</td>
<td>(1,300,650)</td>
<td>(1,393,000)</td>
<td>(1,312,500)</td>
<td>(1,319,500)</td>
<td>(1,352,488)</td>
<td>(1,386,300)</td>
<td>(1,420,957)</td>
<td>(1,456,481)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation (Project assets - funded) *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(625,467)</td>
<td>(1,476,401)</td>
<td>(2,752,801)</td>
<td>(3,352,801)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditure</strong></td>
<td>(9,643,514)</td>
<td>(10,175,872)</td>
<td>(11,568,872)</td>
<td>(11,721,195)</td>
<td>(12,198,913)</td>
<td>(12,803,523)</td>
<td>(14,247,809)</td>
<td>(16,006,389)</td>
<td>(17,102,898)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net operating surplus/(deficit)</strong></td>
<td>2,836,331</td>
<td>(148,361)</td>
<td>(44,444)</td>
<td>(144,444)</td>
<td>(195,504)</td>
<td>(652,821)</td>
<td>(686,013)</td>
<td>(945,103)</td>
<td>(621,203)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Unfunded expenditure

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation (Project assets - deferred) *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(140,730)</td>
<td>(822,190)</td>
<td>(1,444,380)</td>
<td>(1,244,380)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation (Project assets - unfunded) *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(470,650)</td>
<td>(1,441,950)</td>
<td>(1,882,599)</td>
<td>(1,882,599)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net operating surplus/(deficit)</strong></td>
<td>2,836,331</td>
<td>(148,361)</td>
<td>(44,444)</td>
<td>(144,444)</td>
<td>(666,153)</td>
<td>(2,205,501)</td>
<td>(3,390,803)</td>
<td>(4,672,083)</td>
<td>(3,748,183)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                         |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |
| CLA levy % increase (excl Project depn) | 2.30% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 3.93% | 2.50% | 0.77% | 5.67% |
| CLA levy % increase (funded Project depn) | - | - | - | 0.00% | 6.07% | 7.50% | 10.23% | 4.33% |
| Local Authority levy % increase | 2.30% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 10.00% | 10.00% | 11.00% | 10.00% |

* The Museum recognises the Contributing Local Authorities' discomfort with the level of levy increases required to fund the Project depreciation. It has been agreed with the Contributing Local Authorities that the building depreciation would be deferred for 5 years, no charge would be made for base isolation & earthquake strengthening, and that the remaining funded depreciation would be spread evenly over the first seven years of Project depreciation.
6.3 Seven-year forecast – capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income - Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital levy - local government</td>
<td>297,786</td>
<td>236,862</td>
<td>321,482</td>
<td>8,844,399</td>
<td>8,844,399</td>
<td>8,844,399</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital grants - central government</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>909,387</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital fundraising by the Museum</td>
<td>16,886,108</td>
<td>17,602,978</td>
<td>14,352,978</td>
<td>14,352,978</td>
<td>14,352,978</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision - Base Isolation &amp; Strengthening</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>3,383,436</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougall – Local Authorities tbc</td>
<td>1,244,296</td>
<td>1,244,296</td>
<td>1,244,296</td>
<td>1,244,297</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision - McDougall Strength - CCC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,700,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>3,813,646</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>297,786</td>
<td>21,622,970</td>
<td>35,124,460</td>
<td>50,441,673</td>
<td>49,941,673</td>
<td>49,164,707</td>
<td>3,383,436</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income – other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded depreciation</td>
<td>1,211,976</td>
<td>1,300,650</td>
<td>1,393,000</td>
<td>1,312,500</td>
<td>1,319,500</td>
<td>1,977,954</td>
<td>2,862,700</td>
<td>4,173,758</td>
<td>4,809,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total income</td>
<td>1,509,762</td>
<td>22,923,620</td>
<td>36,517,460</td>
<td>51,754,173</td>
<td>51,261,173</td>
<td>51,142,661</td>
<td>3,664,707</td>
<td>4,173,758</td>
<td>4,809,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure – Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure – other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital expenditure</td>
<td>663,879</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenscar House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset replacement/ gallery redevelopment reserve</td>
<td>548,097</td>
<td>600,650</td>
<td>693,000</td>
<td>(487,500)</td>
<td>419,500</td>
<td>977,954</td>
<td>1,862,700</td>
<td>3,273,758</td>
<td>4,009,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,211,976</td>
<td>1,300,650</td>
<td>1,393,000</td>
<td>1,312,500</td>
<td>1,819,500</td>
<td>1,977,954</td>
<td>2,862,700</td>
<td>4,173,758</td>
<td>4,809,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure</td>
<td>1,211,976</td>
<td>16,225,650</td>
<td>17,418,000</td>
<td>53,212,500</td>
<td>52,669,500</td>
<td>47,477,954</td>
<td>24,787,700</td>
<td>13,173,758</td>
<td>4,809,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(deficit)</strong></td>
<td>297,786</td>
<td>6,697,970</td>
<td>19,099,460</td>
<td>(1,458,327)</td>
<td>(1,408,327)</td>
<td>3,664,707</td>
<td>(18,541,564)</td>
<td>(9,000,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 Operations and capital levies

Operations levy for 2019/20
by population and distance factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Population * % of total No.</th>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>% of Total products</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Installment amount</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>No. products</th>
<th>amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>388,500</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>74.11</td>
<td>86.78</td>
<td>8,117,327</td>
<td>2,705,776</td>
<td>86,780</td>
<td>2,705,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurunui District</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>12,850</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>80,546</td>
<td>26,849</td>
<td>80546</td>
<td>26,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn District</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>62,200</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>564,824</td>
<td>194,941</td>
<td>564824</td>
<td>194,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri District</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>60,700</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>570,720</td>
<td>190,240</td>
<td>570720</td>
<td>190,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>524,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>85.39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,353,417</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,117,806</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The population numbers used are the estimated resident populations as at 30 June 2018, as provided by Statistics New Zealand.

Capital levy payments
by population and distance factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Population * % of total No.</th>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>% of Total products</th>
<th>Levy paid and held in trust</th>
<th>Projected interest accrual</th>
<th>Additional levy</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Out Standing capital levy 19/20</th>
<th>20/21-22/23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>388,500</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>74.11</td>
<td>6,021,980</td>
<td>853,669</td>
<td>47,143,664</td>
<td>54,019,313</td>
<td>12,700,000</td>
<td>34,443,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurunui District</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>12,850</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>292,778</td>
<td>292,778</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>292,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn District</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>62,200</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>516,646</td>
<td>73,239</td>
<td>1,535,890</td>
<td>2,125,775</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,535,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri District</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>60,700</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,074,510</td>
<td>2,074,510</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,074,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>524,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>85.39</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,538,626</strong></td>
<td><strong>926,908</strong></td>
<td><strong>51,046,842</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,512,376</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,700,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,346,842</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The population numbers used are the estimated resident populations as at 30 June 2018, as provided by Statistics New Zealand.
Our Reference: FIN-01 / 190424059293

24 April 2019

Anthony Wright
Director
Canterbury Museum
Rollston Avenue
Christchurch 8013

Dear Anthony

OBJECTION TO CANTERBURY MUSEUM’S DRAFT 2019/20 ANNUAL PLAN

The Council acknowledges receipt of the Museum’s draft 2019/20 Annual Plan. Our Council was appreciative of the presentation that the Canterbury Museum representatives provided and the discussion that followed on Tuesday 2 April 2019.

The purpose of this letter is to register Waimakariri District Council’s objection, under section 16 of the Canterbury Museum Act 1993, to the Board’s draft 2019/20 Annual Plan.

This Council’s main objection is that the draft 2019/20 Annual Plan proposes unreasonable changes to the funding arrangements that were previously agreed between the Museum and the contributing authorities. In particular, the changes to the funding arrangements for the Robert McDougall building, which is owned by Christchurch City Council, and was previously agreed to be funded by the Christchurch City Council.

The proposed change in funding related to the Robert McDougall building almost doubles the Development levy that was previously required to be funded by Waimakariri District ratepayers, who have not been consulted with in respect of the proposed change. It appears the decision to change funding arrangements has occurred between the Canterbury Museum requesting an earlier referral period and the production of the draft Annual Plan. The proposed timeframe provided by the Canterbury Museum does not allow our Council and, potentially the other Councils, sufficient time to consult their communities in respect of the change. This change of funding methodology fundamentally changes prior agreements and is significant.

While the Council is objecting to the proposed Development levy and change in the apportionment of costs, it is not objecting to the Operational levy for 2019/20. It suggests that the Canterbury Museum and contributing authorities should, over the next two years, review and agree the capital funding allocation levied to each contributing authority.

Concerns regarding the Draft Annual Plan

The Council key concerns with the draft Annual Plan are as follows:

- Our Council considers that the Robert McDougall building, owned by the Christchurch City Council, should still be funded by the Christchurch City Council, and it is understood that the Christchurch City Council previously had made full funding provision within its Long Term Plan. Our Council considers it is the Christchurch City Council’s
responsibility to ensure the building is maintained and strengthened to the required earthquake standards. By changing the previously agreed funding structure, it places additional financial burden onto this Council and other contributing authorities. Contributing authorities also have their own rating challenges, experiencing similar if not significantly higher rate increases than the Christchurch City Council. It is the belief of our Council that only the capital costs of connecting the Museum and Robert McDougall buildings and the operational costs relating to the Robert McDougall building should be shared using the Museum Act 1993 levy calculation.

Our Council requests a copy of any agreement between the Canterbury Museum and the Christchurch City Council, or any other information that determined the revised funding arrangements. It is understood the Museum is seeking a long term lease, with ownership remaining with the Christchurch City Council. However, it is unclear who has the liability of the ongoing financial commitments such as insurance, depreciation and building maintenance. It is noted within the Canterbury Museum’s draft Plan that there are increased provisions for funding depreciation and other costs. It also appears that the Canterbury Museum is now providing for the costs relating to the Robert McDougall building that is owned and the responsibility of the Christchurch City Council. Clarification of these costs would be appreciated to understand what costs have been taken into account when determining the formula, provided within the Canterbury Museum Act 1993, for levying contributing Local Authorities.

- The Waimakariri District Council is of the view that the Canterbury Museum has not consulted adequately, or in a timely manner. This Council had agreed to an earlier consultation referral period in the belief that there were no changes to the funding methodology and project, as previously consulted on by the Canterbury Museum. There was no prior indication that the capital contribution would be different, other than an index movement. The increase in levy represents a significant shift in costs from the building owner to contributing councils, with significant cost implications for this Council.

- The Canterbury Museum has yet to secure a funding agreement with Central Government for its funding share of the redevelopment project. Since the inception of the redevelopment project costs have escalated which exposes the project, Canterbury Museum and Councils to greater uncertainty and risk. Given the significant Crown contribution sought, we strongly encourage the Board to secure a funding agreement with the Crown. Should any material changes in funding apportionment be contemplated, this Council requests that the Canterbury Museum engages with the contributing authorities before the agreement is finalised.

- It has been a long-held belief of this Council that the wider Canterbury region should assist in the funding of the Canterbury Museum, and that the Canterbury Museum Act 1993 is deficient and outdated to provide for the future funding requirements of the Canterbury Museum. Pursuant to earlier submissions by this Council, the Canterbury Museum indicated that it will address the Canterbury Museum Act 1993, once the redevelopment and strengthening works have been undertaken. The delay in reviewing the Act exposes our Council to significant cost increases. Where the Canterbury Museum is signaling annual operating levy increases of 10 percent, and greater, immediately following the capital works, this cost could be otherwise reduced by sharing it more appropriately with other local authorities.

- The Council considers that the review of the Canterbury Museum Act 1993 should be considered in conjunction with the redevelopment and strengthening, so that funding of the Canterbury Museum is considered across a greater number of local authorities.
Conclusion

The Waimakariri District Council requests that the Canterbury Museum calls a meeting of all contributing authorities to address the issues raised in this letter.

The Council believes that the Board should:

- amend its draft 2019/20 Annual Plan to reflect the previously agreed funding apportionments, until a more comprehensive revision of the funding methodology, ownership responsibilities and operational costs can be determined;
- consult with the contributing authorities that allows sufficient time for those Councils to incorporate any proposals into their draft Annual Plans, to enable them to consult their communities;
- secure a funding agreement with Central Government for its share of the redevelopment project, and should the funding apportionment change from that currently signaled in the draft Annual Plan, that contributing authorities are consulted before the agreement is finalised; and
- re-consider the timing of the review of the Canterbury Museum Act 1993, including the consideration of increasing the number of contributing authorities that should be within the levy catchment area.

Should the Board convene a meeting, the Council would appreciate you allowing our Deputy Mayor, Kevin Felstead, and Jeff Millward, Manager Finance and Business Support to be present to outline our concerns.

Yours sincerely

Jim Palmer
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Cc Mayor, Christchurch City Council
Mayor Hurunui District Council
Mayor, Selwyn District Council
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report seeks the agreement of the Council to the renewal of the Council’s rates collection agreement with Environment Canterbury (ECan). (DVR is the District Valuation Roll.)

Attachments:
   i. Rates Collection Agreement (Trim 190619086625)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190619086630

(b) Agrees to the extension of the DVR and Rates Collection Agreement with Environment Canterbury for a term of 10 years from 1 July 2019, and authorises the Manager Finance and Business Support to sign the agreement on behalf of the Waimakariri District Council.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 ECan has an agreement with the Canterbury Councils to collect rates on its behalf. The current agreement expires on 30 June 2019, and ECan has provided a replacement agreement for the Council to sign.

3.2 Briefly, the arrangement is that WDC collects the rates set and assessed by ECan in this District on behalf of ECan and pays the rates collected quarterly following the due date of each instalment. This involves the rates calculation, administering remission and postponement policies, sending out assessments and invoices, answering basic enquiries, receipting and payment arrangements and recovery of unpaid rates.

3.3 Included in the agreement is the WDC’s statutory requirement under the Rating Valuations Act to provide a District Valuation Roll for ECan. While this is included in the rates collection agreement, Council would need to meet this statutory obligation regardless of whether any separate agreement is in place.
3.4 WDC receives a commission of 2% of the rates collected. In 2018/19 this amounts to $158,781.75. In addition ECan pays $37,274 towards the cost of providing the District Valuation Roll. This second amount is based on a formula in the Rating Valuations Act based on the proportion of rates collected. The budget for the Rates activity, less provision for discount was $752,700, therefore ECan meets 26% of the cost of the rates function.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The District Councils have collected rates on behalf of ECan since the Regional Council was set up in 1989. The arrangement brings savings to the District’s ratepayers who would otherwise have to pay a share of a separate rating administration.

4.2. Changes to the agreement are minor and mostly relate to the outcome of a Court decision in the Northland case. The agreement has been considered and approved by the Canterbury Finance Managers.

4.3. The commission rate has not changed. The dollar amount of commission received increases each year as the ECan rates take rises. There is provision in the agreement to review the commission in the fifth year of the ten year term.

4.4. This is a successful example of a shared service that is providing cost savings to the Community. An alternative rating system was reviewed under the shared service arrangement in 2018/19 in conjunction with Ernst Young. The result of the review recommended the current arrangement with some modifications and ongoing reviews. This includes a network of support between the Councils through the Canterbury Rating Officers Group.

4.5. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. Groups and Organisations – Not applicable

5.2. Wider Community – Not applicable

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. Financial Implications

If this agreement ended, there would be a loss of revenue of $196,055 in the rates budget, and while some cost savings would be made eg. printing and database maintenance, this would not come close to the value of lost revenue.

6.2. Community Implications

The advantage of cost savings to the community of a shared administration would be lost if this agreement ended.

6.3. Risk Management

Risk is low as WDC staff are administering ECan policies and are not in the position of making decisions on behalf of that Council. Any decisions to take ECan rates through the legal process (beyond judgment) are referred to ECan for approval.

6.4. Health and Safety - Not applicable
7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy
This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2. Legislation
Local Government (Rating) Act 2002
Section 53 – One or more local authorities may appoint collector

Rating Valuations Act 1998
Section 7 – Territorial authorities prepare and maintain district valuation rolls
Section 43 – Regional Councils to share costs of maintaining district valuation rolls

7.3. Community Outcomes Not applicable

7.4. Delegations
This type of arrangement is not specifically noted in the Delegations Manual. The previous contract was signed by the Manager Finance and Business Support in 2015.

Maree Harris
Customer Services Manager
DVR AND RATES COLLECTION AGREEMENT

Date: 

Parties

1. THE CANTERBURY REGIONAL COUNCIL, a Regional Council pursuant to the Local Government Act 2002
   ("ECan")

2. WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL, a Territorial Authority pursuant to the Local Government Act 2002
   ("District Council")

Background

A. The Rating Valuations Act 1998 requires (amongst other things) that:
   (i) The District Council prepare and maintain a district valuation roll for its district;
   (ii) The District Council, on request, provide ECan a copy of its district valuation roll without charge;
   (iii) ECan pay the District Council a share of the District Council's costs in preparing and maintaining the district valuation roll.

B. Under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 ECan may appoint a Local Authority to collect rates on ECan's behalf.

C. The District Council currently provides its district valuation roll and various rate collection services to ECan in the District. The parties wish to formalise this arrangement.

D. ECan has requested and the District Council has agreed that, the District Council will:
   (i) Maintain and provide to ECan the Rating Information Database and District Valuation Roll for the District; and
   (ii) Undertake rates collection and other related services on ECan's behalf in the District,
   on the terms set out in this agreement.

It is agreed:

1. INTERPRETATION

1.1 In this document the following terms have the following meanings (unless the context requires otherwise):

"Annual Plan" means the plan adopted by a Local Authority under section 95 of the Local Government Act 2002.

"Commencement Date" means 1 July 2019, or such other date as both parties may agree in writing.
"Commission" has the meaning given to it in clause 7.2.

"Default Interest Rate" means 5% per annum, calculated daily.

"District" means the geographical district governed by the District Council.

"District Council Rates Policies" has the meaning given to it in clause 4.3.

"DVR" or "District Valuation Roll" means the district valuation roll for the District as prepared and approved in accordance with the Rating Valuations Act 1998.

"ECan Rates" means the Rates assessed by ECan in accordance with the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 as payable by Ratepayers in the District.

"ECan Rates Policies" has the meaning given to it in clause 4.1.

"ECan Revenue" means all ECan Rates collected by the District Council on ECan's behalf during a Financial Year.

"Financial Year" means a year commencing on 1 July in one year and finishing on 30 June in the next year.

"GST" means goods and services tax charged in accordance with the Goods and Services Tax Act 1985.

"Instalment" means an instalment of Rates during a Financial Year.

"Long-term Plan" means that plan adopted by a Local Authority under section 93 of the Local Government Act 2002.

"RID" or "Rating Information Database" means the rating information database required to be kept by a local authority under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

"Rate" or "Rates" has the meaning given to it in the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

"Rates Assessment" has the meaning given to it in the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

"Rates Collection Services" has the meaning given to it in clause 3.2.

"Rates Invoice" has the meaning given to it in the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

"Ratepayer" means a ratepayer within the meaning of section 44.10 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

"Rates Record" has the meaning given to it in the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

"Rating Unit" has the meaning given to it in the Rating Valuations Act 1998.

"Representative" in relation to a party, means the person appointed as that party's representative under clause 14.1. At the commencement of this agreement, each party's Representative is the person named in Schedule 3.

"Term" has the meaning given to it in clause 10.1.

1.2 In this document (unless the context requires otherwise):
a. Reference to a Schedule is reference to a Schedule to this agreement, each of which forms a part of and is included in this agreement.

b. The singular includes the plural and the plural includes the singular.

c. Headings and the table of contents (if any) must be ignored in interpreting this document.

d. A reference to a person includes a partnership, a company formed under the Companies Act 1993, or any other kind of corporation.

e. A reference to a person includes (where applicable) its successors, personal representatives and permitted assigns.

f. A reference to a holding company, subsidiary company, or related company of a company has the same meaning as in the Companies Act 1993.

g. A reference to legislation includes a re-enactment of it, an amendment of it, and a replacement of it.

h. A reference to a document (including this document) includes the document as amended, supplemented, or novated from time to time.

2. RATING INFORMATION DATABASE AND DISTRICT VALUATION ROLL

2.1 Under section 27 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, ECan and the District Council are both required to maintain a RID in relation to the District. As permitted under section 27(7) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, ECan hereby delegates its obligations under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 to keep and maintain a RID for the District, to the District Council and the District Council accepts that delegation.

2.2 For the purposes of clause 2.1, the District Council will keep and maintain the RID for the District strictly in accordance with the requirements of section 27 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

2.3 To enable the District Council to fulfil its obligations under clause 2.2 and to perform the Rates Collection Services, ECan shall, for each Financial Year during the Term, provide the District Council with ECan’s:

a. Proposed general and targeted Rates as soon as reasonably practicable following approval of the draft ECan Annual Plan (or Long-term Plan, as the case may be) including those Rates; and

b. Confirmed general and targeted Rates for the District as soon as reasonably practicable following approval of those Rates in accordance with the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, including any differential rating categories and differential Rates adopted by ECan for the District,

and the District Council will update the RID with such information as required by section 27 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

2.4 As required by section 43(5) of the Rating Valuations Act 1998, the District Council will, without charge, provide ECan with a copy of the DVR as prepared and maintained by the District Council, which shall include the information required to enable ECan to meet its rating obligations under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

2.5 The District Council shall provide ECan with electronic access to the DVR and RID on the basis set out in Schedule 1 which shall include, together with the relevant
database information, such applications necessary to enable ECan to retrieve, manipulate and use that information so that (without limitation):

a. ECan is reasonably able to answer any enquiries it receives from Ratepayers or other persons in relation to ECan's Rates on any Rating Unit in the District; and

b. Generally, allows ECan to comply with its obligations under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 including, without limitation, ECan's disclosure requirements under section 28 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

2.6 ECan acknowledges that, as at the date of this agreement, the form of access described in Schedule 1 is sufficient to enable ECan to comply with its obligations under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002. In the event that ECan's requirements in relation to access to or the format of the DVR and RID change for any reason, the District Council will work with ECan in good faith to make such changes to the manner in which the DVR and RID (including any specific reports and data from the DVR or RID) are provided so that ECan is at all times able to meet its obligations under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

2.7 The cost of and responsibility to provide any computer hardware at ECan’s offices and to maintain any electronic communication system between the District Council and ECan for the purpose of giving effect to clause 2.5 will be the sole responsibility of ECan.

2.8 The District Council will supply to ECan, such reports and data extracted from the DVR and RID as ECan may request from time to time, including (without limitation):

a. Estimates of the Rating Key Values from the RID to allow ECan to prepare a draft Rate setting resolution for the purposes of section 23 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002; and

b. The actual Rating Key Values from the RID to allow ECan to set Rates within its Annual Plan or Long-Term Plan; and

c. A monthly report recording any changes in the DVR and RID; and

d. Full data files following any revaluation of a Rating Unit.

In this clause 2.8, “Rating Key Values” means the rateable value of Rating Units paying a particular Rate and the number of Rating Units paying uniform charge Rates as set by ECan. It also includes the expected Rate yield from each ECan Rate. The values will be either in draft and therefore estimates or actually based on the DVR as at 1 July in any year and based on the Rates as set in the Annual Plan or Long Term Plan adopted by ECan, depending on the time the values are given.

2.9 Where a data file is required under clause 2.8, access to the DVR and the RID will be provided by the District Council in the form of a SQL data file following receipt of a specified data file query report from ECan (or such other format as the parties may agree).

2.10 The District Council will make the Rates Record available to ECan at the same time and in the same manner as the RID and DVR.

2.11 ECan will be responsible for any public notification about its Rates that is required under section 23(3)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

2.12 Except as set out in this agreement, neither party will be deemed to assume or be responsible for any obligation the other party has under either the Local Government

3. **RATES COLLECTION SERVICES**

3.1 ECan hereby appoints the District Council under section 53 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, and the District Council accepts the appointment, to act as ECan's agent for the collection of ECan Rates in the District, during the Term of this agreement.

3.2 For the purpose of giving effect to clause 3.1 the District Council will provide the following Rates collection services in relation to ECan Rates ("Rates Collection Services"):  

   a. Maintain a Rates Record for each Rating Unit in the District that shall record, in addition to the information required under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Rates invoiced, credit notes issued, Rates paid, adjustments and balances owing in each case clearly showing the division between the Rates assessed by the District Council and ECan Rates;
   
   b. Issue all Rates Assessments and Rates Invoices (including without limitation, invoices for penalties owing on ECan Rates) to each Ratepayer in the District together with such other letters and debit and credit notes as may be required from time to time in relation to the assessment and collection of ECan Rates;
   
   c. Collect and receive payment of all ECan Rates on behalf of ECan and distribute the same to ECan in accordance with this agreement;
   
   d. Receive and process all enquiries, requests, objections and complaints by Ratepayers and any other person in relation to ECan Rates, the Rates Record and the processes for rating a unit.

3.3 The District Council shall provide the Rates Collection Services with the highest reasonable standard of care, diligence and skill and shall, at its own expense:

   a. Allocate sufficient and appropriately qualified and competent staff to enable it to properly fulfil its obligations under this agreement;
   
   b. Provide and maintain sufficient computer system resources and software to:
      
      i. Process and maintain the DVDDVR, RID and Rates Records; and
      
      ii. Process and keep records of all Ratepayer transactions and inquiries; and
   
      iii. Generally perform its obligations under this agreement.

3.4 ECan will process all enquiries it receives regarding the setting and assessment of ECan Rates and general questions about assessing its Rates. However, ECan may refer all inquiries for information regarding ECan Rates, the Rates Record and the processes for rating a unit that ECan receives to the District Council.

3.5 The District Council shall comply with all requirements under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 in relation to the Rates Collection Services.

3.6 The following procedures will apply to the issue of any Rates Assessments and Rates Invoices (and any other letters and debit and credit notes relating to ECan Rates) by the District Council on behalf of ECan (collectively referred to in this Part 3 as "notices"): 
a. The District Council shall have sole responsibility for the format, printing and distribution of all notices. The District Council must consider all reasonable requests made by ECan in relation to format but is not bound to comply with any such request where it is not reasonably practicable to do so, having regard to costs and the District Council’s obligations in relation to its own rating notices.

b. The District Council may issue a combined assessment and combined invoice for both the District Council’s Rates and ECan Rates, except in relation to any adjustment invoice or credit note that relates solely to ECan Rates. For the avoidance of doubt, the Rates Assessment for the District Council’s Rates and ECan Rates must be included in the same document.

c. The design of Rates Assessments and Rates Invoices will be based on the assumptions that:

i. The necessary Rates Assessment and Rates Invoice data specific to a Rating Unit is combined and will be printed on A4 paper, (including double-sided where reasonably necessary having regard to the information required);

ii. The Rates Assessment and Rates Invoice will be issued to Ratepayers in one envelope (size A4);

iii. Any non-rating information required by ECan to be included with a Rates Assessment or Rates Invoice will be:

A. supplied by ECan to the District Council at ECan’s own cost; and

B. provided as a separate attachment(s) which the District Council shall insert into the rates envelopes together with the Rates Assessment and/or Rates Invoice;

iv. ECan Rates will be assessed prior to delivery of the first Instalment of the District Council’s Rates Assessments. In the event that ECan is unable to comply with this requirement for any reason, the District Council may, in accordance with section 50 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, base the first Instalment of ECan Rates in that Financial Year on the previous year’s Rates.

4. RATES POLICIES: EARLY PAYMENT, REMISSION AND POSTPONEMENT

4.1 As at the date of this agreement, ECan has adopted, in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002 and the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the following policies in relation to the setting, collection, payment, discounting, remission and postponement of ECan Rates:

a. Rating policies for the setting, collection, payment and discounting of rates;

b. Early repayment of Rates in current Financial Year;

c. Early repayment of Rates in subsequent Financial Year;

d. Remission and postponement of Rates on Maori freehold land;

e. Rates remissions; and

f. Rates postponement.
Such policies are attached as Schedule 2 and are collectively referred to as "ECan Rates Policies".

4.2 The District Council will perform the Rates Collection Services in accordance with the ECan Rates Policies.

4.3 The District Council will provide ECan with a copy of the District Council's own policies in relation to each of the matters described in clause 4.1 ("District Council Rates Policies").

4.4 Each party will, to the extent reasonably practicable and subject always to the requirements of the Local Government Act 2002 and the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, endeavour to develop and maintain consistency between its and the other party’s respective Rates Policies.

4.5 Each party will advise the other party of any proposed amendment to its Rates Policies so that the other party may:
   a. Make submissions during the relevant special consultative procedure to influence the proposed amendment; and
   b. Take such steps as that party considers reasonably appropriate to maintain consistency between each party's Rates Policies.

4.6 Any amendment to ECan Rates Policies will become effective and must be complied with by the District Council once ECan has advised the District Council of the amended ECan Rates Policies.

4.7 To the extent that any District Council Rates Policy is, or becomes as the result of any change in policy by ECan or the District Council, different from the ECan Rates Policies the District Council shall apply the ECan Rates Policies in relation to all matters that affect ECan Rates.

4.8 The District Council may agree to a remission on or postponement of payment of ECan Rates provided:
   a. The remission or postponement that applies to the ECan Rates is the same as the remission or postponement that is applied to the District Council's Rates; and
   b. Granting the remission or postponement is consistent with the ECan Rates Policies in relation to remission and/or postponement of Rates (as the case may be); and

   b-c. The District Council has obtained ECan's prior written approval of the remission on or postponement of payment of ECan Rates.

In all other cases, no remission or postponement of ECan Rates may be agreed to without ECan's prior written consent. For the avoidance of doubt, ECan may require the District Council to grant a remission or postponement of payment of ECan Rates at any time.

4.9 Subject to ECan's Rates Policies (as amended from time to time):
   a. ECan will adopt the same discount policy for the early repayment of ECan Rates as the District Council adopts for the early repayment of the District Council's Rates; and
   b. The District Council will ensure that its discount policy is applied consistently for both ECan Rates and the District Council's own Rates.
5. **PAYMENT, COLLECTION AND PENALTIES PROCEDURES**

5.1 In each Financial Year ECan Rates:
   a. Shall be due and payable on such date or dates and in such number of Instalments as are fixed by ECan in its annual rate setting resolution. ECan will use reasonable endeavours to set these dates for consistency with the dates set by the District Council for payment of the District Council's Rates during that Financial Year;
   b. May be paid using such methods and at such venues as the District Council determines appropriate for the collection of the District Council's Rates.

5.2 On or before 15 April in each Financial Year, the District Council will advise ECan of:
   a. The number of Instalments allowed for payment of Rates and the relevant dates for payment of Rates in the subsequent Financial Year; and
   b. The number of and timing for Rates Assessment and Rates Invoice notices to be issued to Ratepayers in the subsequent Financial Year.

5.3 ECan will:
   a. Direct all Ratepayers to make payment of ECan Rates to the District Council; and
   b. Not offer Rates cash receipting or Rates direct crediting to any ECan bank account or permit postage of Rates payments to any ECan office.

In the event that payment of any ECan Rates is made direct to ECan, ECan will hold the payment on account and the equivalent amount may be deducted by the District Council from the next distribution of ECan Revenue to ECan.

5.4 Where ECan Rates and the District Council's Rates are invoiced in a combined invoice all amounts received by the District Council on account of the payment of Rates shall be applied against payment of the outstanding ECan Rates and the District Council Rates on a pro rata basis unless the relevant Ratepayer has specifically directed in writing that the payment made should be applied in a specific manner. In that case, the District Council shall apply the payment in accordance with the Ratepayer's instructions and update the Rating Record accordingly.

5.5 The District Council shall add an additional charge of 10% (referred to in this clause as a "Penalty") in accordance with ECan Rates Policies for non-payment of ECan Rates:
   a. On the unpaid balance of any Instalment levied in the current Financial Year; and
   b. On the unpaid balance of any Instalment levied in the previous Financial Year, including any additional charges previously imposed which remain unpaid.

Any Penalty received by the District Council in respect of ECan Rates will be held by it for the account of ECan and distributed to ECan in accordance with Part 8.

5.6 Where any ECan Rates remain unpaid after the due date for payment, the District Council shall take such action for recovery of those Rates (including, without limitation, commencing legal proceedings for recovery of the unpaid amount) that the District Council would take in relation to recovery of its own Rates.
5.7 Nothing in clause 5.6 authorises the District Council to commence any rating sale or lease procedures or exercise any power under section 68 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 in relation to the recovery of any ECan Rates without ECan’s prior written consent. If ECan grants approval for commencement of any rating sale or lease action, the District Council shall carry out the processes necessary to conduct the rating sale or lease at its own cost in all respects. Nothing in this clause 5.7 shall prevent the District Council from taking any such action in relation to the recovery of the District Council’s own Rates.

6. GENERAL OBLIGATIONS

6.1 Each party shall comply with the provisions of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Local Government Act 2002 and the Rating Valuations Act 1998 in performance of its obligations under this agreement. To the extent of any inconsistency between a party’s obligations under those Acts and its obligations under this agreement, a party shall comply with its obligations under the relevant Act.

6.2 Each party shall:
   a. Maintain appropriate privacy procedures to ensure the protection of all personal information contained in the DVR, RID or the Rates Record in accordance with the Privacy Act 1993; and
   b. Comply with the Domestic Violence Act 1995 and where requested by any person named or identified within the DVR, hold that identification separate from the balance of the DVR, RID or Rates Record data. Where a request under the Domestic Violence Act 1995 is received by one party, that party shall advise the other party’s Representative and the other party will update its records accordingly.

6.3 The District Council shall:
   a. Keep full, up-to-date and accurate records relating to all services performed by it under this agreement.
   b. Upon request, provide ECan or its duly appointed agent, free of charge, at the District Council’s premises, access to all relevant data, systems, and procedures relating to performance of this agreement.
   c. Upon ECan giving 5 working days’ notice (or less where this is agreed by both parties) provide ECan a copy of, or permit ECan to inspect at the District Council’s offices, such records and accounts as may be required to enable the ECan to satisfy itself that the District Council has complied with the provisions of this agreement.

6.4 ECan shall:
   a. Use its reasonable endeavours to ensure that all information provided by it to the District Council for the purpose of this agreement is accurate (to the best of ECan’s knowledge) and complies with the requirements of the Local Government Act 2002 and the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.
   b. Provide such assistance and co-operation as the District Council may reasonably request from time to time to allow the District Council to perform its obligations under this agreement.
7. **PAYMENT AND INVOICING**

7.1 ECAn shall pay the District Council a proportion of the District Council's costs for preparing and maintaining the DVR on the basis set out in section 43 of the Rating Valuations Act 1998. If the parties cannot agree the amount payable by ECAn, the parties shall refer their dispute for resolution in accordance with clause 15.3.

7.2 In consideration of the District Council's performance of all services under this agreement, the District Council will receive a commission equal to 2% of all ECAn Revenue (GST incl) collected by the District Council in each Financial Year during the Term of this agreement ("Commission"). The Commission calculated under this clause 7.2 is inclusive of GST.

7.3 In each Financial Year, the Commission will be payable by ECAn in such number of periodic payments as correspond with the number of Instalments the District Council applies for the payment of Rates ("payment period").

7.4 The amount of Commission due for each payment period will be:

   a. Calculated on completion of the relevant Instalment as a percentage of the ECAn Revenue payable to ECAn under clause 8.2(b) for that Instalment; and
   
   b. Payable by ECAn at the same time the District Council pays ECAn Revenue to ECAn under clause 8.2(b).

ECAn hereby authorises the District Council to automatically deduct the amount of Commission payable by it from the amount of ECAn Revenue payable by the District Council to ECAn under clause 8.2(b).

7.5 For the avoidance of doubt, the Commission includes payment for all disbursements, costs and expenses (including legal fees) incurred by the District Council in performance of the Rate Collection Services during the relevant payment period, unless specifically provided otherwise in this agreement.

7.6 The parties may review the Commission structure at the fifth anniversary of the Commencement Date ("review date"). If the District Council wishes to review the Commission structure, the District Council must provide no more than one calendar month's written notice to ECAn prior to the review date. If the District Council provides this notice:

   a. The notice must include the District Council's proposed changes to the Commission structure, together with documentation showing the District Council's costs and the ECAn Revenue collected by the District Council in the previous Financial Year to support the District Council's proposed changes.
   
   b. On receipt of that notice the parties will meet and discuss the proposed changes in good faith.
   
   c. Any agreed changes to the Commission structure must be recorded in writing as a variation to this agreement and will take effect from the review date or any other date agreed by the parties.
   
   d. If the parties cannot agree on any changes to the Commission structure by the review date, the Commission structure in this agreement will remain unchanged.

7.7 The District Council must provide ECAn with a quote for any additional fees it proposes to charge ECAn as a result of any proposed changes the District Council wishes to make to its systems. This quote must be approved by ECAn before any additional fees are charged (such approval not to be unreasonably withheld).
The District Council shall provide ECan with a GST invoice in relation to any amount due for payment by ECan under this agreement not less than 5 working days prior to the due date of that payment.

Where GST is payable in relation to any amount due for payment by either party under this agreement, the GST amount will be due and payable at the same time and in the same manner as the amount to which that GST relates.

If a party fails to pay any amount due under this agreement within 10 working days following the last date or penalty date for that payment (other than because of a default by the other party), the non-defaulting party may, without prejudice to its other rights and remedies, require the defaulting party to pay interest on that money at the Default Interest Rate. That interest:

a. Will be payable for the period from when the money was due until the money and all interest on it is paid; and
b. Will be calculated on a daily basis.

8. DISTRIBUTION OF ECAN RATES TO ECAN

The District Council shall maintain a separate current account in ECan's name ("ECan Current Account") and shall hold all ECan Revenue it receives on trust for ECan in such a manner that it can, at all times, be clearly identified as being for the account of ECan.

The District Council will distribute ECan Rates to ECan as follows:

a. Unless otherwise agreed by ECan, the District Council shall credit the ECan's Current Account with the ECan Revenue received by the District Council within 5 working days following the date of receipt of that ECan Revenue.

b. The District Council shall, no later than seven working days after the last date of or penalty date for each Instalment, distribute to ECan, by way of direct credit to such bank account as ECan may advise in writing from time to time, an amount equal to:
   
i. The total amount of ECan Revenue held by the District Council in the ECan Current Account at the close of business on the due date of that Instalment;

   less an amount equal to:
   
   ii. The District Council's Commission for that Instalment period.

All distributions of ECan Revenue to ECan will be treated as GST inclusive unless directed to the contrary by the Department of Inland Revenue. The District Council will collect, hold and pay over to ECan the GST amount on all ECan Rates in the same manner and at the same times as it does for the ECan Rates. For the avoidance of doubt, the District Council has no liability or obligation to pay or account for GST to the Department of Inland Revenue on ECan's behalf.

At the end of each Financial Year the District Council will carry out a wash up of amounts received and amounts paid under this agreement on the following basis:

a. By 15 June for the period 1 July to 31 May (inclusive); and
b. By 15 July for the period 1 June to 30 June (inclusive),

the District Council will calculate:
i. all ECan Revenue actually received by the District Council;

ii. the ECan Revenue paid to ECan;

iii. the amount of Commission owing to the District Council; and

iv. the amount of Commission credited to the District Council,

for the relevant period and will:

v. invoice ECan for the amount of any excess payment of ECan Revenue or shortfall in payment of Commission to the District Council; and

vi. credit ECan's bank account with the amount of any shortfall payment in ECan Revenue or excess payment of Commission to the District Council.

8.5 The District Council will provide ECan with a full written report of each wash up under clause 8.4 by the relevant due date for that wash up.

9. REPORTING

9.1 The District Council will:

   a. Keep ECan fully informed of the District Council's activities in relation to performance of this agreement including reporting all material breaches of this agreement, relevant legislation or other issues that arise; and

   b. Promptly give ECan any reports or information ECan reasonably requests regarding the rates process.

9.2 Without limiting clause 9.1, the District Council will provide ECan with the following written reports:

   a. By the 20th of November and 20th of May in each Financial Year: a biannual balance of the ECan Current Account. Any residual payment due to ECan will be made by that date; and

   b. Within 10 working days following the due date of each Instalment a detailed report describing the following in relation to the relevant rating period:

      i. Opening ECan Rates debtors balance as at 1 July;

      ii. ECan Rates received leveried (including details of payments made in advance and payments in arrears);

      iii. Penalties received applied;

      iv. ECan Rates write offs applied;

      v. Discounts and remissions provided;

      vi. Remissions provided;

      vii. Any other adjustments undertaken;

      viii. ECan Rates received (including details of payments made in advance and payments in arrears);

      ix. ECan Rates in arrears (showing amounts for the current rating year and any previous rating year);
x. Any legal action commenced for recovery of ECan Rates;

xi. Closing ECan Rates debtors balance. Any change to the 30 June closing balance must be recorded in the appropriate categories referred to in this clause;

xii. The total ECan Revenue payable to ECan for that period;

xiii. The total Commission payable to the District Council for that period; and

xiv. Any amount held by the District Council in respect of ECan Rates and not paid to ECan.

10. TERM AND TERMINATION

10.1 This agreement shall commence on the Commencement Date and shall continue in full force and effect until 30 June 2029, unless terminated earlier by either party in accordance with clause 10.2 ("Term").

10.2 This agreement may be terminated at any time:

a. By ECan giving not less than 6-12 months’ prior written notice to the District Council; and

b. By the District Council giving not less than 12 months’ prior written notice to ECan,

Provided that:

c. Neither party may give notice under this clause 10.2 at any time prior to the first anniversary of the Commencement Date.

d. The anticipated date of termination must correspond with the end of a Financial Year.

10.3 If the District Council, a party (the "defaulting party") breaches any material obligation under this agreement and where such obligation is capable of remedy, fails to remedy that breach within 10 working days after ECan, the other party (the "non-defaulting party") has given it notice in writing specifying the breach, or, after receiving that notice, it remedies the breach but commits the same or a similar breach within three months after the notice was given then ECan, the non-defaulting party may, by written notice to the District Council, cancel this agreement.

10.4 The District Council shall, in the six months prior to the expiry or termination of this agreement and following the expiry or termination of this agreement, co-operate fully with ECan and, where appropriate, any third party service provider appointed by ECan to replace the District Council as service provider, to facilitate the transfer to and provision by ECan (or such third party) of the District Council's obligations under this agreement. The District Council shall (without limitation):

a. Provide ECan with access to the District Council's systems, equipment, documents, information relating to the performance of this agreement;

b. Transfer to ECan in such format as ECan may require, all reports, registers, records and data held by the District Council in relation to each Rating Unit and Ratepayer in the District and provide such other assistance as ECan may reasonably require to enable ECan to access and use those reports, registers, records and data; and
c. Provide ECan access to and facilitate co-operation by any subcontractor responsible for performance of any part of the District Council’s obligations under this agreement.

10.5 Termination of this agreement howsoever caused shall:

a. Be without prejudice to any obligations or rights of either party accrued prior to such termination; and

b. Not affect any provision of this agreement which is expressly or by implication intended to come into effect on, or to continue in effect after such termination.

11. CONFIDENTIALITY AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

11.1 Each party shall treat as confidential all information obtained as a result of negotiating, entering into and carrying out this agreement and which relates to:

a. The provisions of this agreement;

b. The negotiations relating to this agreement;

c. Any information provided to or obtained by that party in relation to the collection, payment and processing of Rates by the other party, where such information is not already in the public domain.

11.2 Neither party shall:

a. Disclose any confidential information to any person other than its officers or employees who need to know such information in order to discharge their duties; or

b. Use any confidential information other than for the purpose for which it was disclosed or to the extent reasonably required in order to give effect to the terms of this agreement.

11.3 Each party shall ensure that any person to whom confidential information is disclosed by it complies with the restrictions set out in this Part 11 as if that person were a party to this agreement.

11.4 Notwithstanding the previous provisions of this Part 11, either party may disclose any confidential information:

a. If and to the extent required by law or for the purpose of any judicial proceedings;

b. To its professional advisers, auditors and bankers; or

c. If and to the extent the information has come into the public domain through no fault of that party.

11.5 Neither party shall make any public announcement concerning any matter arising in relation to the operation agreement without the prior written approval of the other party. However, nothing in this clause 11.5 shall prohibit either party from making any announcement which it is legally required to make.

11.6 The restrictions contained in this Part 11 shall continue to apply to each party without limit in time.
12. LIABILITY AND INDEMNITY

12.1 Subject to clause 12.2 and clause 12.3, each party (the "indemnifying party") will indemnify the other party against any damages, costs, claims, liabilities or expenses the other party suffers or incurs as a result of:

a. Any breach by the indemnifying party of its obligations under this agreement;

b. Any reckless, negligent or fraudulent act or omission by the indemnifying party or its employees or agents in the performance of that party's obligations under this agreement; or

c. Any breach by the indemnifying party of its obligations under any laws in relation to the matters contemplated by this agreement.

12.2 Neither party is liable to the other for any loss of profit, or any indirect or consequential loss, damage or liability of any kind howsoever arising (including, without limitation, loss of business opportunity or any special or punitive damages).

12.3 Clause 12.1(a) shall not apply to any breach that the indemnifying party can show was reasonably necessary for the purpose of compliance by it with any statutory obligation that it is (or was at the time of the breach) subject to.

12.4 The indemnifying party will provide the other party with notice of any breach (or anticipated breach) referred to in clause 12.3 as soon as it becomes aware of a conflict and will use its best endeavours to cooperate with the other party to minimise the effect of that breach.

13. FORCE MAJEURE

13.1 Subject to this Part 13 but not any other provisions of this agreement neither party is liable for non-performance of any of its obligations (other than to pay money) under this agreement during the time and to the extent that performance is materially prevented by force majeure.

13.2 The party claiming the benefit of this Part 13 ("the party claiming") must:

a. Promptly give written notice to the other party specifying:

i. the cause and extent of its inability to perform any of its obligations; and

ii. the likely duration of the non-performance; and

b. In the meantime, take all reasonable steps to remedy or reduce the force majeure and/or its effects.

13.3 No party is required against its will to settle any strike, lockout or other industrial disturbances.

13.4 Performance of any obligation affected by force majeure will be resumed as soon as reasonably possible after the termination or reduction of the force majeure. If a party is unable to perform any obligation under this agreement for a period of 30 days because of force majeure the other party may, on giving 5 days written notice to that party cancel this agreement.

13.5 Cancellation of this agreement under clause 13.4 does not prejudice the rights of either party arising before cancellation.

13.6 In this Part 13, "force majeure" means any:
a. Act of God, fire, earthquake, storm, flood or landslide;
b. Strike, lockout, work stoppage or other labour hindrance;
c. Explosion, public mains electrical supply failure, or nuclear accident;
d. Sabotage, riot, civil disturbance, insurrection, epidemic, national emergency (whether in fact or law) or act of war (whether declared or not);
e. Requirement of restriction of, or failure to act by, any government semi-governmental or judicial entity;
f. Unavoidable accident;
g. Unavoidable delay in obtaining or, inability to obtain adequate labour, contractors, equipment, materials, transport or supplies;
h. Any computer related problem if the problem occurs as the result of a defect in any equipment or software program which is not owned or operated by the party claiming;
i. Any other similar cause beyond the reasonable control of the party claiming and which that party is unable to overcome at reasonable cost;

but does not include:

j. Any risk or event which the party affected could have prevented or overcome by taking reasonable care (including taking out appropriate insurance); or

k. A lack of funds for any reason.
l. Any computer related problem, if the problem occurs as the result of a defect in any equipment or software program owned or operated by the party claiming.

13.7 The party claiming must prove force majeure exists and has satisfied all its obligations under this Part 13.

14. APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES

14.1 Each party shall appoint a senior manager with sufficient decision making authority for determining operational matters relating to this agreement to act as that party's first point of contact and representative for all matters concerning the operation of this agreement (each a "Representative").

14.2 Either party may change its Representative by notice in writing to the other party.

14.3 The initial Representative of each party is described in Schedule 3.

15. DISPUTES

15.1 Initial discussion

a. If a dispute arises out of or in connection with this agreement, but not any attempted re-negotiation of this agreement, (the "Dispute"), the parties must promptly give full written particulars of the dispute to each other and each party's Representative must promptly meet to discuss and try to resolve the dispute.
b. The discussions held between the parties under this clause 15.1, and any material disclosed during the course of them, will be without prejudice to each parties’ rights and confidential.

15.2 Mediation

a. If the dispute is not resolved following the process in clause 15.1 within 20 working days, the Dispute must be referred to mediation following this process:

i. the referral to mediation is commenced by a party giving written notice to the other party that the Dispute is to be referred to mediation;

ii. there will be a single mediator appointed by agreement between the parties or, if they cannot agree, then at the request of a disputing party, the President of the New Zealand Law Society or the President’s nominee will appoint the mediator;

iii. the guidelines governing the mediation will be set by the mediator and be binding on the parties;

iv. each party to the mediation will pay its own costs and an equal share of the mediator’s costs;

v. the mediation process and any material disclosed as part of it will be without prejudice to each parties’ rights and confidential.

b. If the Dispute is not resolved by the mediation the disputing parties must then refer the Dispute to a single arbitrator for arbitration under the Arbitration Act 1996 in accordance with clause 15.3.

15.3 Arbitration

a. If the Dispute is to be referred to arbitration then the following will apply:

i. the referral to arbitration occurs by, after the failure of the mediation process in clause 15.2, a party giving written notice to the other party that the mediation process has failed and the Dispute is to be referred to arbitration;

ii. the Dispute will be referred to a single arbitrator appointed by agreement between the parties or, if they cannot agree, then at the request of a disputing party, the President of the New Zealand Law Society or the President’s nominee will appoint the mediator;

iii. the arbitration will be conducted pursuant to the Arbitration Act 1996, except that the arbitrator will not have the power in article 3(1)(a) of Schedule 2 of the Arbitration Act 1996 to adopt an inquisitorial process;

iv. the arbitration process and any material disclosed as part of it will be confidential.

b. The arbitration shall be commenced by a party serving written notice on the other parties stating the subject matter and details of the Dispute and requiring the Dispute to be referred to arbitration. The arbitrator shall be appointed by the parties, or failing agreement within 5 Business Days, working days after, and exclusive of, the date of service of the written notice shall be appointed at the request of a party by the President or vice-president for the time being of the New Zealand Law Society or the President's
nominee of such president or vice-president. The arbitration shall be conducted as soon as possible at a location determined by the arbitrator, the registered office of the Company in accordance with the Rules in Schedules 1 and 2 of the Arbitration Act 1996, the provisions of the arbitration statutes for the time being in force in New Zealand.

c. The procedure and time frame for the arbitration will otherwise be determined by the arbitrator.

d. The decision of the arbitrator will be binding on the parties.

15.4 Legal proceedings

The parties must use the mediation and arbitration procedures in this Part 15 before issuing any legal proceedings. However, this does not apply to:

a. A dispute arising in connection with any attempted re-negotiation of this agreement; or

b. An application by a party for urgent interlocutory relief; or

c. A claim for a liquidated debt.

16. NOTICES

16.1 All notices under this document must be sent by registered mail (postage prepaid) or by hand delivery as follows:

a. In the case of ECan to:
   Director Finance and Corporate Services
   Canterbury Regional Council
   5 Sir William Pickering Drive200 Tuam Street
   PO Box 345
   Christchurch 8140

b. In the case of the District Council to:
   Waimakariri District Council
   Private Bag 1005
   Rangiora 7440
   Rangiora Service Centre (03) 313 4432
   Kaiapoi Service Centre (03) 327 2873
   Oxford Service Centre (03) 312 4833

16.2 A party may, by giving written notice to the other or others, change its address or facsimile number for notices to another address or facsimile number in New Zealand.

16.3 All notices will be deemed to have been given:

a. If mailed, two 5 working days after being deposited in the mail by the sender;

b. If delivered by hand, upon delivery;

c. If faxed, upon a satisfactory transmission report being generated by the sender.
17. **ASSIGNMENT / SUB-CONTRACTING**

17.1 Neither party may assign its rights under this agreement without the other party's prior written consent (which may be withheld for any reason).

17.2 The District Council may not sub-contract the whole, or any part of this agreement, without the prior written consent of ECan, such consent not to be unreasonably withheld where:

   a. The services to be sub-contracted (taking into account any other sub-contracting arrangement previously approved under this agreement) do not represent the whole, or a significant portion of the whole, of the District Council's obligations under this agreement;
   
   b. The proposed sub-contractor is suitably qualified, financially stable and able to perform the services required of it in relation to this agreement; and
   
   c. The appointment of the sub-contractor would not constitute a breach by either party of the delegation restrictions under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 or the Local Government Act 2002.

18. **MISCELLANEOUS**

18.1 If a provision of this agreement (or any part of a provision) is held to be invalid, illegal, or unenforceable, this will not affect any other provision of this agreement.

18.2 A failure or delay in exercising a party's right under this agreement will not be a waiver of that right. A waiver of a party's right under this agreement will not be effective unless it is in writing. A waiver of a party's right on one occasion will not constitute a waiver of that right or a similar right on any other occasion.

18.3 Each party must, at its cost, execute and deliver all documents and do all other things reasonably necessary for the proper and complete performance of its obligations under this agreement.

18.4 This agreement may be executed in any number of counterpart copies which taken together will be deemed to form the same document.

18.5 This agreement will be deemed to be executed by a party if that party has executed an original, a facsimile copy, or a photocopy of it.

18.6 This agreement may be executed and delivered in any number of counterparts, including by way of electronic transmission where a party signs a counterpart and sends it as a PDF to the other party by email. All such counterparts, when taken together, shall constitute one and the same document.

18.7 The law of New Zealand applies to this agreement and the transactions contemplated by it. The courts of New Zealand have jurisdiction in respect of this agreement and the transactions contemplated by it.

---

**SIGNED by**

CANTERBURY REGIONAL COUNCIL

after the schedule(s) (if any)

) X ________________

Authorised Person

) X ________________

Authorised Person
SIGNED by
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL
after the schedule(s) (if any)

) X ___________________________
)  Authorised Person

) X ___________________________
)  Authorised Person
SCHEDULE 1
TERMS OF ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO DVR AND RID

1. NCS format; and
2. SQL format
   provided on a portable media device sufficient to allow ECan to upload, use and manipulate the information
SCHEDULE 2
ECAN RATES POLICIES
SCHEDULE 3
DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVES

Environment Canterbury – Miles McConway
Waimakariri District Council – Jeff Millward
DVR AND RATE COLLECTION AGREEMENT

THE CANTERBURY REGIONAL COUNCIL
ECan

WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL
District Council
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report presents the 2019 Pre-Election Report (PER) to the Council for their information.

**Attachments:**

i. Waimakariri District Council Pre-Election Report 2019 (Trim 190620086739)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190618085424.

(b) **Notes and receives** the 2019 Pre-Election Report.

(c) **Notes** the 2019 Pre-Election Report is required to be prepared and available for potential electoral candidates two weeks prior to nomination closure. It will be available from 8 July 2019, noting a Candidate Information Evening is being held on 9 July 2019.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The 2010 Amendments to the Local Government Act added a requirement to prepare a Pre-Election Report (PER) as part of the 'transparency, accountability and financial management' package of reforms. The purpose of a PER is to provide information to promote public discussion about the issues facing the local authority during the 2019 local body election.

3.2 During March 2019 the Local Government Regulatory Systems Amendment Bill amended the statutory list of responsibilities of Chief Executives set out in section 42(2) of the Local Government Act. It added a new subsection 42(2)(da) which establishes that the Chief Executive is responsible to their local authority for “facilitating and fostering representative and substantial elector participation in elections and polls held under the Local Electoral Act 2001”. The Bill added a new principle to those listed in section 4(1) of the Local Electoral Act which reads “representative and substantial electoral participation in local elections and polls”.
3.3 The Pre-Election Report brings together information previously published in Council’s Ten Year (Long Term) Plan, Annual Plans, Annual Reports and associated summaries.

3.4 The PER is an obligation placed specifically on the Chief Executive. It must not have any statements by, or photographs of an elected member. The Council does not have to adopt it before it can be published.

3.5 Staff consulted the SOLGM Pre-Election Report Guidelines, during production of the document.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. In March 2019 legislative changes placed greater responsibility for promoting participation in the democratic process on the Chief Executive. The PER is seen as a mechanism for that to occur.

4.2. Projects have been selected based upon the significant dollar spend, major projects identified each year and key projects identified in the Long Term Plan and 2019/20 Annual Plan.

4.3. A summary of the mandatory information to be included in the document is outlined in the tables, taken from the SOLGM Pre-Election Report Guidelines.

Figure 1: Mandatory disclosures in a pre-election report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retrospective information</th>
<th>Prospective information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• funding impact statements for election year -3 and election year -2 (from the annual reports) and either an estimated FIS for election year -1 or the FIS from the annual report for that year</td>
<td>• funding impact statements for election year +1, election year +2, and election year +3 (from the LTP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• summary balance sheets for election year -3 and election year -2 (from the annual plan) and either an estimate FIS for election year -1 or data from the annual plan for that year</td>
<td>• summary balance sheets for election year +1, election year +2, and election year +3 (from the LTP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a report on compliance with the financial strategy</td>
<td>• major projects for the election year +1, election year +2, and election +3 (no source legislatively specified but in most instances will be the LTP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a report comparing the actual and target returns on investments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2016/17 (-3) | 2017/18 (-2) | 2018/19 (-1) | 2019/20 (election year) | 2020/21 (+1) (LTP) | 2021/22 (+2) | 2022/23 (+3) |
4.4. In preparing the PER, more information has been included than is required by the Act.

4.5. The PER is legislatively required to be available to all candidates two weeks before nominations close, being 2 August 2019, however it will be available on the web and in hard copy format from Monday 8 July. This availability coincides with a candidate information evening being held for perspective electoral candidates on Tuesday 9 July, at 7pm in the Council Chamber.

4.6. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations
   Community views were not sought, as this is a document for community information.

5.2. Wider Community
   Community views were not sought as this is a document for community information.
   The purpose of a pre-election report is to provide information to potential candidate, and promote and stimulate public discussion about the issues facing the local authority.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications
   There are no financial implications for Council arising from the Pre-Election Report.

6.2. Community Implications
   There are no community implications for Council arising from the Pre-Election Report.

6.3. Risk Management
   There are no risk management implications for Council arising from the Pre-Election Report.

6.4. Health and Safety
   There are no health and safety implications for Council arising from the Pre-Election Report.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy
   This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2. Legislation
   Local Electoral Act 2001 section 4(1).

7.3. Community Outcomes
   The Pre-election Report contributes to the outcome:
There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by public organisations that affects our District

- Public organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available.

- Public organisations make every effort to accommodate the views of people who contribute to consultations.
2019.
Pre-Election Report
Basis of preparation

This report is being released in the pre-election period. Special care has been taken to ensure that it is politically neutral.

It is presented as an apolitical document, and is not a manifesto, either in whole or in part, for any candidate or political grouping taking part in the election campaign.

While this report has not been audited, much of the information presented has been sourced from audited reports. For example, the first two years’ retrospective financial data has been audited as it has been taken directly from the respective annual reports.

Photography by Aaron Campbell Photography, Spraydrift Digital Media and Nicola Hunt.
Waimakariri as a District has undergone significant change over the past ten years – and looking ahead a further ten, this appears set to continue.

This pre-election report is to provide information, and a snapshot of where the District is heading to, our community and those interested in standing for Council or a Community Board.

Councils across the country put these reports together in the interests of promoting discussion about the challenges facing the Council during the 2019 local body election campaign.

This pre-election report brings together information previously published in Council’s Long Term Plans, Annual Plans, Annual Reports and associated summaries, which have been independently audited.

Every three years Council prepares a Long Term Plan, which outlines the work programme and financial implications for ten years.

Council will prepare the next Long Term Plan for 2021-2031 which will review work, priorities and budgets set in the current Long Term Plan.

The financial summaries provide historic information for the 2016/17, and 2017/18 financial years and planned financial information for 2018/19, 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22, and 2022/23 financial years.

The key issues facing the Council continue to be influenced by recovery from the Canterbury earthquakes and accelerated population growth.

Although some of the costs associated with the Canterbury earthquake rebuild were met from insurance and others from borrowing, the ongoing servicing costs of these loans will be met from rates for the next ten years and beyond.

With a residential population expected to reach 75,000 by 2028, and most of the growth anticipated in the eastern area of the District, planning and catering for growth remains a priority issue for the Council.

While growth brings challenges from an infrastructure perspective, it also brings with it a lot of opportunity in the form of new investment, talent, businesses and jobs - which all play a part in building a more exciting and vibrant District.

While catering for growth is important, so is the need to ensure we have a healthy environment. Accordingly, the Council is increasing its focus on sustainability, improving water quality in the District and considering the effects of climate change.

You’ll see more information about what’s been done, what we’re currently doing and what work is planned under the Key Projects section of this report.

Financially the Council is in a strong position - the percentage of rates revenue applied to service debt is currently 13.2% and is forecast in the Long Term Plan to peak at 15.3%. This is well within the 25% limit imposed by Council’s Financial Strategy and that of the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency.

The Council’s Annual Reports and Long Term Plan provide more detail on the financial information contained in this Pre Election report.

The above documents can be found at: waimakariri.govt.nz/your council/council-finances.aspx
The Waimakariri District Council is comprised of:

Four Community Boards representing the community comprised of:

- **Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board**
  - 5 members + 2 councillors
  - from Kaiapoi-Woodend Ward

- **Woodend-Sefton Community Board**
  - 5 members + 2 councillors
  - from Kaiapoi-Woodend Ward

- **Oxford-Ohoka Community Board**
  - 6 members + 2 councillors
  - from Oxford-Ohoka Ward

- **Rangiora-Ashley Community Board**
  - 8 members + 4 councillors
  - from Rangiora-Ashley Ward

A Mayor

**Responsibility of the Council and Community Boards:**

The Council is responsible for the overall governance of the District Council. It sets Council policy and monitors its implementation.

The Community Boards seek and represent their community’s views and advocate for the interests of their community. The Boards also make decisions related to community issues where authority has been delegated to the Boards from the Council.

**Local authority elections take place every three years on the second Saturday in October.**

This year, the election will be held on Saturday 12 October 2019. The elections are held under the requirements of the Local Electoral Act 2001, The Local Electoral Regulations 2001, and the Local Government Act 2002.

**Key dates**

- **JULY 19**: Nominations open
- **AUGUST 16**: Nominations close (closes 12 noon)
- **SEPTEMBER 20-27**: Delivery of voting documents
- **SEPTEMBER 20**: Voting period
- **OCTOBER 12**: Election Day (voting closes 12 noon)
- **OCTOBER 17**: Official result declaration

**District ward map**
## A Snapshot of the District

### Waimakariri OUR STRENGTHS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Waimakariri</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People who rate their quality of life as good or extremely good</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>81% Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are more than satisfied with local community facilities</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>67% Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and annual growth</td>
<td>60,700</td>
<td>624,000 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP/Economic growth measure</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.3% Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household income</td>
<td>$104,200</td>
<td>$100,900 Canterbury average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 average house cost</td>
<td>$444,818</td>
<td>$680,062 National average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average weekly rent</td>
<td>$394</td>
<td>$442 National average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.3% National average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of working age people employed</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>68.2% Canterbury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures sourced from Infometrics December 2018, Regional Economy ACTIVITY Report: LAWA and 2018 Canterbury Wellbeing Survey*
Community Outcomes describe how Waimakariri District Council aims to achieve meeting the current and future needs of our communities with good-quality local infrastructure, providing local public services and performance of regulatory functions.

Community outcomes set the direction for our Long Term Plan (LTP) and all activities included in the 2015-2025 LTP that the Council undertakes contribute towards achieving these outcomes. The key groups of activities that contribute to each outcome are displayed.
Since 2009

Key highlights include:

- Providing temporary housing and accommodation across the District for displaced residents and businesses
- Creating two new wastewater pumping stations for Kaiapoi
- Designing and rebuilding the Kaiapoi Wharf
- Designing and building Courtney Drive and new link road in Kaiapoi East
- Rebuilding and redesigning the Rangiora Town Hall
- Designing and building the Oxford Library and Service Centre
- Designing and building the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre
- Working with residents to enable a successful rebuild of town centres, townships, villages and community facilities
- Upgrading the Ashley Bridge
- Working with building owners across the District to make sure buildings meet standards of the Earthquake Amendment Act 2016. There are under five buildings remaining that don't meet standards.

The Waimakariri is a District that has undergone a significant amount of change in a short period of time – most recently due to the Canterbury earthquakes.

However, what was expected to be a growth bubble as people moved out of Christchurch we now understand is a trend. More and more people move to the District attracted by the semi-rural and relaxed lifestyle offered here. You would have seen some of the compelling reasons on the previous ‘Snapshot of the District’ page.

When the Council was founded in 1989 the District had approximately 30,000 residents. Today the Waimakariri is home to over 60,000 residents and we anticipate we will reach near to 100,000 residents in another 30.

Over the last ten years our focus has primarily been on earthquake recovery and adapting to the challenges inherent with the natural disasters and accompanying growth spurt.

On the ground this has meant the Waimakariri District Council has undertaken a significant amount of infrastructure.
OUR FUTURE.

As a District we’re moving from a focus on recovery to planning how best we cater for anticipated growth.

A large degree of this is making sure we look at how we can take better care of the environment, encourage social wellbeing, prepare as best as possible for natural hazards and provide a positive social and economic environment for our residents and businesses.

Some of this work is already underway.

In our 2018-2028 Long Term Plan we committed to some significant projects which will make Waimakariri an even greater place for us all to live in.

To date we have:

✓ Updated the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016. This provides an integrated planning framework for the coastal area between the Waimakariri and Ashley-Rakahuri estuaries.
✓ Adopted the Canterbury Water Management Strategy’s Waimakariri Zone Committee’s Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) in December 2018. The ZIPA ultimately aims to improve the quality of local waterways and includes a range of actions. Council’s response is to spend $300,000 per year to contribute to some of the on-ground outcomes.
✓ Adopted the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan - 2028 and Beyond. This plan promotes a better vision of a vibrant town centre that embraces the river, attracts visitors and new businesses and created enjoyable public spaces. It looks at a Kaiapoi which is fully ‘recovered’.

And some of this work is already on the to-do list, including:

• The District Plan Review. This is a significant project which details how development can occur across the District. It provides a set of rules for residential, commercial and rural development.
• Rollout of the upgraded rubbish, organics and recycling bins. This will significantly reduce the amount of waste across the District which goes to landfill.
• The planning and construction of a $28M Multi-use Sports Facility. This will meet the growing community’s needs and demand for recreation space.
• Preparing for anticipated upgrades to our water network following the Havelock North Drinking Water Report. To do this we are looking at introducing universal ultra-violet treatment across the District.
• Completing Regeneration projects – this includes a BMX track, dog park, sports fields with changing areas and ecological space.
• An extension to the Rangiora Library and investigation into a new community space for Pegasus/Woodend. As the community grows so does the demand for facilities and services.

The return is shown through more vibrancy, talent, businesses, jobs, diversity and innovation. All things already make the Waimakariri a great District and will continue to add to our quality of life.
Some features on the Waimakariri Water Zone:

- The Waimakariri water zone lies north of the Waimakariri River and extends from Pegasus Bay in the east to the Puketeraki Range in the west.
- Groundwater quality in the Zone is generally very good and mostly meets drinking-water standards without any treatment.
- Approximately 70% of groundwater is used for agriculture, with about 25% used for community water supply; but only around 50% of the consented water was used in 2015/16 – a very dry year.
- Poorer quality groundwater occurs naturally in some areas, often linked to organic-rich coastal soils and sediments in old swamp areas.
- The braided Ashley River is an internationally significant habitat supporting breeding populations of threatened wildlife.
- Over 90% of the original vegetation cover in the lowland areas has gone.
- Greatest loss of indigenous habitat and biodiversity has occurred in lowland and coastal environments.
- There are three catchment areas, Silverstream, Cam River tributaries and Saltwater Creek, which show the effects of intensive agricultural practices. Work is underway to better understand these catchments and improve local water quality.

Social and Ecological ENVIRONMENT.

An area of focus over the coming years for Waimakariri is one of balance – making sure our growth doesn’t come at a cost to our social connectivity or environment.

Residents regularly tell us one of the things they value the most about life in the Waimakariri District is our connectivity to each other and the natural environment.

Social environment

As a growing District it’s also important we look closely at our population to make sure we are best supporting our residents.

Waimakariri as a District has a relatively evenly spread population. Our latest data shows that:

- 16% of the population are between 12 and 24.
- 54% are between 24 and 65.
- 16.8% are over 65.

This year Waimakariri District Council adopted a Youth Strategy and are currently working towards an Age-friendly Plan.

Both plans have been developed as tools for the Council understand the needs of specific community groups and shape how we develop our community to cater for different life stages.

As our District grows these groups will also continue to grow, and how we plan for our townships across the District to develop is important in keeping the social connectivity and feel within Waimakariri that attracts many of our new residents.

Each year the Council undertakes a Community Survey to ensure we have a good dataset, alongside the Census, for use when planning how best to provide facilities and services for our different resident groups.

Ecological environment

Environmental monitoring information tells us there are some parts of the District (waterways and air quality) that are not safe at times of the year due to a high number of pollutants.

Some of these results are due to man-made pollutants and others representative of a general decline in the quality of our natural environment.

Our District is reliant on the agricultural industry, and it’s important the Council works with the community to ensure we are all playing our part in how we stop environmental decline.

In 2018 the Council adopted the Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) which has a range of recommendations for the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee to improve water quality in our waterways and groundwater, and enhance indigenous biodiversity.

The ZIPA is a collaborative partnership project between local government partners, private businesses, farmers and environmental researchers. Recommendations are driven into five main areas:

- Improving stream health
- Protecting and enhancing indigenous biodiversity
- Reducing nitrates
- Managing surface water
- Managing groundwater.

Waimakariri District Council has been identified as being responsible or playing a role in the delivery of the ‘improving stream health’ and ‘protecting and enhancing indigenous biodiversity’.

To do this we’re allocating over $300,000 per annum towards improving our Water Zone – along with ECan and other agencies.
Value for money

The cost of running council’s services (per day)

- Governance
- Roads and Footpaths
- Libraries
- Swimming Pools
- Planning (Admin, District Development, Civil Defence)
- Economic Development (Promotion CBA’s)
- Stormwater Drainage (Urban & Rural areas)
- Health and Safety (Concessions, Rural Fire, Health, Animal & Buildings control)
- Community Buildings
- Parks and Reserves
- Christchurch Museum
- Sewerage Disposal
- Water and Water ways
- Earthquake Recovery
- Waste Collection and Disposal

This all equates to approximately $7.33 per day.
Rates on average residential property equate to around 3% of the average household income.

For a more personalised breakdown you can view the Rates Calculator on Council’s website.

*Based on average residential property rates for 2019.

FINANCES.

At a glance

Your Council currently owns
$1.7 billion
worth of physical assets
(facilities, infrastructure, property etc)

Council owes
$145 million
of net debt
as at 30 June 2019

We spend
$73 million
on the operational costs
of running the District every year

Overall the District has
equity of
$1.6 billion
Managing our finances

Like the majority of Councils in New Zealand, the Waimakariri District Council borrows money to ensure we can provide infrastructure and invest in our community ahead of time in line with growth.

Councils need to respond to the rising expectations that communities have of them, and with higher environmental and government-imposed standards. Councils will need to continue investing in their districts, with debt funding providing the best means of ensuring inter-generational equity.

Council’s level of external borrowing is $145M, as at the end of June 2019. The Long Term Plan proposed that debt levels would peak at about $217M in 2020/21, before reducing to about $195M in 2028.

Local government debt is used to build infrastructure and with this in mind our annual expenditure exceeds $100M, with assets valued over $1.8B. Relative to this is our interest cost of about $5.3M per annum. Council’s current average cost of borrowing is 3.7%

This is well within limits imposed by the Local Government Funding Agency and Council’s self-imposed conservative policy limits.

Capital spending

In the 2018-2028 LTP, capital spending (spending to buy, maintain or improve assets) included:

• $165 million on replacement capital projects - 24% of which will be in the Wastewater, Stormwater and Water Supply areas, 39% on Roading, 16% on regeneration and 13% on Recreation, including Libraries and Aquatic services. This includes Regeneration projects $10.3 million, Rangiora central Wastewater replacements $2 million, Kaiapoi Wastewater pipeline replacement program $4 million, Road resurfacing $23 million and pavement rehabilitation $10 million.

• $96 million on improved levels of service capital projects on meeting water quality standards, improving drainage, and other levels of service. 45% of which will be in the Wastewater, Stormwater and Water Supply areas, 8% on Roading and 33% on Recreation, including Libraries and Aquatic facilities. Significant capital projects include a new $27.85 million Multi-Use Sports Facility. Rangiora Wastewater capacity $3 million and Flood response projects $4.6 million.

• $179 million on projects relating to growth, 34% of which will be in the Wastewater, Stormwater and Water Supply areas, 38% on Roading and 29% on Recreation, including Libraries and Aquatic facilities. Projects include Rangiora Wastewater second aeration basin $3.5 million, West Rangiora drainage $3.5 million and extension to the Rangiora Library $7.1 million.

Rates

In the 2018-2028 LTP, average rates increases were:

• From 2019-2023 average rates increases (excluding the new kerbside collection provisions, which are optional) were signalled to be about 4.3%

• Waimakariri District Council’s rates are the 23rd most expensive out 66 Council’s across the country. *Taxpayers Union Ratepayers Report.
### Looking Back

#### Key projects undertaken 2016 to 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Activity</th>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Total spent ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earthquake Recovery and Regeneration</strong></td>
<td>Infrastructure Rebuild Programme This programme includes 50 projects for the repair and replacement of water, sewer, and stormwater, and roading assets.</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuild and reinstatement of the Kaiapoi Wharf</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford Library and Service Centre The rebuild of Library and Service Centre opened in late 2017.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Services</strong></td>
<td>Oxford rural No.2 and Oxford No.1 water supply upgrades</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drinking water upgrades for the Mandeville and Ohoka schemes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodend and Rangiora Wastewater Treatment Plant</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Rangiora Wastewater Network Upgrade (multi-year project)</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artificial hockey turf Coldstream Road</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southbrook Road/South Belt intersection traffic signals</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Kaiapoi new arterial road</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Belt extension to Townsend Road</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New cycle-ways from Rangiora to Kaiapoi and Woodend</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barkers Road seal extension</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford rural No.2 and Oxford No.1 water supply upgrades</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Completed the District Development Strategy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refreshed the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed the review of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Present Day

#### Key projects for 2019/20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Activity</th>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Total spent ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earthquake Recovery and Regeneration</strong></td>
<td>Playing field Kaiapoi</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Kaiapoi road upgrade Kaiapoi</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation and ecological links Kaiapoi</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dredging the Kaiapoi River and installing the pontoons</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Services</strong></td>
<td>Kaiapoi Charles Street rising main</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southbrook resource and recovery park (stage 1)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi and Rangiora flood mitigation</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kerbside collection services</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Services</strong></td>
<td>Multi-use sports facility Coldstream Road (total cost, will be completed in the 2021/22 year)</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Rangiora service centre alterations</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Future Focus

Key projects planned for 2020 and beyond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Activity</th>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Total spent ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earthquake Recovery and Regeneration</strong></td>
<td>Recreation and ecological links Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road improvements Kaiapoi East</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports facilities Kaiapoi East</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage and Mahinga Kai Kaiapoi East</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Services</strong></td>
<td>Rangiora wastewater network upgrade</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodend wastewater treatment pond extensions</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi wastewater network upgrade</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southbrook resource and recovery park</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flood mitigation and protection</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skewbridge Road alignment/replacement</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Services</strong></td>
<td>Rangiora library extension</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Leadership</strong></td>
<td>District Plan review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Funding impact statement

This financial statement sets out the funding mechanisms and forecast budgets Council will use to pay for its capital and operating programme from 2020 to 2023.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources of operating funding</strong></td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rates, uniform annual general charges, rates penalties</td>
<td>33,967</td>
<td>35,007</td>
<td>38,108</td>
<td>39,855</td>
<td>41,980</td>
<td>43,933</td>
<td>46,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Rates</td>
<td>19,808</td>
<td>21,379</td>
<td>22,580</td>
<td>25,275</td>
<td>27,265</td>
<td>29,642</td>
<td>31,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies and grants for operating purposes</td>
<td>2,966</td>
<td>2,991</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>3,134</td>
<td>3,205</td>
<td>3,406</td>
<td>3,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and charges</td>
<td>16,638</td>
<td>16,582</td>
<td>17,367</td>
<td>16,471</td>
<td>16,749</td>
<td>17,157</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and dividends from investments</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>1,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities fuel tax, fines, infringement fees, and other receipts</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPERATING FUNDING</strong></td>
<td>75,853</td>
<td>78,112</td>
<td>84,128</td>
<td>86,868</td>
<td>91,191</td>
<td>96,491</td>
<td>101,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applications of operating funding</strong></td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to staff and suppliers</td>
<td>59,127</td>
<td>66,276</td>
<td>67,192</td>
<td>64,890</td>
<td>65,419</td>
<td>67,843</td>
<td>68,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance costs</td>
<td>4,139</td>
<td>4,716</td>
<td>5,471</td>
<td>9,534</td>
<td>10,626</td>
<td>10,754</td>
<td>10,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating funding applications</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL APPLICATIONS OF OPERATING FUNDING</strong></td>
<td>63,266</td>
<td>70,992</td>
<td>72,663</td>
<td>74,424</td>
<td>76,045</td>
<td>78,597</td>
<td>78,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SURPLUS / (DEFICIT) OF OPERATING FUNDING</strong></td>
<td>63,266</td>
<td>70,992</td>
<td>72,663</td>
<td>74,424</td>
<td>76,045</td>
<td>78,597</td>
<td>78,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources of capital funding</strong></td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies and grants for capital expenditure</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>10,127</td>
<td>5,241</td>
<td>7,163</td>
<td>5,013</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>3,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and financial contributions</td>
<td>15,282</td>
<td>9,298</td>
<td>11,008</td>
<td>13,169</td>
<td>13,071</td>
<td>14,136</td>
<td>13,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in debt</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>35,231</td>
<td>8,439</td>
<td>(3,305)</td>
<td>(678)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Proceeds from sale of assets</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1,958</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lump sum contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other dedicated capital funding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SOURCES OF CAPITAL FUNDING</strong></td>
<td>25,822</td>
<td>51,383</td>
<td>44,500</td>
<td>55,745</td>
<td>26,709</td>
<td>15,069</td>
<td>16,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applications of capital funding</strong></td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital expenditure</td>
<td>29,387</td>
<td>42,666</td>
<td>22,402</td>
<td>21,006</td>
<td>17,566</td>
<td>10,788</td>
<td>17,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to meet additional demand</td>
<td>14,518</td>
<td>12,487</td>
<td>12,745</td>
<td>29,271</td>
<td>13,206</td>
<td>4,466</td>
<td>6,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to improve the level of service</td>
<td>17,184</td>
<td>25,437</td>
<td>25,022</td>
<td>19,223</td>
<td>12,710</td>
<td>12,982</td>
<td>12,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to replace existing assets</td>
<td>(22,374)</td>
<td>(22,342)</td>
<td>(2,756)</td>
<td>(1,875)</td>
<td>(1,762)</td>
<td>4,727</td>
<td>3,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in reserves</td>
<td>(305)</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL APPLICATIONS OF CAPITAL FUNDING</strong></td>
<td>38,410</td>
<td>58,503</td>
<td>55,965</td>
<td>68,189</td>
<td>41,855</td>
<td>32,963</td>
<td>39,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SURPLUS / (DEFICIT) OF CAPITAL FUNDING</strong></td>
<td>(12,587)</td>
<td>(7,170)</td>
<td>(11,465)</td>
<td>(12,444)</td>
<td>(15,146)</td>
<td>(17,894)</td>
<td>(23,177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDING BALANCE</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consolidated balance sheet
The consolidated balance sheet shows what the Council owns (our assets) and what we owe (our debt/liabilities) and the net worth (represented by net assets).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>31,890</td>
<td>35,509</td>
<td>41,204</td>
<td>25,150</td>
<td>23,873</td>
<td>26,037</td>
<td>28,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>1,652,887</td>
<td>1,743,161</td>
<td>1,829,118</td>
<td>1,890,904</td>
<td>1,954,320</td>
<td>2,003,061</td>
<td>2,062,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td>1,574,349</td>
<td>1,664,322</td>
<td>1,740,853</td>
<td>1,800,461</td>
<td>1,863,053</td>
<td>1,911,067</td>
<td>1,965,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NON-CURRENT ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>1,652,887</td>
<td>1,743,161</td>
<td>1,829,118</td>
<td>1,890,904</td>
<td>1,954,320</td>
<td>2,003,061</td>
<td>2,062,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>1,684,777</td>
<td>1,778,669</td>
<td>1,870,322</td>
<td>1,916,054</td>
<td>1,978,193</td>
<td>2,030,898</td>
<td>2,090,808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current liabilities**
- Borrowing: 10,055, 25,055, 25,000, 5,000, 9,822, 9,494, 9,843
- Other current liabilities: 22,110, 25,134, 22,831, 21,096, 21,639, 19,283, 18,789
- **TOTAL CURRENT LIABILITIES** | 32,165 | 48,169 | 47,831 | 31,461 | 28,777 | 26,037 |

**Non-current liabilities**
- Borrowing: 90,153, 105,098, 130,000, 203,293, 206,910, 203,934, 202,096
- Other non-current liabilities: 3,542, 5,088, 5,288, 4,263, 4,436, 4,368, 4,354
- **TOTAL NON-CURRENT LIABILITIES** | 95,695 | 110,186 | 135,288 | 207,556 | 211,346 | 208,302 | 207,261 |

**TOTAL LIABILITIES** | 125,860 | 158,335 | 183,119 | 233,652 | 242,807 | 237,079 | 235,893 |

**TOTAL RATEPAYERS’ EQUITY** | 1,558,917 | 1,620,314 | 1,687,203 | 1,682,402 | 1,735,386 | 1,792,019 | 1,854,915 |

**Credit rating**
Credit rating agency, Standard and Poor’s, affirmed its AA long-term and A+ short-term credit rating with a negative outlook for Waimakariri District Council on 29 April 2019.

The AA rating equates the Council with New Zealand’s national credit rating – the ‘sovereign rating’. Standard and Poor’s does not rate any individual Council higher than the sovereign rating.

The outlook is based on Standard and Poor’s view that Council’s capital works programme is significant, which can cause an increase of debt in the short term (approx. two years).

The significant work programme includes necessary infrastructure to cater for Waimakariri’s growing needs and population.

**Financial strategy and performance**
The Financial Strategy outlines key financial parameters and limits within which Waimakariri District Council will operate for the life of a ten year Long Term Plan.

The Strategy provides a guide for which proposals for expenditure and funding may be considered and a context for public disclosure of the overall effect of long term expenditure on levels of service, rates, debt and investments.

**Strategic objectives**
To maintain levels of service, respond to community expectations and meet the requirements of national standards, there are four key objectives set out in the Strategy:

- Reinvest Council’s community assets to pre-earthquake condition
- Restrict operating expenditure movements to the rate of Local Government Cost Inflation, excluding catering for population growth and improved levels of service
- Maintain debt within policy limits, while maintaining headroom for significant natural disasters long term
- Maintain the current prudent financial management while still providing high levels of service to both current and future generations.

**Financial benchmarking**

**Forecast for 2018/19**
The result for 2018/19 is a forecast. That forecast is based on the most recent financial information available for 2018/19 plus an estimate of financial transactions until 30 June 2019.

This information has not been audited.

**Budgets for 2019/20 to 2022/23**
The budgets for 2019/20 to 2022/23 are taken from the Long Term Plan 2018-2028 (LTP).

The 2018-2028 Long Term Plan was audited by Audit New Zealand.
Rates affordability
Rates movements have been affected by a number of factors including the impact of the Canterbury earthquakes and growth.

In terms of growth, while Development Contributions fund much of the capital projects, additional developed land and services need to be maintained and form part of the Council’s operational expenditure.

Balanced budget
The Council meets this benchmark if its revenue equals or is greater than its operating expenditure. Council revenue excludes development contributions, financial contributions, vested assets, gains on derivative financial instruments and revaluations of property, plant, or equipment, as a proportion of operating expenses (excluding losses on derivative financial instruments and revaluations of property, plant, or equipment).

Debt affordability
The debt affordability benchmark is met if Council’s planned borrowing is within each quantified limit on borrowing.

This benchmark is met if capital expenditure on network services equals or is greater than depreciation on network services. The Council expenditure on network services excludes earthquake repairs/replacements but includes new/growth works.

Council is not meeting the benchmark from 2017 to 2022. The primary reasons are due to:
- The funding costs relating to the earthquakes being spread over the outer years and progressively funded
- The depreciation funding policy where the full amount of depreciation is shown as an operating cost but is not fully funded due to depreciation funds being invested at higher rates than inflation over the life of the asset
- Funding of District Plan and sewer desludging.
Debt servicing as a percentage of total revenue

The limit for Council borrowing is set at 15 per cent. Borrowing costs as a proportion of revenue excluding development contributions, financial derivative financial instruments, and contributions, vested assets, gains on revaluations of property, plant, or equipment.

Debt servicing as a percentage of rates revenue

The Council meets this benchmark if interest expense as a proportion of rates revenue does not exceed 25%.

Other policy limits

These Policy limits measure the Council’s ability to pay its debts and pay interest on those debts. The Council has stayed within its Policy limits and is budgeted to remain within those limits.

Debt with limits

This illustrates the “headroom” Council has to raise debt should it be required to help pay for infrastructure repairs after a natural disaster.
Equity investments and other interests

The Council has equity investments in three companies and interests in four trusts. The primary reason for holding equity in these entities is to achieve efficiency and community outcomes and not for financial return on investment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Shareholding percentage</th>
<th>Principal reason for holding</th>
<th>Budget return per annum</th>
<th>2016/17 Actual</th>
<th>2017/18 Actual</th>
<th>2018/19 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transwaste Canterbury Ltd</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>Develop and operate the regional land facility at Kate Valley</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Funding Agency</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Assurance</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>Insurance and risk management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Shareholding percentage</th>
<th>Principal reason for holding</th>
<th>Budget return per annum</th>
<th>2016/17 Actual</th>
<th>2017/18 Actual</th>
<th>2018/19 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te Kohaka O Tuhaitara</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Environment and recreation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise North Canterbury</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Art Collection</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>District Art</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Libraries</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>District Libraries</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report seeks to formally review the Register of Interests for the Mayor and Councillors as a matter of best practice and as per Council resolution of 5 June 2018.

1.2 The Register is reviewed twice a year, with the last review formally occurring at the 4 December 2018 Council meeting. Although voluntary amendments have been made to the Register in March and June 2019.

**Attachments:**
- Register of Interests, current as at 24 June 2019 (Trim 190624088464).
- Register of Interests Policy (Trim 180419043038).

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190618085401.

(b) Reviews the Register of Interests content, recording any amendments.

(c) Notes a Register of Interests will be republished in the August 2019 agenda and notes the Register of Interests is listed on the Council website.

(d) Notes the Register will be next reviewed by the new Council in December 2019.

(e) Notes a Register of Interests will be activated for the Community Boards in December 2019.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. Elected members of the Council are required to operate in a transparent and unbiased manner, and it is important to be seen to be operating in this manner by the community. The Auditor-General states elected member decision-making should be guided by the principles of integrity, honesty, transparency, openness, independence, good faith and service to the public.

3.2. The Council, Standing Committees and Community Boards, at the beginning of each meeting, ask for any conflicts of interest to be declared and this is duly recorded in the
meeting minutes. It is recommended best practice to have a more formal disclosure of members' interests where pecuniary (financial) interest may arise. The register is not designed to be a 'register of wealth' but only record fact of a personal financial interest in matters that intersect with the Council business.

3.3. The Code of Conduct describes conflicts of interests in general terms using the Office of the Auditor General's Good Practice Guide. Local Government NZ, the Auditor General and Deloitte's recommended that the Council should establish a Register of Members' Interests. The Council subsequently adopted a Policy and Register which is reviewable every December and June. Staff now present the Register for its bi-annual review.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. A conflict of interest, in any matter before the Council, must be declared to the meeting, recorded in the minutes and members refrain from discussing or voting on the matter, as is this Council's present practice. The Local Authorities (Members' Interests Act 1968) applies to the pecuniary interests of members of local authorities, and the Auditor-General recommends that the same procedure be followed for non-pecuniary interests.

4.2. It is recommended by the Auditor-General that the Council have a Register of Members' Interests to help ensure that any conflicts of interest (both pecuniary and non-pecuniary) that arise are identified and managed before they cause issues. Such a disclosure signals openness, transparency and reduces the potential for false allegations of improper behaviour.

4.3. In the Auditor-General’s Best Practice Guide a conflict of interest is defined as “where a member’s or official’s duties or responsibilities to a public entity could be affected by some other interest or duty that the member or official may have”.

4.4. A pecuniary interest is not defined in the Act but the recommended test to use is: Whether, if the matter were dealt with in a particular way, discussing or voting on that matter could reasonably give rise to an expectation or a gain or loss of money for the member concerned. Would a reasonable, informed observer think that your impartiality might have been affected?

4.5. The Interests Register would also apply to any business activities/contracts with the Council undertaken by the spouses or partners or immediate family (including children/siblings), of any elected or externally appointed members.

4.6. While the Council has adopted to establish a register of interests, whether a member wishes to make a declaration, and the extent of such a declaration, is a matter for each member. The Council cannot require a member to make a disclosure.

4.7. It should be noted that declarations associated with an election fall outside the intention of the Interests' Register and are subject to the Local Electoral Act 2001.

4.8. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

Groups and Organisations

5.1. No groups or organisations have been consulted.

Wider Community

5.2. The wider community has not been consulted.
6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

6.1. Under section 3 (Disqualifying contracts between local authorities and their members) of 'the Act', no person shall be capable of being elected as or appointed to be or of being a member of a local authority or of any committee of a local authority, if the total of all payments made or to be made by or on behalf of the local authority in respect of all contracts made by it in which that person is concerned or interested exceeds $25,000 in any financial year. This is applicable unless approval from the Auditor-General is obtained (section 3,(3)).

6.2. Any elected member that commits an offence under 'the Act' is liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding $200.

6.3. No cost is associated with maintaining a Register of Members Interests, which would be maintained by the Governance Manager.

Community Implications

6.4. Perceived conflict of interest of undemocratic and appropriate best practices being upheld and loss of confidence from the community if a breach occurs.

Risk Management

6.5. By having a Register of Interests, and reviewing at least annually, elected members are aware of their responsibilities and minimal risk to the organisation due to best practices and appropriate declarations. All Council, Committee and Community Board agendas will continue to list “conflicts of interest” for recording at each decision meeting.

6.6. It is proposed that in the new electoral term (post October 2019) the Register of Interests will be extended to include all Community Board members.

Health and Safety

6.7. Not applicable.

7. CONTEXT

Policy

7.1. This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

Legislation

7.2. Local Authorities (Members’ Interests Act 1968)

7.2.1. ensuring that members are not affected by personal motives when they participate in decisions of their local authority, and

7.2.2. preventing members, in contracting situations, from using their position to obtain preferential treatment from the authority.

7.2.3. controls the making of contracts worth more than $25,000 in a financial year between members and their authority, and

7.2.4. prohibits members from participating in matters before the authority in which they have a pecuniary interest, other than an interest in common with the public.

7.3. Local Government Act 2002

Community Outcomes

7.5. There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District:

- The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available.
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.
- The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District’s wellbeing.
- Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued.

Delegations

7.6. The Council has the authority to approve or amend any Policy at any time.

Sarah Nichols
Governance Manager
# Waimakariri District Council

Register of Interests – as at 24 June 2019 - Mayor and Councillors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elected Member</th>
<th>Date of Update from Member</th>
<th>Member Declared Interest (Business/Patron/Club/Partnership)</th>
<th>Council Appointments</th>
<th>Spouse/Partner Declared Interest</th>
<th>OAG approval status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mayor David Ayers               | 24 June 2019               | North Canterbury Radio Trust  
Rotary Club of Rangiora, including Charitable Trust  
Rangiora & Districts Early Records Society  
Rangiora Methodist Parish Patron – North Canterbury Musical Society  
Patron – Rangiora Brass Band  
Patron – Southbrook Sports Club  
Member – Landmarks  
Waimakariri Art Collection Trust  
Kaiapoi District Historical Association  
Rangiora Promotions Association  
Kaiapoi Promotions Association                                                                                                                                                  | Trustee - Canterbury Museum Trust  
Enterprise North Canterbury  
Waimakariri Community Arts Council | Nil.                           | n/a                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elected Member</th>
<th>Date of Update from Member</th>
<th>Member Declared Interest (Business/Patron/Club/Partnership)</th>
<th>Council Appointments</th>
<th>Spouse/Partner Declared Interest</th>
<th>OAG approval status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Kevin Felstead</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Sole Trader: Resource Consent Services</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Neville Atkinson</td>
<td>18 June 2019</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Community Care and Employment Trust (KCC&amp;ET) (Tag Busters) Kaiapoi Railway Station Trust (Chair)</td>
<td>Trustee – Te Kohaku O Tuhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>Approved (KCC&amp;ET) 17 June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Kirstyn Barnett</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Nothing to declare</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Alistair Blackie</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Nothing to declare</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Robbie Brine</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>Serving NZ Police Officer</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Wendy Doody</td>
<td>4 December 2018</td>
<td>Partner of The Oxford Fete</td>
<td>Trustee - North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor John Meyer</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Patron Kaiapoi Tennis Club Patron Kaiapoi Darnley Club</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Sandra Stewart</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Self-employed journalist, owner four hectare property Springbank (near Cust)</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Paul Williams</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Nothing to declare</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Member</td>
<td>Date of Update from Member</td>
<td>Member Declared Interest (Business/Patron/Club/Partnership)</td>
<td>Council Appointments</td>
<td>Spouse/Partner Declared Interest</td>
<td>OAG approval status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Councillor Dan Gordon  | 11 March 2019               | Employed by Parliamentary Services  
Trustee – Rotary Club of Rangiora Charitable Trust  
Member – Rotary Club of Rangiora  
Chair – Waimakariri Arts Trust Committee Member – Waimakariri Community Arts Council  
Member - Rangiora Museum Patron – North Canterbury Musicals | Trustee - North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust  
Deputy Chair – Rural Canterbury Primary Health Organisation  
Board member – Rangiora Promotions  
Chair – Friends of Rangiora Town Hall Incorporated  
Member – Rangiora Airfield Advisory Committee | Nil.                                      | n/a                  |

This document was reviewed at the Council meeting of 4 December 2018 and subsequently updated.

This document supersedes the previous documents Trim 190311031245 Dated 11 March 2019 and Trim 181205143166 Dated 5 December 2018.
1 Introduction
Elected members of the Council have a number of professional and personal interests and roles. Conflicts of interest sometimes cannot be avoided but they need not cause problems when promptly disclosed and well managed. Disclosure by an elected member is voluntary.

This policy is intended to reflect best practice, and will generally be applied by the Council (ie Councillors).

Examples of conflicts include paid outside employment, company directors or commercial relationships that interface with the Council or a Community Board.

2 Policy Context
This policy applies to all elected members, including committees and hearing panels. A disclosure of interest policy is already in place for Council employees.

A conflict of interest occurs when:
- the activities of an elected member leads, or could lead, to material benefit for that elected member concerned or to an external entity, either directly or indirectly, to the detriment, or potential detriment, of the Council.
- the activities of an elected member interfere, or could interfere, with that elected member’s fulfilment of their obligations.

If elected members are unclear about the application of this policy to specific circumstances or situations they should seek clarification from the Governance Manager or Chief Executive.

3 Policy Objective
The objective of this policy is to:
- provide best practice guidance to Council members so that such decisions are seen to be transparent and unbiased and without giving rise to any perception of conflict of interest;
- set rules around disclosing actual, potential and perceived conflicts and accepting gifts and other benefits; and
- set out Council’s expectations for its members to ensure compliance with the provisions of the legislation and good practice guides listed below;
- preserve public trust in Council by avoiding actual, perceived or potential bias.

4 Policy Statement
Elected members must carry out their duties in an efficient and competent manner and avoid any behaviour which might impair their effectiveness, or damage the integrity or standing of the Council. Thus it is fundamental to the protection of the reputation of Waimakariri District Council that no elected members have, or are perceived to have, a conflict between their official responsibilities and their personal interests.

A conflict of interest can arise where two different interests overlap, i.e. in any situation where an elected member has a financial interest, a private or personal interest or business interest
sufficient to influence or appear to influence the impartial exercise of their official duties or professional judgment.

Members must at all times avoid situations where their integrity might be questioned or where they may appear to favour one party, supplier or customer over another. In addition, members must act honestly and impartially and in no circumstances reveal or make private use of personal, confidential or other non-public information obtained as a result of their employment by the Council.

The existence of a conflict of interest may not necessarily mean that the elected member concerned has done anything wrong or that the interests of Council or the public have been compromised. For an elected member a conflict of interest that creates risks may be where their duties or responsibilities to Council could be affected by some other interest or duty that they may have. For example, other interests or duties might exist for an elected member because of their own financial affairs; a relationship (private or personal interest) or other role (business interest) that the elected member has; or something the elected member has said or done.

Disclosure provides transparency and protects those concerned from allegations of duplicity and enables the avoidance of being unwittingly placed in situations that may lead to a conflict of interest.

5 Policy Actions

Council members are to conduct themselves at all times under the above principles, ensuring that:

• self-interest or personal factors are not permitted to influence their decision making;
• financial, family, personal or business relationships or interests do not in fact, nor appear to, unfairly advantage or disadvantage the Council, elected members or other individuals or organisations;
• they are not involved in the appointment process of people with whom they have a close personal or family relationship;
• they do not take part in discussions, deliberations, decision-making or voting on a matter in which he/she (or a member of his/her immediate family or a dependent) has a material interest;
• they observe the highest standards of behaviour in accepting gifts or rewards. Any gift that might attract the suspicion of improper motive, or which obligates the individual should not be accepted. In any event all gifts offered (received or not) are to be declared (refer to WDC Gifts & Hospitality Policy and Elected Members’ Code of Conduct);
• Council’s name, resources, information and time are not used for private or personal benefit without prior written consent of an authorised person;
• any conflict of interest identified is declared as soon as possible;

As part of the induction process, new Council members will receive advice on how to identify, report, and manage conflicts of interest.

Council members must monitor any business interactions between the Council and any company or organisation in which the member has a material interest and ensure that such business does not exceed $NZ25,000 (including GST) in value without the prior approval of the Auditor-General.
Elected Members shall:
• declare any interests in contracts in the Council’s Interest Register;
• discuss any proposed interest in contracts (of whatever value) in advance with the Chief Executive and/or the OAG and follow the advice that they are given;
• not participate in decision-making relating to any contract in which they have an interest;
• not accept any gifts (including hospitality, entertainment) from tendering parties where the Council or community board/committee will be part of the decision-making process.

6 Interests Register
The Governance Manager will maintain an elected member Interests Registers which is to be updated at least annually (1st December) and as required when an elected member declares a conflict of interest at any time during the year.

The Elected Members Interests Register will be published on the Council website and in the Council agenda each December and following any amendment.

7 Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes
- Local Authorities (Members Interests) Act 1968
- Managing Conflicts of Interest: Guidance for Public Entities (Office of the Auditor-General)
- Guidance for Members of Local Authorities about the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act 1968
- Purchasing Policy (including Tendering) 2017
- Elected Members Code of Conduct.

8 Guidance Notes relating to the making of returns:
The following explanatory notes are intended to assist members in preparing their returns for the register but a final judgment on interpreting the requirements in the responsibility of the members themselves.
• You may have financial interests that are not covered by the requirements for the register but do need to be declared orally to a committee before you participate in debate relating to that interest. This might include an interest you have acquired but is not due for registration until several months later, or it may relate to an interest of a family member. If in any doubt, you should consider making an oral declaration to the committee before participating in consideration of a related item of business, regardless of any written registration.
• There is no formal requirement to register any change in your interests 1st December each year (or any other date required for an initial return) until the next return is required. However the requirements for an oral declaration will apply to any interests that have not been registered.
• At no stage are you required to state the actual value or extent of any interest. You simply need to register its existence.
• If any interest is held jointly with another person or persons, you should indicate the interest. You can list it as jointly owned but do not need to name the other owner(s).
9 Definitions

Business entity means anybody or organisation, whether incorporated or unincorporated, that carries on any profession, trade, manufacture, or undertaking for pecuniary profit, and includes a business activity carried on by a sole proprietor.

Company means:
- a) A company registered under Part 2 of the Companies Act 1993, or
- b) A body corporate that is incorporated outside New Zealand

Relevant Interest is when an elected member has a business, financial or personal interest in a company, trust, or community organisation that is likely to do business with council at any time.

Conflict of Interest means any situation when a person has a financial, personal or business interest sufficient to influence or appear to influence the impartial exercise of their official Council duties or professional judgement.

Matter means the Council’s performance of its functions or the exercise of its powers, or an arrangement, agreement or contract the Council has entered into or proposes to enter.

Member means elected members of Waimakariri District Council and Community Boards.

Business Interest An elected member will have a business interest in an enterprise seeking to do business with the Council if they:
- are a director of the enterprise;
- are an owner of or partner in the enterprise;
- have a shareholding in the enterprise;
- have a close personal or familial relationship with a person who is an owner or partner or significant shareholder in the enterprise.
- Holds a significant managerial role that trades with Waimakariri District Council.

Declarations of a Conflict: is a reference to a real, perceived or potential conflict and is valid for Council, Committees and Community Boards.

Financial Interest means anything of monetary value, including but not limited to:
- Salary or payments for service, e.g. consulting fees and honoraria;
- Equity interests, e.g. stocks, stock options and other ownership interests;
- Gifts;
- Allowances, forgiveness of debts, interests in real estate or personal property, dividends, rents, capital gains; and
- Intellectual property rights, e.g. patents, copyrights and royalties from these rights.
- The term does not include salary or other remuneration received from or approved by Council.

Pecuniary Interest: An interest that involves money.

Personal Interest An elected member has a personal interest in a matter if their spouse or partner, or other person in their family with whom there is a close friendship or relationship, could be advantaged or disadvantaged by any decision that the
REGISTER OF INTERESTS POLICY

staff or elected member either can make, or does make, or is in a position to influence.

Relevant Interest is when an elected member has a business, financial or personal interest in a company, trust, or community organisation that is likely to do business with council at any time.

Spouse/Partner/Family: Under the various Acts pertaining to Conflict or Pecuniary Interests it is also relevant to the elected member if the conflict of interest pertains to their spouse, partner or close family member (ie brother/sister, son/daughter, parent).

10 Adopted by and date

This Policy was considered and adopted by the Council at its meeting of 1 May 2018.

11 Review

First Review October 2019, then review every six years thereafter, or sooner on request.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to make the attached submission to the Environment Select Committee on the *Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill*.

1.2 The Bill was preceded by an extensive nation-wide public consultation process in mid-2018 through the Discussion Document *Our Climate: Your Say* foreshadowing the four main provisions of the Bill. Some 15,000 submissions were received on the Discussion Document, mainly in support, including from this Council.

1.3 The Bill was introduced on 8 May 2019 and was read a first time on 21 May 2019. The Bill is now in the Select Committee stage, and submissions to the Environment Select Committee close on 16 July 2019.

1.4 A Council briefing on the Bill and its four main elements was provided on 11 June 2019.

**Attachments:**

i. Draft Waimakariri District Council submission on the *Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill* (TRIM No. 190612082501)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) Receives report No.190612082497

(b) Approves the submission on the *Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill*.

(c) Circulates the submission to Community Boards for their information.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The Productivity Commission Inquiry into a Low-emission Economy (final report August 2018) recommended new architecture for New Zealand’s Climate Change legislation.
including the establishment of a Climate Commission, establishment of emissions budgets and clear carbon reduction targets.

3.2 An extensive nation-wide public engagement process about a proposed Zero Carbon Act was undertaken in July 2018 through the Discussion Document Our Climate; Your Say which attracted 15,000 submissions.

3.3 A staff briefing on the Discussion Document was provided on 10 July 2018 and the Council submitted on the four proposed elements including:

- A 2050 target of zero for long lived gasses, and a stabilisation of short lived gasses (the two-baskets approach recommended by the Productivity Commission);
- Setting three five yearly emissions budgets to 2035;
- Establishment of a Climate Change Commission with advisory powers;
- Providing for National Risk Assessments and National Adaptation Plans.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The Bill proposes to amend the Climate Change Response Act 2002 by inserting the above four elements (outlined in 3.3) into the Act.

4.2 The Climate Change Commission is proposed to be a Crown Entity and will consist of 7 members. The process for appointing members of the Commission is prescribed, as are the functions of the Commission.

4.3 Some of the Commission’s functions are to prepare a National Climate Change Risk Assessment and National Adaptation Plans. Until the Commission is established, the Minister is responsible for preparing the first National Climate Change Risk Assessment and National Adaptation Plan.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Environment Canterbury, Christchurch City Council and Nelson City Council all declared a Climate Change Emergency in May 2109.

5.2. Wider Community

Community views have recently been expressed with the 15 March 2019 student demonstration “School’s Strike for Climate”.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

Council’s 2018 base-line emissions profile was completed in May 2019. A corporate response to emissions reductions is the subject of future stages of Council’s Sustainability Strategy and financial implications have not yet been assessed.

6.2. Community Implications

Moving to a low-emissions economy has significant implications for the community in the way in which we travel, produce and consume.

6.3. Risk Management
The Bill’s National Climate Change Risk Assessment will provide significant national leadership and be extremely beneficial for local government in planning for adaptation to Climate Change.

6.4. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy
This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2. Legislation
The Bill is the first tranche of amendments to the Climate Change Response Act 2002. Further amendments have been foreshadowed to adjust the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) to remove the $25 per tonne ceiling, and establish a framework for a market-based ETS.

7.3. Community Outcomes
- People have wide-ranging opportunities for learning and being informed;
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.

7.3. Delegations
N/A

Geoff Meadows, Policy Manager
To the Environment Select Committee

Submission by
Waimakariri District Council

In the matter of the
Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill

2 July 2019
Person for Contact: Geoff Meadows, Policy Manager
General Submission

The Waimakariri District Council discussed the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill at a Council briefing on Tuesday 11 June 2019 and offers the following submission in response to the Bill. The Council is generally supportive of the four elements of the Bill, but has reservations about the costs of transitioning to a low-emissions economy and how the costs of adaptation will be shared between Government with the prime responsibility, the community at large and local government. That said, the Council is cognisant of the massive environmental costs of the do-nothing option. The Regulatory Impact Statement accompanying the Bill is useful in assessing where costs fall.

2050 Target

The Council supports the introduction of a new 2050 emissions reduction target, and supports the objective of net zero long-lived gasses and stabilised short-lived gasses, so that emissions of long-lived greenhouse gasses are reduced to zero by 2050, while also stabilising emissions of short-lived gasses. There is no reason why New Zealand should not meet this target through not only reducing domestic emissions, but also through the use of overseas emissions reductions via international carbon units, provided these international units have strong environmental safeguards.

Emissions Budgets

The Council supports the first three emissions budgets, set in 2020, to be five-year budgets so that the initial set of three emissions budgets of five years each provide certainty to 2035. Once these budgets have been initially set, they should not be revised unless the monitoring of the forecast reductions indicates a failure to meet the long term goal of zero carbon by 2050. The Bill’s requirements for the Government to publish a plan to meet future emissions budgets is supported.

Climate Change Commission

The Council carefully considered the proposed role of the Climate Change Commission and supports the proposal that the Commission advises on and monitors New Zealand’s progress towards its goals. In relation to the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS), this Council supports the proposal that the Commission makes recommendations in respect to the number of units available in the ETS. The Council supports the proposal that the Commissioners need to have a range of essential and desirable expertise.

Adapting to the Impacts of Climate Change

The Council supports the provisions in the Bill that cover adaptation to Climate Change. The requirement for a National Adaptation Plan would be very helpful for local government in planning for, and dealing with, natural hazard risks that arise from Climate Change.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Council on Health and Safety matters for the month of June.

**Attachments:**

i. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties

ii. June 2019 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 190617085189

(b) **Notes** that there are no significant Health and Safety issues at this time, and that WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the PCBU duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

2. **BACKGROUND**

2.1. The Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 requires that Officers must exercise due diligence to make sure that the organisation complies with its health and safety duties. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties for WDC is outlined in Appendix 1.

2.2. An officer under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 is a person who occupies a specified position or who occupies a position that allows them to exercise a significant influence over the management of the business or undertaking. Councillors and Chief Executive are considered to be the Officers of WDC.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. There are 7 new work-related incidents in this report, 3 of which require further investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Event description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/05/2019</td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>Worker was responding to a service request to remove a dead hawk that had been duct taped to the branches of a street</td>
<td>Recurrence will be prevented by returning tools directly into the vehicle rather than slipping a small tool into</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Incident Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/05/2019</td>
<td>Near Miss</td>
<td>Found that worker was doing pond testing readings in an unsafe location. No training or locations for pond testing readings provided to worker. This was a near miss due to very close proximity to ponds and a risk of falling in.</td>
<td>Pending investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/06/2019</td>
<td>Illness/Medical Incident</td>
<td>Worker had finished swimming in masters, went to get changed when they started to have a mild panic attack. Took the medication which usually helps but it didn't - then had a seizure. Worker was in the changing room with other masters swimmers, one who was an ambulance officer got the worker into a stable position to keep him safe and timed the seizure (1 minute – ambulance was called). Another went onto poolside and notified a lifeguard. After the seizure the worker was helped to the car to be taken home.</td>
<td>Cause of incident was a medical issue, previously known to staff. Recurrence can't be prevented however future corrective action to be taken is that staff have been asked to make the leadership team aware of staff accidents in a timelier manner. CLOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/06/2019</td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>While hitting in a nail, the staff member has struck their finger causing a bleed.</td>
<td>Accident was caused by not concentrating on task, or someone walking past (distraction). Contributing factor was other work site noise. Recurrence can be prevented by concentrating on the task. No further corrective action to be taken. CLOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06/2019</td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>Worker was demonstrating an aqua skill when right leg slipped in a puddle of water her leg went one way and knee went another, straining their right knee. Worker was advised by a lifeguard to seek medical attention. Worker went to the hospital the next day and got an X-ray. Was told that they have a Segmonds Fracture (right side of right knee) soft tissue injury and tear. Worker is booked into get a MRI scan next week.</td>
<td>Worker stated that she slipped on poolside. Contributing factor is water on the floor. Recurrence can be prevented by working being aware of surroundings and identify risks/hazards. Demonstrate moves for the aqua class on dry parts of the pool deck. If there was water on the floor that caused the slip, then the demonstration should have been performed away from this area. Corrective Action to be taken is that instructors are to identify risks that are present. Reminder to aqua instructors that they need to be aware of hazards in their working environment. MONITOR (due to lost time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/06/2019</td>
<td>Near Miss</td>
<td>Sprayed by effluent from irrigation pump 1 screen. Wasn't seated properly resulting in</td>
<td>Pending investigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. The Health and Safety Team are working with the Business and Technology Services team to review and improve the Take-5 hazard assessment form. This activity is being completed in consultation with two workgroups: a workgroup of non-Water Unit field workers, and another workgroup of Water Unit field workers. The goal is to create two Take-5 forms that are relevant to particular groups within the organisation. This will be a focus for the health and safety workplan for 2019/20.

3.3. The Health and Safety Team are working with the project manager for the Corporate Accommodation Project to ensure that health and safety risks and issues are being reviewed and mitigated as part of the overall project. In particular Safety in Design assessments will be completed by the architects as part of their overall brief, and will include the findings of the site security assessments which were completed in 2016 and 2017. Additional key project risks include contractor management, construction site management, and health and safety risks associated with the transition of staff to and from temporary accommodation.

3.4. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. **Groups and Organisations**

   4.1.1. The above reporting is shared with Management Team and the Health and Safety Committee in particular, for their review and comment.

4.2. **Wider Community**

   4.2.1. The community has not been consulted with regard to this matter, as this is internal compliance reporting, relating to Health and Safety at Work.

5. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. **Financial Implications**

   5.1.1. All financial implications for the upcoming year’s health and safety activities have been accounted for within approved project costs (such as Promapp implementation), or via departmental budgets already allocated to health and safety.

5.2. **Community Implications**

   5.2.1. Community implications have not been included in this report as this is internal compliance reporting, relating to Health and Safety at Work.

5.3. **Risk Management**

   5.3.1. Risk Management is one of the key performance requirements of a functioning Health and Safety system, therefore an updated version of the Health and Safety Register Action Plan is a key aspect of this monthly report (see Attachment 2).

5.4. **Health and Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Investigation Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13/06/19</td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>Worker got 3 small cuts on hands due to lifting grates at the Rangiora Waste Water Treatment Plant without gloves. Cleaned and disinfected straight away.</td>
<td>Pending investigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

no seal when pump turned on. Went home for a shower.
5.4.1. Continuous improvement, monitoring, and reporting of Health and Safety activities are a key focus of the health and safety management system. Attachment 1 indicates the health and safety monitoring and improvement activities that are in progress at WDC.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

6.1.1. This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

6.2. **Legislation**

6.2.1. The key legislation is the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

6.2.2. The Council has a number of Human Resources policies, including those related to Health and Safety at Work.

6.2.3. The Council has an obligation under the Local Government Act to be a good employer.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

6.3.1. There is a safe environment for all

The Health, Safety and Wellbeing of the organisation, its employees and volunteers ensures that Community Outcomes are delivered in a manner which is legislatively compliant and culturally aligned to our organisational principles: ta mātou mauri.

6.4. **Delegations**

6.4.1. An officer under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 is a person who occupies a specified position or who occupies a position that allows them to exercise a significant influence over the management of the business or undertaking. Councillors and Chief Executive are considered to be the Officers of WDC.
### Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICER DUTIES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT DISCHARGE OF DUTIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (To acquire, and keep up to date, knowledge of work health and safety matters) | • Updates on new activities/major contracts  
• Council reports to include Health and Safety advice as relevant  
• Audit Committee to receive minutes of Health and Safety Committee meetings  
• Update on legislation and best practice changes to Audit Committee | Various Committee reports  
Monthly, as required  
Quarterly  
As required |
| **UNDERSTAND** |                                                      |           |
| (To gain an understanding of the nature of the operations of the business or undertaking of the PCBU and generally of the hazards and risks associated with those operations) | • Induction of new Council through tour of District and ongoing site visits.  
• H&S Risk register to Audit Committee  
• Training on H&S legislation and best practices updates  
• CCO activities reported to the Audit Committee | Start of each new term and as required  
Six monthly, or where major change  
At least annually  
At least annually |
| **RESOURCES**  |                                                      |           |
| (To ensure that the PCBU has available for use, and uses, appropriate resources and processes to eliminate or minimise risks to health and safety from work carried out as part of the conduct of the business or undertaking) | • LTP or Annual Plan to have a specific report on H&S resources  
• Reports to Committees will outline H&S issues and resourcing, as appropriate | Annually  
As required |
| **MONITOR**    |                                                      |           |
| (To ensure that the PCBU has appropriate processes for receiving and considering information regarding incidents, hazards, and risks and for responding in a timely way to that information) | • Report to every Council meeting – standing agenda item to include Dashboard Update and any major developments  
• Risk register review by Audit Committee | Monthly  
Six monthly, or where major change |
| **COMPLY**     |                                                      |           |
| (To ensure that the PCBU has, and implements, processes for complying with any duty or obligation of the PCBU under this Act) | • Programme of H&S internal work received by Audit Committee  
• Internal Audit reports to Audit Committee  
• Incident Investigations reported Audit Committee  
• Worksafe review of incidents/accidents reported to Audit Committee | Annually  
As completed  
As required  
As required |
| **VERIFY**     |                                                      |           |
| (To verify the provision and use of the resources and processes) | • Receive any external audit results and remedial actions (if any) reported to Audit Committee  
• Worksafe audits, if undertaken  
• Self-assessment against Canterbury Safety Charter and/or SafePlus reported to the Audit Committee | Two yearly  
As completed  
As completed |
### Progress against 2018/19 Workplan – June 2019 (*as at 17 June 2019*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1: Improve Health and Safety systems, to align with organisational objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 1</strong>: Re-develop Safety Management System to ensure that all Policies align with SafePlus framework (see TRIM 180315027921), and all critical risk procedures are captured in Promapp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong>: Policy structure has been defined, and re-writing of policies has been completed and submitted to Management Team for review and approval. After Management Team approval has been received, the policies will be submitted to the organisation for feedback prior to finalisation. The policy structure has 3 key policies: Leadership &amp; Commitment, Risk Management and Worker Engagement. There will be several key risk management processes under the ‘Risk Management’ main policy, to address critical risks (e.g. Asbestos Management, Drug and Alcohol, Driver Safety etc.) To date, the following number of health and safety procedures have been captured in Promapp: Published (finalised) = 37 Unpublished (in progress) = 1 Additionally, the Water Unit have used Promapp to review and rewrite their Standard Operating Procedures, and have &gt;130 procedures that have been developed. For the most part they have been finalised, with some in final draft phase. Promapp training has been delivered to the Water Unit team and the Standard Operating Procedures are available on their mobile devices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2: Maintain a fit-for-purpose internal health and safety auditing system to ensure that WDC is compliant with health and safety policies, procedures and legal requirements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 2</strong>: Implement Promapp training module to improve the management of all Health and Safety training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong>: The Promapp training module has been purchased, and key staff (including H&amp;S Admin and Manager) are trained in how to use the module. Single sign-on has been confirmed, and all staff are creating their Promapp profiles. Health, Safety and Quality team has transferred all current training data across to the Promapp Training Module. The Promapp Training Module will now be the default training register for all H&amp;S training records.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action 3**: Review and re-develop internal health and safety auditing system, aligned with SafePlus. (see TRIM 180315027921). **COMPLETE** The SafePlus Online Self-Assessment tool from WorkSafe has been issued. From there the team will complete the following actions:  
- Assess the suitability of the tool (and determine any changes in approach – if required) COMPLETE  
- Confirm audit timing and approach (report to Management Team) COMPLETE  
- Arrange audit COMPLETE  
- Complete audit and submit findings to Management Team COMPLETE  
- Develop action plan and monitoring schedule COMPLETE  
- Review process and adjust if required
Objective 3: Ensure that all contractors are managed according to health and safety procedural requirements, and improve staff knowledge of those requirements.

**Action 4**: Contractor management process improvement project (carry-over).
- Deliver training to all staff once Promapp processes are complete (Oct 2018).
- Develop audit function based on PDU audit role.

**COMPLETE**

Contract Management training is complete as of 12th November. Training delivered to 55 contract managers from across the Council, and notes sent out to a total of 90 (including the staff that attended training). Timing of the training was determined by the Promapp rollout project (access to the system).

Additionally:
- Health and Safety Manager provides a H&S Contract Management overview to all new staff at their induction.
- Health and Safety Manager also provided an overview of current procedures to U&R, Water Unit, Greenspace and Regeneration teams at a June workshop.
- A 6-monthly reminder email was sent to staff on 24/08 to inform them of H&S processes and tools to manage contractors.
- A ‘deep-dive’ audit of adherence to H&S aspects of contract management has been completed as part of SafePlus assessment (see above).
- **Further Contract H&S Management training has been scheduled for early July 2019 for relevant staff.**

Objective 4: Improve the Health and Wellbeing of staff, and create measures to ensure success.

**Action 5**: Wellbeing strategy development and implementation project (carry-over).

**COMPLETE**

A Wellbeing Committee has been established, the wellbeing strategy is complete, and has been submitted to Management Team for their approval in early August. Additionally, the Management Team approved:
- Wellbeing calendar of events
- Wellbeing presence on intranet
- Wellbeing branding
- Wellbeing communications plan.

The Wellbeing Committee has now issued the strategy and communications to all staff (September 2018), and will coordinate and communicate all wellbeing activities going forward.

**LEGEND**

- On track
- Slightly behind schedule (less than one month)
- Behind schedule (greater than one month)

In addition to the above workplan, there will be a particular focus on working with volunteers to manage their health and safety. This will include creating written agreements with high risk volunteers, and proactively engaging with all volunteers to ensure that health and safety expectations are aligned with all parties.
Incidents/Injuries - June 2019 (*as at 17 June 2019)

June 2018 to Current: Worker/Volunteer Incident Reporting

- Near Miss: 20 (27%)
- Property or Vehicle Damage: 9 (12%)
- Illness/Medical Incident: 5 (7%)
- Injury: 40 (54%)

Legend:
- Illness/Medical Incident
- Injury
- Near Miss
- Property or Vehicle Damage
### Lost Time Injuries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>340.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>3 (to date)</td>
<td>187.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Pending LT data on 1 incident at @ 17/06

### LEAD INDICATORS

#### Safety Inspections

| Completed (Workplace Walkarounds) | Q1 2019 | 12 out of 15 Workplace Walkarounds completed for Q2 2019 (June). Hazards raised for any non-compliances. |

#### Training Delivered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>People Trained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>406 (to June 2019)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Contractor Database (drawn from SiteWise Database)

![Graph showing contractor pipeline and assessment scores]

- **Your Contractors**: 84%
- **All Contractors**: 73%
Hazard Reported (last 12 months)

Risk Register Action Plan Tracking June 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
<th>Action Lead</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Airfield operations</td>
<td>*Require audits of hangars to ensure that they are in compliance with Building Act and tenancy requirements (including the requirement that hazardous substances are prohibited from hangars).</td>
<td>Grant MacLeod</td>
<td>Chris Brown</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Armed Hold-up/Violent or Abusive Customers (on Council Sites) &amp; Site Security</td>
<td>*Develop and implement action plans based on Site Security Reviews.</td>
<td>Rob Hawthorne</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td>Review early 2020 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Boat Operations</td>
<td>*Practise rescue plan drills on regular basis *SOPs have been recently reviewed and require re-training.</td>
<td>Richard Cookson</td>
<td>Jeff Millward</td>
<td>30/06/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Confined space entry</td>
<td>*Review procedures for any work on Ocean Outfall Pipeline/drop-structure to ensure they are adequate.</td>
<td>Richard Cookson/Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Contract Management refresher training at least every 2 years (to provide opportunity to review processes to keep up with industry practice).</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>31/07/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*PDU to create an internal contract management auditing programme which will include H&amp;S requirements.</td>
<td>Kelly La Valley</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Corporate Accommodation</td>
<td>*Ensure that comprehensive planning for any large-scale staff relocations has been completed, which includes workstation ergonomic assessments (may need contractor based on volume of assessments.).</td>
<td>Rob Hawthorne</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td>Review early 2020 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Encourage staff to find alternatives to driving: e.g. video conferencing, skype etc.</td>
<td>Ashleigh Radford</td>
<td>Jeff Millward/Liz Ashton</td>
<td>Review early 2020</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Electricity &amp; Gas (proximity to overhead/underground lines)</td>
<td>*Ensure that emergency response procedures (i.e. what do to in the event of incident/interaction with underground or overhead power lines) is available, and that all relevant staff are trained.</td>
<td>Richard Cookson</td>
<td>Jeff Millward</td>
<td>30/06/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Responsible Parties</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity (proximity to overhead/underground lines)</td>
<td>Retrain all Water Unit staff in use of cable locators.</td>
<td>Richard Cookson, Jeff Millward</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity (proximity to overhead/underground lines)</td>
<td>Engagement with Mainpower to improve Before-U-Dig response times (create MOU?). Engagement with Pegasus Gas to improve Before-U-Dig processes</td>
<td>Richard Cookson, Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management (Workers responding to Civil Emergency events)</td>
<td>Ensure that all of the current control measures are captured in Standard Operating Procedures which are clearly communicated to all relevant workers.</td>
<td>Brennan Wiremu, Nick Harrison</td>
<td>Review early 2020</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency response (internal)</td>
<td>Earthquake seismic sensors to be installed in key buildings to measure potential damage (decision-making as to whether to evacuate or remain in building in earthquake event).</td>
<td>Greig Wilson, Nick Harrison</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency response (internal)</td>
<td>Ear Protection needs to be considered in Emergency Procedures i.e. every person should have access to ear plugs or muffs in case of being trapped or required to stay in the building.</td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety, TBC</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavations</td>
<td>Develop/review standard operating procedures and retrain staff in new SOP. Create and implement Water Unit competency register to ensure ongoing excavator operator competence.</td>
<td>Richard Cookson, Jeff Millward (revised)</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Substances - BAU Handling &amp; Storage</td>
<td>Ensure non-compliances and improvements from 2019 audit have been completed.</td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety, Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td>31/10/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile plant and machinery</td>
<td>Check maintenance records and maintenance schedules are in place to ensure safety of equipment.</td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety, Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td>31/10/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile plant and machinery</td>
<td>Improve competency records to include a schedule of levels of competency for each staff member/each piece of mobile plant.</td>
<td>Richard Cookson, Jeff Millward (revised)</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence/High Risk</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Review and action of 3-Waters Sites Hazard Review (Dan McNally)</td>
<td>Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>30/06/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence/High Risk</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Review and action of Water Unit Observation Report (Impac)</td>
<td>Richard Cookson</td>
<td>Jeff Millward</td>
<td>30/06/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Site Security WWTP</td>
<td>*Site security review to consider any points of access or vulnerabilities to sabotage (in particular pump stations, treatment plants or pipelines)</td>
<td>Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>30/06/2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Traffic management</td>
<td>*Review Traffic Management requirements for Greenspace Team, given that the Greenspace team will be carrying inspections of street trees / street gardens as well as supervision and checking of the contractor working within the road corridor.</td>
<td>Grant MacLeod</td>
<td>Chris Brown</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Violent or Abusive members of public (in the field)</td>
<td>*Consider use of body cameras for enforcement staff</td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Nick Harrison</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Violent or Abusive members of public (in the field)</td>
<td>*Enforce mandatory StopViolence training for all staff that interact with public face-to-face (needs analysis by role)</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Violent or Abusive members of public (in the field)</td>
<td>*Develop 'key client' staff relationships to ensure that only certain staff deal with identified difficult customers</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td>Nick Harrison</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Volunteers conducting hazardous activities</td>
<td>*Undertake a review of operations to ensure that all activity and training is being carried out as per internal H&amp;S processes.</td>
<td>Brennan Wiremu</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td>30/06/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Water Safety (Public)</td>
<td>*Review of risk and required control measures (based on what is 'reasonably practicable')</td>
<td>Grant MacLeod</td>
<td>Chris Brown</td>
<td>Review early 2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Stormwater/Stock Races</td>
<td>*Review of risk and required control measures (based on what is 'reasonably practicable')</td>
<td>Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>Review early 2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>WWTP</td>
<td>*Require review of security fencing of all Waste Water Treatment Plant sites (internal review – test against other organisations). Review Stormwater site security (internal review – test against other organisations).</td>
<td>Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>30/06/2020 (revised)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Working at heights</td>
<td>Water Unit: *Review of all structures which require work at heights to determine the adequacy of the fall protection (in particular the harness systems) and any further procedure/training required to ensure safe use of systems.</td>
<td>Richard Cookson / Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary / Jeff Millward</td>
<td>30/06/2020 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All actions are new since the April 2019 Risk Register review.
*All actions with strikethrough have been transferred to department operational risk registers.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval to undertake footpath improvements adjacent to the Riverview development on the corner of Williams Street and Charles Street.

1.2. This report also seeks Board approval to recommend to Council that funding be allocated from the Kaiapoi Town Centre Budget to this project.

1.3. The second stage of the Riverview development is currently underway at the intersection and high amenity footpath finishes have previously been installed in this area but now need to be extended to tie in with the new buildings to complete the area.

1.4. The developer is carrying out the work within the property boundary however the footpath area has changed from the original Hansen’s Mall development and as such the footpath now needs to be extended to the new boundary on Williams Street and further to the east along Charles Street to the end of the new building.

1.5. The proposed improvements will include exposed aggregate concrete footpaths with saw cuts to match the existing path and extension of the paver bands to match the existing footpath finishes.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190606080258;

(b) Approves the extension of the high amenity paving to tie in with the new Riverview development boundary;

AND

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board recommends:

THAT the Council:
Approves the extension of the high amenity paving to tie in with the new Riverview development boundary;

Approves $22,000 of budget for the extension of the high amenity footpaths outside Riverview Development from the Kaiapoi Town Centre budget;

Notes that following this allocation there will be $572,000 unallocated in the Kaiapoi Town Centre Budget and that future projects have been identified to be carried out from this unallocated budget;

Notes that the timing of the work will need to be carried out to prior to the opening of the new development on 1 September 2019;

Circulates this report to the Utilities and Roading Committee for information.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Kaiapoi Town Centre was upgraded following the Canterbury Earthquakes and at that time the future use of the old Hansen Mall site was not known.

3.2 A number of workshops were held with the Community Board at the time to agree the landscaping details for the refreshed town centre.

3.3 At the time the upgrade was carried out a number of risks were identified and this included the risk of building development on adjoining sites delaying or impacting on works as details of future use was not known at that stage. This was considered to be a risk that needed to be managed and that it was important to move forward with improvements in order to help facilitate future development.

3.4 Staff have been working with the developer of the Riverview development to achieve a high level of interaction between the river and the town centre.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. It is proposed to extend the high amenity footpaths to the boundary alongside the development to tie in with courtyard works which are being carried out by the developer. This will provide a consistent and seamless finish between the footpath and the business frontages.

4.2. The proposed footpath improvement work will involve constructing approximately 100m² of exposed aggregate footpath with saw cuts to tie in with the existing path, along with extension of the existing paver bands. The areas involved are shown as shaded in the image below.
4.3. An alternative option is to use a lower cost finish such as asphalt. This is not considered appropriate as it would detract from the existing footpath and be unsightly.

4.4. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. Discussions have been held with the developer of the Riverview development on extending the existing footpath finished to tie in with the boundary of the new development.

5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. Extensive consultation on the town centre improvements was carried out in conjunction with the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan 2011. The streetscape and landscape plan was developed and approved by the Community Board at the time.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. Should the recommendations in this report be supported then the proposed funding source would be the Kaiapoi Town Centre Budget (PJ 100971.000.5013).

6.3. The Kaiapoi Town Centre budget is $6,000,000. A significant portion of this budget has already been spent or committed however there is still $572,000 of unallocated funds.
A breakdown of the Kaiapoi Town Centre budget is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>LTP Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Purchase 178, 178A, 143 Williams St</td>
<td>Complete. $315,000 returned to date from subsequent sales of property.</td>
<td>$289,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Street Off Ramp contribution</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Improvements and North of Bridge in conjunction with the EQ Repair work</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raven Quay at Library/Service Centre and Blackwell’s</td>
<td>Complete. Overspend $50k on shared space at the Library Service Centre</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocate Mainpower Kiosk on Williams St</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Street South of the Bridge and Hilton Street</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$1,924,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTC Plan Review</td>
<td>Complete. Third funding from the Town Centre Budget.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Town Centre Feature Lighting. Estimate for Stage One</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Town Centre Linkages with Mixed Use Business Areas</td>
<td>Complete. Purchase and demolition of 131 Raven Quay.</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further strategic purchases.</td>
<td>As identified.</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COMMITTED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$5,428,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNALLOCATED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 572,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$6,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following projects have also been identified for this budget, and are likely to be discussed with the Board and Council:

- Painting of the Williams Street Bridge. Estimate $30,000.
- Kaiapoi Town Centre Feature Lighting. Estimate for Stage Two is $125,000. Stage Two extents of work has not yet been confirmed.
- New street lights north of the Williams Street Bridge (to match south of the bridge). High level estimate $400,000 based on Raven Quay to the Railway Line costs.
• Additional footpath work on the corner of Williams Street and Charles Street at Riverview development – Estimated costs $22,000.

• Total cost of the above additional future works $572,000

In summary there is approximately $572,000 of cost to be funded from the unallocated Town Centre Budget, therefore this is likely to be fully utilised.

6.4. The cost estimates for the remaining work in Kaiapoi Town Centre is high level at this stage and a refinement of the estimate will be required.

6.5. Community Implications
6.6. There are no community implications associated with this report.

6.7. Risk Management
6.8. There is a risk that the work may not be completed in time for the opening of the new development. This will be minimised by working closely with the developer to ensure that all works are completed in a timely manner.

6.9. Health and Safety
6.10. Any field work required will be undertaken under the guidelines of the Safe Working in the Field manual.

7. CONTEXT
7.1. Policy
This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2. Legislation
7.3. Not applicable.

7.4. Community Outcomes
This report consider the following outcomes:

There is a safe environment for all
• Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

The distinctive character of our takiwā - towns, villages and rural areas is maintained
• The centres of our towns are safe, convenient and attractive places to visit and do business.

Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
• There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs.
7.5. **Delegations**

The Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board has delegation to make recommendations to Council on issues affecting the ward area.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report recommends the scope for Council to undertake a risk assessment of arsenic in groundwater, for private wells in the wider Kaiapoi area.

1.2 Arsenic has been found above the Maximum Accepted Value (MAV) as defined in the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ 2005, amended 2018) in a small number of private wells in the north-west Kaiapoi area. This has led to the issuing of a Notice under Section 69ZZP of the Health (Drinking Water Amendment) Act 2007, to warn users of a contaminated drinking water supply, directed to Waimakariri District Council (WDC) and Environment Canterbury by the Canterbury Medical Officer of Health.

1.3 The Section 69ZZP notice specifies that Waimakariri District Council must ‘ensure that an assessment is made as to whether the drinking water that is not potable has been or is being supplied to any self-supplying buildings in the area bounded by; the coast in the east, Flaxton in the west, the Cust/Waimakariri River to the south, and Woodend in the north.’

1.4 The Section 69ZZP notice states that ‘where self-supplied buildings are found to have water supplies which are contaminated, the district council must:

(b) take all practicable steps—

   (i) to warn users of that supply—

      (A) that drinking water must not be used for domestic use and food preparation;

      (ii) to exercise any other power or take any action to remedy the situation. Such action may include offering a range of treatment options.’

1.5 Environment Canterbury staff have confirmed in a note to their Councillors on 2 May 2019 that they are able to provide technical data and support to WDC under existing budgets.

1.6 Community and Public Health has a role to provide any interpretation of the Section 69ZZP notice and to receive the final assessment. The assessment under Section 69ZZP is required to be completed by 1 March 2020.
1.7 It is recommended by WDC staff that the assessment under Section 69ZZP is a 'risk assessment'; that defines an area(s) where any elevated risk of high arsenic in groundwater exists, through arsenic test results of approximately 50 representative private wells and interpretation of existing geochemical data, such as for reduced (low oxygen) groundwater zones and/or high levels of iron and manganese that can correlate with arsenic. The risk assessment will also recommend how to minimise any risk to private well owners.

1.8 This report recommends that a budget of $37,000 is allocated from the general rate under the Environmental Health Account for the risk assessment to be undertaken.

1.9 A media release summarising information to-date and with advice for private well owners was released by the WDC Communications Team in early May 2019.

1.10 Council staff have examined staff resourcing and recommend engaging an external consultancy to undertake the risk assessment, with water sampling carried out by the Water Unit.

Attachments:


ii. Arsenic in Private Well Highlights Importance of testing- Media Release (TRIM 190530077281).

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee recommends:

**THAT** the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190527075121.

(b) Notes the scope of the risk assessment, which aims to define an area(s) where any elevated risk of arsenic in groundwater exists, which includes testing for arsenic in 50 private wells and geochemical data interpretation for the wider Kaiapoi area.

(c) Approves an additional budget of $37,000 from the general rate to be allocated under the Environmental Health account, against the Environmental Surveys GL (10.571.829.2465), for a risk assessment of arsenic in groundwater for the wider Kaiapoi area.

(d) Notes that approximately $12,000 of the allocated budget will be for Water Unit sampling and laboratory analysis of 30 private wells. Approximately $15-20k of the allocated budget is for a consultant to undertake data analysis, existing geochemical data review, report writing and recommendations. The remaining $5,000 is for project contingency.

(e) Notes that specific communication will be undertaken by WDC staff with individual landowners and general communication with the wider community following obtaining test results and the risk assessment.

(f) Notes that a sole source supplier will be approached for the data analysis role, due to the limited market of suppliers for the service, and existing knowledge about arsenic within groundwater in the District.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 A level of arsenic in a private well on Lower Camside Road that is over the Maximum Acceptable Value (MAV) of 0.01 mg/L (as per the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand 2005, amended 2018) was reported to WDC in early 2019.
3.2 Subsequent testing of five neighbouring private wells on Lower Camside Road by WDC confirmed one additional well that is over the MAV for arsenic. Environment Canterbury monitoring bores have shown two wells in the wider Kaiapoi area, in 1970 and 2007, that measured over the MAV for arsenic, however arsenic has not been routinely tested for.

3.3 Property owners with the wells over the MAV for arsenic have been advised by WDC to install treatment or use bottled water, as well as an option to connect to a community supply well where practicable. The Water Operations Team Leader is progressing a quote to connect one or two of the properties on Lower Camside Road to the Kaiapoi town supply.

3.4 Arsenic contamination in the coastal area of the District has previously been reported. In 2001, a study of arsenic in private wells and surface water by consultants Pattle Delamore Partners Ltd. (PDP) was commissioned by WDC, Environment Canterbury and Crown Public Health for the area of Saltwater Creek - Waikuku - Woodend. The wider Kaiapoi area was not included in this study due to limited samples at the time (one sample) that were over the MAV for arsenic. The conclusion from the report was that the arsenic is likely to be naturally occurring in sediment deposits, rather than from an industrial source.

3.5 The WDC Communications Team issued a media release early May 2019 with information regarding:

- The extent of knowledge regarding the arsenic in private wells in the wider Kaiapoi area to-date, and that it is thought as this stage to be naturally occurring, rather than from an industrial source.
- That public supplies do not have levels of arsenic over the MAV.
- A reminder to private well owners that water quality testing is their responsibility, with a recommendation from WDC for regular testing.

3.6 Arsenic levels can change over time, i.e. between years. This can be due to changes in the oxygen levels in the groundwater. The groundwater around the west of Kaiapoi can change between oxygenated and reduced (low oxygen) levels. When there are reduced oxygen levels, arsenic attached to sediment can be released into groundwater in higher amounts. Therefore it is recommended for private well owners to test water supplies regularly, particularly where there is reduced oxygen levels in groundwater or ‘mixed’ groundwater (sometimes reduced, sometimes oxygenated).

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Risk Assessment

4.1. The risk assessment will be carried out as per a proposal that will be agreed to by WDC and the consultant. The proposal will outline study objectives, scope, exclusions, deliverables, and timeframe, as laid out in this report, with some potential changes following discussion and agreement with the consultant.

Study Objectives

4.2. The objectives of the risk assessment are:

4.2.1. To establish if there are any sub-areas / cross-sections that can be identified as higher risk for arsenic, where private well users should be warned. ‘Higher risk’ would be defined together with the consultant, but potentially could be set at an arsenic level of 0.005 mg/L (½ MAV).
4.2.2. To assess what is the likely source of the arsenic (natural or anthropogenic), based on what is known of the natural geology and chemistry of the area, and other potential arsenic sources in the area.

4.2.3. To hypothesise if there is any correlation with a geochemical factor, such as low oxygen levels in the groundwater, or geological formation of a particular aquifer, which can be used as a proxy indicator for possible elevated arsenic levels.

4.2.4. To hypothesise what is the variation of arsenic levels over time, through a desktop literature search, in order to recommend how often selected private well owners should re-test the level of arsenic.

4.3. Due to the full chemical suite of parameters that are proposed to be sampled, there is a potential opportunity for water quality results to be further analysed at a later date, outside of the scope of this assessment. An example would be valuable information on the prevalence of E. coli in private wells in the wider Kaiapoi area, indicating whether there is potential faecal contamination.

Scope

4.4. The selection of the 30 wells will follow advice from Environment Canterbury groundwater scientists and/or the consultant. Targeted wells to be sampled will be:

4.4.1. Private wells (i.e. excluding WDC and private community water supplies that are already required to test for arsenic and other determinands under the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand).

4.4.2. Currently, or potentially, used for domestic consumption within the area on Map 1.

4.4.3. Sampled from the well head, or as close to it as possible (i.e. not from a kitchen tap). This is because arsenic could precipitate out when in contact with oxygen.

4.4.4. Sampled for the full chemical suite as defined on the WDC website. In addition to the full chemical suite, additional determinands of; Dissolved Organic Carbon (Non-Purgeable Organic Carbon), Turbidity, Total Suspended Solids, and Ammoniacal-N will be added, as recommended by the 2001 study of Arsenic in Saltwater Creek - Waikuku - Woodend by Pattle Delamore Partners Ltd.
Map 1: Indicative area to which the Section 69ZZP Notice applies to, as confirmed by the Medical Officer of Health. Note that the reticulated areas covered by the Kaiapoi and Tuahiwi community water supplies are excluded from this study.

4.5. The geochemical data review will interpret existing analyses, for example a predictive redox status analysis for the Canterbury Region by Murray Close et al. (2016) from the Institute for Environmental Science and Research (ESR).

4.6. The final report will integrate the discussion and recommendations from the 2001 report by PDP for arsenic in the Saltwater Creek-Waikuku-Woodend area, to give an overview of arsenic in groundwater for the coastal area of the Waimakariri District.

Exclusions

4.7. Exclusions from the risk assessment are:

4.7.1. Well water used for stock and other agricultural uses such as crops and bee-keeping.

4.7.2. Surface water samples and non-water samples e.g. watercress or sediment.

4.7.3. The programme to contact and warn private well owners of any arsenic found that is over ½ MAV (0.005 mg/L), as this will be carried out by WDC staff.

4.7.4. Sampling of Council community water supplies, as these are already regularly tested.

Deliverables

4.8. The consultant would provide as contract deliverables:

4.8.1. A proposal of the risk assessment that is approved by WDC staff.

4.8.2. Advice on the selection criteria for the wells to be sampled.
4.8.3. A summary of well sampling data with interpretation in a report format.

4.8.4. An assessment of risk in the defined area (see Map 1) presented in a form that can be used to inform and warn private well owners.

4.8.5. Reference and comparison to the discussion and recommendations from the 2001 report by PDP for arsenic in the Saltwater Creek-Waikuku-Woodend area.

4.8.6. Maps or criteria of any higher risk sub-areas / cross sections for arsenic, and references to geochemical data used as the basis for recommendations.

4.8.7. A presentation of final report findings and recommendations to Council.

4.8.8. Final recommendations on how risk could be mitigated for private well owners.

**Timeframe**

4.9. The proposed timeframe for the risk assessment is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By July 2019</td>
<td>Scope and budget confirmed by Council with this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By August 2019</td>
<td>Approach to sole source supplier and agreement of risk assessment proposal by WDC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By September 2019</td>
<td>Ground-truthing of Environment Canterbury well data by WDC and Environment Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September- November 2019</td>
<td>Private well owners contacted by WDC. Sampling carried out by the Water Unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September - November 2019</td>
<td>Existing geochemical data review and interpretation by contracted consultant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2019 onwards</td>
<td>Potential programme by WDC staff commences to warn private well users, based on private well testing results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November- December 2019</td>
<td>Data analysis by contracted consultant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By December 2019</td>
<td>Draft report to WDC staff for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By January 2020</td>
<td>Final report accepted by WDC staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 February 2020</td>
<td>Final report with recommendations presented to Council by WDC staff and consultant at Council meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 1 March 2020</td>
<td>Risk assessment is presented to the Canterbury Medical Officer of Health.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data quality and data management**

4.10. Environment Canterbury groundwater scientists will provide advice and technical support to refine which wells are suitable for sampling within the area.

4.11. Some ground-truthing of Environment Canterbury well data will be required by WDC staff, for example by looking at the location of habitable dwellings that are not connected to a reticulated water supply. Environment Canterbury well data may not identify all wells that would be suitable for sampling in cases such as:

4.11.1. Wells dating from pre-1990’s, with no consent expiry or review carried out since this date

4.11.2. Wells are used for domestic use, though not consented for this use.

4.11.3. A reticulated water supply connection exists, therefore an available well is assumed to not be used for domestic consumption.
4.11.4. Wells not recorded in Environment Canterbury well data, for example if no consent to drill a well has been issued.

4.12. It is recommended that a selective representation of wells are sampled (i.e. 30 wells) as there are approximately 280 active wells in the area according to Environment Canterbury data. The area is recommended to be split into five sub-areas to ensure representation and diversity. A ‘shout-out’ for wells via Council communication channels could provide a basis of wells to start from.

4.13. The sampling of 30 additional wells would bring the total for data analysis to 36 well samples with full/extended chemical test results. This is because 6 private well sampling results have been obtained in preliminary testing from North-West of Kaiapoi.

4.14. The 30 wells are recommended to be selected, in discussion with the consultant, on criteria such as:

4.14.1. close proximity to a well with an identified elevated arsenic level;
4.14.2. evidence of reduced oxygen groundwater conditions and/or high levels of other metals, such as iron and manganese;
4.14.3. representativeness within a sub-area;
4.14.4. depth;
4.14.5. willingness of the landowner to provide a sample;
4.14.6. request from landowner to be sampled; and/or
4.14.7. complaints of illness possibly caused by chronic exposure to arsenic.

4.15. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.1.1. Lower Camside Road residents with elevated arsenic levels have expressed a desire for wider testing to be carried out, and for private well owners to be warned of the possible elevated high arsenic.

5.2. **Wider Community**

5.2.1. The wider community has not been consulted on the scope of a risk assessment for arsenic in the wider Kaiapoi area. The wider Kaiapoi community was advised to test water supplies, particularly for arsenic, in a media release from WDC in early May.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. A total cost of $37k is anticipated for the risk assessment, in addition to WDC staff time (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Cost (approximate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sampling by the Water Unit and water sample analysis – 30 wells over 5 sub-areas</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.2. Note that the WDC staff time that would be required to warn any private well owners with elevated arsenic levels, and possibly offering advice on treatment options is currently un-scoped at this stage, due to unknown size of this task. Connection to a Council community water supply could be a potential option that is offered to property owners.

6.1.3. Any proposal for a significant extension of a Council community water supply scheme, due to results of the risk assessment, would be brought to Council for consideration as part of the Long Term Plan process.

6.2. Community Implications

6.2.1. A comprehensive and coordinated risk assessment of arsenic in private wells for the wider Kaiapoi area will give the best outcomes for the community. This is because currently water quality testing by private well owners is discretionary, and results are not required to be shared with Council unless as a condition for a subdivision or building consent. Due to this situation, an overview of the level of risk and how to mitigate it, is not able to be carried out.

6.3. Risk Management

6.3.1. Risk to private well owners in the wider Kaiapoi area of exposure to arsenic levels over the MAV will likely be reduced as a result of this assessment and subsequent communication of recommendations.

6.3.2. The programme to warn private well users of any elevated arsenic level will commence as soon as water test results are confirmed. However, this is before the risk assessment report will be finalised. This is because a water test result is sufficient to alert private well owners, and there is a potential risk to human health in delaying communication of results.

6.4. Health and Safety

6.4.1. There are some health and safety considerations of water sampling staff while out in the field, which will be minimised by complying with the ‘Safe Working in the Field’ manual if staff from the Water Unit.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

7.1.1. This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2. Legislation

7.2.1. Health (Drinking Water Amendment) Act 2007 (Section 69ZZP)

7.3. Community Outcomes

7.3.1. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all
7.3.1.1. Cultural values relating to water are acknowledged and respected.

7.3.1.2. Harm to the environment from the spread of contaminants into ground water and surface water is minimised.

7.4. **Delegations**

7.4.1. The Council has the authority to approve allocation of new budget.
Dr. Alistair R.G. Humphrey  
Medical Officer of Health (Canterbury)

Notice to warn users of a contaminated drinking water supply

Section 69ZZP, Health Act

To: Mr. Jim Palmer, CEO  
Waimakariri District Council  
215 High Street,  
Rangiora  
Canterbury 7400

Mr. Bill Bayfield CEO  
Environment Canterbury  
200 Tuam St  
Christchurch Central 8011

1. The reasons for this order are:  
Heavy metal contaminants (arsenic) have been identified in two monitoring bores on SH71 (0.013g/m$^3$ and 0.0112g/m$^3$) close to SH71 (appendix 2a and 2b). This indicates that an aquifer is contaminated with arsenic from which drinking water is drawn that supplies self-supplied households in the area. Two private bores which draw from the same aquifer and are used for drinking water at 57 Lower Camside Road and 139 Lower Camside Road have also been found to be contaminated with arsenic (0.017gm$^3$ and 0.03gm$^3$ respectively - see appendix 2c and 2d).

2. The action required to be taken is:  
Waimakariri District Council must:
(a) ensure that an assessment is made as to whether drinking water that is not potable has been or is being supplied to any self-supplied buildings in the area bounded by the coast in the east, Flaxton in the west, the Cust/Waimakariri River in the south; and Woodend in the north.

Where self-supplied buildings are found to have water supplies which are contaminated, the district council must:

(b) take all practicable steps—
(i) to warn users of that supply—  
(A) that drinking water must not be used for domestic use and food preparation;
(ii) to exercise any other power or take any action to remedy the situation. Such action may include offering a range of treatment options.

3. The assessment must be completed by 1st March 2020.

4. The name and address of the Medical Officer of Health who issued this notice is:

Dr. Alistair Humphrey MPH MHL FAFPHM FRACGP  
Medical Officer of Health (Canterbury)  
Community & Public Health  
310 Manchester Street  
Christchurch  
Canterbury 8013

Identification provided as Appendix 1 in accordance with s69ZU Health Act 1956

Community & Public Health Division, Canterbury District Health Board  
PO Box 1475, Christchurch 8140  
Telephone 03 364 1777

A.R.G. Humphrey  
30th April 2019
Appendix 1

Health Act 1956

69ZU Drinking-water assessors and designated officers must produce identification

1) The Director-General must provide an identity card or other means of identification to each drinking-water assessor and each designated officer.

2) Whenever a drinking-water assessor or designated officer exercises any power under this Part, that drinking-water assessor or designated officer must, on request, produce the identity card or other means of identification for inspection.
## Appendix 2a

### Eurofins ELS Limited

**Analytical Report**

**Report Number:** 18/00149

**Issue:** 3

**27 December 2018**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Map Ref.</th>
<th>Data Sampled</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Order No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/0149-31</td>
<td>Domestic Water Supply</td>
<td>Notes: 817-2016-00073815 EU2BC0002044</td>
<td>14/12/2018 15:53</td>
<td>18/12/2018 11:06</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- **PH:** 7.3
- **Nitrate - Total:** 132 mg/l
- **Conductivity at 25°C:** 40.3 µS/m
- **Total Dissolved Solids:** 230 mg/l
- **Nitrate - Nitrogen:** 0.10 mg/l
- **Sulphate:** 0.04 mg/l
- **Asarce - Acid Soluble:** 0.017 mg/l
- **Barium - Acid Soluble:** 0.11 mg/l
- **Calcium - Acid Soluble:** 0.27 mg/l
- **Copper - Acid Soluble:** 0.019 mg/l
- **Iron - Acid Soluble:** 0.040 mg/l
- **Magnesium - Acid Soluble:** 0.21 mg/l
- **Manganese - Acid Soluble:** 0.008 mg/l
- **Phosphorus - Acid Soluble:** 0.04 mg/l
- **Silicon - Acid Soluble:** 99.3 mg/l
- **Total Hardness:** 2 mg/l
- **Silica:** 20.9 mg/l

**Comments:**

- Sampled by customer using ELS approved containers.
- Report re-issued with amended testing and/or test method.
- TSS report cancels and replaces report 16/0149-2. Please dispose of at previous versions.

**Comments on Individual Test Results:**

- **pH:**
  - Measures the acidity or basicity of the water sample. Water with low pH can be corrosive and those with a high pH can promote scale formation in pipes and hot water cylinders. The guideline value for pH in the NZ Drinking Water Standards is 6.5 to 8.5, so the pH of this sample complies with this value.

- **Nitrate - Total:**
  - Nitrate is a measure of a water's ability to neutralise acid and is not listed in the NZ Drinking Water Standards. It is included here as a general water quality parameter and can be used as part of the Salinity Index calculation.

- **Conductivity at 25°C:**
  - Conductivity is not listed in the NZ Drinking Water Standards and is an indicator of how many ions are dissolved in the water such as chlorides, sulphates and iron. The result is used to calculate the Total Dissolved Solids content of a sample.

- **Total Dissolved Solids:**
  - Total Dissolved Solids is calculated from the conductivity result and has a Guideline Value in the NZ Drinking Water Standards of 1,200 mg/l. The result for this...
Appendix 2b

Certificate of Analysis

| Client: Community & Public Health Division, Canterbury District Health Board |
| Contact: Sophie Allen |
| PO Box 1475, Christchurch 8140 |
| Telephone 03 364 1777 |

| Sample Type: Aquous |
| Sample Name: |
| Lab Number: 2150975 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Method Description</th>
<th>Default Detection Limit</th>
<th>Sample No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Alkalinity</td>
<td>gm as CaCO₃</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Carbon Dioxide</td>
<td>gm at 25°C</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hardness</td>
<td>gm as CaCO₃</td>
<td>&lt; 1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conductivity (EC)</td>
<td>mS/m</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conductivity (EC)</td>
<td>µS/cm</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amonia Total Dissolved Salts</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Copper</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Magnesium</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>0.00071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Magnesium</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>&lt; 0.00053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Potassium</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>&lt; 0.00053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sodium</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Zinc</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate-N</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>&lt; 0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Methods

The following table gives a brief description of the methods used to conduct the analyses for this job. The detection limits given below are those attainable in a reasonably clean matrix. Detection limits may be higher for individual samples should insufficient samples be available, or if the matrix requires that blanks be performed during analysis. Unless otherwise indicated, analyses were performed at Hill Laboratories, 28 Duke Street, Parnell, Hamilton 3064.

This Laboratory is accredited by International Accreditation New Zealand (IANZ), which represents New Zealand in the International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC). Through the ILAC Mutual Recognition Arrangement (ILAC-MRA), this accreditation is internationally recognised. The tests reported herein have been performed in accordance with the terms of accreditation, with the exception of tests marked *, which are not accredited.
### M35/0724 - KAIAPOI FIRE WELL

#### Environment Canterbury
Regional Council
Kaunihera Taiao ki Waitaha

#### Results for Sample ID 2706670 taken 04-Oct 2007 12:00pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Name</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Lab</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alkalinity to pH 4.5 as HCO3</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>mg/L as HCO3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammoniacal Nitrogen</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenic, Dissolved</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium, Dissolved</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductivity</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>mS/m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductivity (Field)</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>mS/m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuterium</td>
<td>-57.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in Ion Balance</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved Oxygen</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved Oxygen % Saturation</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardness, Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>g/m³ as CaCO3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron, Dissolved</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium, Dissolved</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganese, Dissolved</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate Nitrogen</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxygen 18</td>
<td>-8.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH (Field)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium, Dissolved</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silica, Reactive</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>mg/L as SiO₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium, Dissolved</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## M35/5111 -

Results for Sample ID 165399405 taken 01-Jan 1970 12:00pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Name</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Lab</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alkalinity, Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>g/m3 as CaCO3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammoniacal Nitrogen</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenic, Dissolved</td>
<td>0.0112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicarbonate</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>mg/L at 25C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium, Dissolved</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductivity</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>mS/m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductivity (Field)</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>mS/m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuterium</td>
<td>-50.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in Ion Balance</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved Organic Carbon</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved Oxygen</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved Oxygen % Saturation</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. coli</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>MPN/100ml</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardness, Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>g/m3 as CaCO3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron, Dissolved</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter Name</td>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium, Dissolved</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganese, Dissolved</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate Nitrogen</td>
<td>&lt;0.002</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate-N + Nitrite-N</td>
<td>&lt;0.002</td>
<td>g/m3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrite Nitrogen</td>
<td>&lt;0.002</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxygen 18</td>
<td>-7.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH (Field)</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium, Dissolved</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silica, Reactive</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>mg/L as SiO2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium, Dissolved</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphate</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of anions</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>meq/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of cations</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>meq/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Coliforms</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>number/100mL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dissolved Phosphorus</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dissolved Phosphorus Digestion</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Temperature (Field)</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Maximum arsenic concentrations recorded in groundwater (1995 to 2016)²

**Arsenic in Private Well Highlights Importance of Testing**

Council is reminding owners of private wells to have their water regularly tested, following a few recent private well tests showing elevated arsenic levels in the north-west of Kaiapoi. The arsenic is thought to be naturally occurring, though further investigation is intended to be carried out by the Council.

Utilities and Roading Manager Gerard Cleary advises “there is no need to be concerned if supplied by a Council reticulated water scheme. The Council supplies have regular testing, with no water supply affected by elevated arsenic levels.”

A Kaiapoi landowner brought arsenic in groundwater to the attention of the Waimakariri District Council, after obtaining a water test for their private well supply. The discovery highlights the importance of private well owners to know that they are responsible to undertake their own water monitoring.

The test showed a level of arsenic above the Maximum Acceptable Value (MAV) of 0.01 milligrams per litre (mg/l), as set out in the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ).

“Consumption of arsenic over 0.01 mg/L can cause adverse health effects over the long term so it’s important to test regularly – at least annually - to check that water is safe to drink. Arsenic levels can change seasonally. The test for arsenic is particularly important in the coastal areas of our district where groundwater oxygen levels get low” says Council’s Water Environment Advisor Sophie Allen. “Arsenic is just one contaminant that well owners should look for, with testing also recommended for other potential contaminants such as nitrates and *E. coli* (bacterial contamination).”

Following the notification, Council has carried out testing on five private wells to the north-west Kaiapoi to assess the extent of higher arsenic levels in neighbouring properties, with another property found to be above the MAV. Over the next 10 months the Council, with the support of Environment Canterbury, intends to undertake further work to determine the extent of the issue in the wider Kaiapoi area below Woodend.

High levels of arsenic have been known to be found in some selected private wells in the Waikuku, Saltwater Creek and Woodend area since early 2000’s. “The arsenic in this northern coastal part of the Waimakariri District was concluded in a 2001 study to be from natural sources found in certain sediments, which is released into groundwater when oxygen levels are low.” says Sophie.

Gerard Cleary recommends that people on private wells regularly test their water to ensure it is safe. “This incidence is an important reminder for private well owners to have their water checked by an accredited laboratory ensuring water is safe to drink.”

Standard filters are not adequate for the removal of arsenic, and advice should be sought from a water treatment specialist on the appropriate filtration system for removal.

Any private well owners who have found arsenic levels over 0.01 mg/L in the wider Kaiapoi Area are encouraged to notify Sophie Allen - Water Environment Advisor, Waimakariri District Council.
Find out more:


ECan pamphlet– Do you get your household water from a private well?

Ends
PRESENT:
Sam Redman (WDC), Caitlin Tipping, Arabella Jarman. Ellie Tizzard, David Ayers (WDC Mayor), Dan Gordon (WDC Councillor), Jacob Harford, Kirstyn Barnett (WDC Councillor), Katie Lange, Eris Le Compte (Minute Secretary).

GUESTS:
Claire Fletcher and John Yin (ECAN)

APOLOGIES:

1. WELCOME:
Arabella welcomed everyone present as well as the guest speakers

2. ECAN BUS ROUTE PROPOSED CONSULTATION:
Claire and John from ECAN walked the committee through the proposed new bus routes in the Waimakariri region. Due to the population increase in the region, there are inefficiencies with the current network. It is planned to extend the Rangiora service to take in the new housing areas and to provide better links between Silverstream, Woodend and Kaiapoi. Unfortunately, surveys show that the service to Waikuku does not show high usage. These changes will have to be carried out within the current operating budget.

It was suggested that Claire contact both Rangiora High School and Rangiora New Life School to arrange a consultation and for Sam to liaise with Claire. ECAN welcome any feedback, ideas etc. And to also look at the possibilities of running express or limited services.
3. REPORTS FOR DISCUSSION:
The WDC Council were very pleased with the good turn outs throughout the district on Anzac Day.

The Annual Plan is to be deliberated next week with rural/residential discussions on future planning taking place at the moment. It would be good to have a representative from the Youth Council sit in – Sam to liaise.

Machinery has started working at the Kaiapoi sports field. Landscape trees have been donated by Honda. The Kaiapoi River is being dredged near where the future pontoon is to be erected.

WDC Council will be calling for proposals/ideas for the Rangiora BNZ Corner space which is owned by the council. The Multi Sports Stadium is going to tender next week.

4. ANNUAL PLAN SUBMISSION:
Sam distributed copies of the Waimakariri Youth Council submission to the Annual Plan 2019/20. He asked members to read and prepare for the presentation to WDC Council on 9 May at 7.20pm. It is hoped to make the presentation very interesting so as to ‘stand out’. Please forward any ideas or suggestions to Sam.

5. RECRUITMENT:
Seven applications have been received as interested applicants. Interviews will take place between 14-16 May between 4 – 5.30pm. Jacob and Caitlin have offered to help Sam with the interviews.

Sam has received a resignation from Alex Jackson due to her move to Australia.

6. TERMS OF REFERENCE:
This will be carried forwarded to the training day to be held in June.

7. EVENTS – YOUTH CONNECT – SKATE JAM:
Sam spoke of his disappointment at the lack of interest for the South Island Youth Connect especially as he had reserved accommodation. He reminded members of the expectations required in serving as a member of Youth Council.
It is planned to hold a training/team building session in June. The second weekend in June was suggested – 8 or 9th? Sam will prepare a shared calendar.

Around 200 people attended the skate jam and munched on sausages.

8. **GENERAL BUSINESS:**

   **Age-Friendly Meeting:**
   Workshop sessions are happening in the community and everyone is getting to know one another.

   Everyone very pleased with the response received from the survey.

   Sam will contact Kathy Graham re talks about the road safety committee.

   **Youth Centre Group:**
   Information is being collated for the research and consultation phase. The first forum takes place at the end of May to which the Youth Council are invited – hoping for brainstorming ideas etc. Sam to let members know time, details etc.

   It was suggested that youth council members inspect youth spaces. Also, looking at pop-up stalls being held throughout the year.

   **Ellie’s Preparation for July visit to Parliament:**
   Ellie is gathering information on employment in the region, youth ideas etc. Sam will connect with Youth Futures.

   An employment expo is being held at Southbrook on Sunday 5 May.

   **Annual Plan:**
   Items to be considered:
   - The new tennis courts – a proposal for clubs to join together was endorsed.
   - Park and ride.
   - The skate park.
   - Funding plan.
   - Further aspirations.
9. **ACTIONS:**

- **ACTION** – Claire to make contact with both Rangiora High School and Rangiora New Life School re the proposed changes to bus services and then to liaise with Sam.
- **ACTION** – Members to read copies of the distributed Submission to the Annual Plan and to prepare for the presentation to council. Sam will liaise with the team.
- **ACTION** - Sam to confirm with those members who offered to help with the interviews on 14-16 May.
- **ACTION** - Sam to ask about the Road Safety Committee meetings. To make contact with Kathy Graham.
- **ACTION** - Sam to prepare a shared calendar.
- **ACTION** – Sam to advise members details, times etc. for the Youth Centre Forum being held at the end of May.
- **ACTION** – Sam to connect with Youth Futures re Ellie’s preparation for her Wellington trip.

Meeting closed at 8:44pm.

Next meeting is on **Tuesday 28 May 2019** at 7pm, at the Rangiora Service Centre.

**NOTES:**
PRESENT:
Sam Redman (WDC), Caitlin Tipping, Ellie Tizzard, David Ayers (WDC Mayor – late arrival), Dan Gordon (WDC Councillor), Jacob Harford, Kirstyn Barnett (WDC Councillor), Benya Ickenroth, Ben Spark, Katie Lange, Luca Hodgson, Bailey Dodd, Jaden Williams, Sasha Crawford, Damon Galbraith, Hope McCormack, Eris Le Compte (Minute Secretary)

GUESTS:
David Hill (North Canterbury News)

APOLOGIES:
Arabella Jarman

1. WELCOME:
Jacob welcomed everyone present especially extending a warm welcome to the new members of WDC Youth Council.

2. INTRODUCTIONS AND EXPLANATIONS OF YOUTH COUNCIL:
A round the table introduction took place followed by an outline of what is involved in being a member of the youth council; questions were invited.

3. REPORTS FOR DISCUSSION:
Dan explained that WDC are meeting at the moment doing the budget for the coming year. Approval was given for new tennis courts at Coldstream Road along with roading improvements around that area and Mainpower Oval. Dan thanked members from Youth Council for attending the council meetings.
There was a great attendance of around 50 volunteers at the Kaiapoi regeneration area last weekend to help plant trees which have been donated by Honda Motors.

Kirstyn outlined that extra resources have been approved to go ahead with the regional water plan and diversities looking ahead to climate change. A Careers Expo will be held at Rangiora High School on Tuesday 11 June between 5.30 – 9 pm. This will be aimed at the 13-25 year age group.

4. **ANNUAL PLAN SUBMISSION:**
   Members of WDC Youth Council spoke at the submission hearing on 9 May re the concept plan for Church Street, Rangiora. Sam circulated drawings of the plan to the new members. Dan thought Ellie, Caitlin and Arabella spoke very well and held the attention of councillors. Youth Council are waiting to hear back from the council.

5. **ECAN CONSULTATION AND SUBMISSION:**
   Caitlin was thanked for her presence at Rangiora High School re the changing of bus routes in the area. ECAn are now consulting with high schools in the area and explaining the changes. It is planned to have Claire Fletcher from ECAn come to the next youth council meeting on 2 July.
   The only feedback Caitlin received was on the presentation of the pamphlet – apparently it was hard to open.

6. **YOUTH SPACES STAKEHOLDERS FORUM:**
   A district meeting will be held on Thursday 4 July at the Woodend Community Centre, 4 – 6 pm. Four youth forums will follow later at High Schools.
   **Please advise Sam if interested in attending. Sam will email out more details.**

7. **TEAM BUILDING:**
   The team building day will be held on Sunday 9 June at the Woodend Christian Camp. From 9am to 4.30pm. WDC Councillors are welcome to attend this event. **Sam will email out the StrengthsFinder code. Youth Councillors to complete the Strengths assessment.**

   There is a Youth Spaces meeting on Thursday 30 May, 3.30 pm at the WDC Council rooms. **Also please let Sam know if attending.**
8. **GENERAL BUSINESS:**
   
   **Age-Friendly Meeting:**
   Madeleine Burdon is organising a steering group and will be sending out a draft strategic plan for future meetings.

   **Waimakariri Health Advisory Group (WHAG):**
   In her capacity as Youth Council representative on WHAG, Benya gave an outline of this group who meet bi-monthly to the new members.

   A quiz night is being held on Tuesday 25 June at the Five Stags Restaurant, Rangiora in aid of Big Brothers, Big Sisters - rangioraleos@gmail.com. They are looking for teams to participate and it was suggested that youth council enter a team. Dan Gordon kindly offered to sponsor a team of six from youth council. **Please advise Sam if interested in taking part.**

   **Because the quiz night falls on a Youth Council meeting night, it was agreed to move the June meeting back a week to 2 July to enable a team to enter.**

9. **ACTIONS:**
   - ACTION – Claire Fletcher from ECan to come to the next meeting on 2 July.
   - ACTION – Please advise Sam if interested in attending the Youth Spaces Forum at the Woodend Community Centre on 4 July.
   - ACTION – Sam to email out details re the Youth Spaces Forum.
   - ACTION – Also, let Sam know if interested in attending meeting at WDC Council Rooms on Thursday 30 May. 3.30pm
   - ACTION – Sam to email out the code for StrengthsFinder. Youth Councillors to complete Strengths assessment by 6th June.
   - Action: Please also advise Sam if wanting to take part in quiz evening.

---

Meeting closed at **7.55pm.**

Next meeting is on **Tuesday 2 July 2019** at **7pm,** at the **Rangiora Service Centre.**

**PLEASE NOTE CHANGE OF DATE.**
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 21 MAY 2019 COMMENCING AT 4.15PM.

PRESENT

Councillor N Atkinson (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors K Barnett, A Blackie and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors W Doody, D Gordon and S Stewart
J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), J Palmer (Chief Executive), C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation), G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), D Young (Senior Engineering Advisor), C Browne (Health, Safety and Quality Manager), G Meadows (Policy Manager), H Street (Corporate Planner), P Christensen (Finance Manager)

The Chairperson welcomed the Mayor, Councillors and representatives of the Management team from Selwyn District Council who were present to observe proceedings of the meeting. The meeting was opened and adjourned at 4.15pm and reconvened at 4.30pm. This allowed for the conclusion of informal discussions between the visiting Councillors and management and Waimakariri District Councillors and management.

1 APOLOGIES

Moved Councillor Williams seconded Councillor Barnett

THAT an apology for absence be received and sustained from Councillor Blackie.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest recorded.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on Tuesday 26 March 2019

Moved Councillor Felstead seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Audit Committee

(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee, held on the 26 March 2019, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING

No matters arising.
5 PRESENTATION/DEPUTATION

There were no presentations.

6 REPORTS

6.1 Audit New Zealand Management Audit Plan for the Annual Report for year ended 30 June 2019 – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)

Dereck Ollsson, who replaces John Mackey as the Waimakariri District Council Audit Director, and Chris Genet, Audit Manager, from Audit New Zealand presented the Audit Plan for the Annual Report for the financial year ended 30 June 2019. D Olsen highlighted some of the key focus areas, being the revaluation of the property, plant and equipment on a cyclical programme – this year the Council is required to value its road, land and buildings and parks and reserves. The Audit will determine if there is a fair valuation undertaken. The audit has also identified the transfer of the ownership of the Regeneration land, which is a key issue that will be looked at. This land was purchased and transferred to the Council for a cost of $1 from the Crown. This land needs to be carried at a fair value within the Council’s accounting records. A valuation is required to be performed of the land. Another area identified is the work relating to service performance information, and focus on rates and to ensure that the legislative requirements are being met. There are audit procedures that need to be performed to ensure that there is no fraudulent activities. There is a focus this year in the OAG office around bribery and corruption and there will be some work done relating to this. There is also the Officer of the Auditor General has a theme around procurement. There is a lot of work being done around procurement and the OAG may request the Auditors look at some matters in this organisation. It has been identified that some of the audit procedures can be undertaken before year end, which will reduce the congestion post year end and alleviate the pressure at the audit. The audit will be finalised and ready by the 1 October 2019.

Following a question from Councillor Barnett, J Millward confirmed that the audit will be adopted by Council either on the 1st or 8th of October. J Millward noted that matters are progressing well and the red zone property valuations are already undertaken. It is not expected there will be anything untoward to delay the audit and adoption of the Annual Report.

Deputy Mayor Felstead questioned who and how the focus areas are decided on. D Ollsson responded that from discussions with management they look at matters which would be of interest to the public. The OAG set their themes and consult with Parliament and they then identify certain themes. Once these are identified, these themes filter down in the work programmes of the Auditors.

J Millward commented that the Procurement and Contract Management Policy was adopted in November which was done in conjunction with Selwyn District Council and Canterbury Finance Managers and Shared services.

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No. 190322039574
(b) Receives Audit New Zealand’s Audit Plan for the Council’s Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2019;
6.2 Local Government Act 2002 Section 17A Cost Effectiveness of Service Delivery – Graphic Design, Valuation Services, Alcohol Licensing and Food Registration – Veronica Spittal (Senior Policy Analyst)

In the absence of Veronica Spittal, G Meadows (Policy Manager) and M Harris (Customer Services Manager) presented this report.

M Harris advised that the Council is in second three-year term of the Valuation services contract which goes until 2021. This function is not something that could be brought in house and delivery by an external contractor is the only option for the Council to meet the requirements of the Act. A more thorough review will be undertaken in 2021, prior to the expiry of the contract, to see what is available in the market.

The review of Environmental Services (alcohol licencing and food registration) is being put out to 2020 and Councillor Atkinson asked why this can’t be done now when it has already been put off once before. J Palmer responded, noting that there is also a vacancy for an ESU Manager which the Council is currently recruiting for. N Harrison (Manager Regulation), is standing in for this role at the moment as well. For Food Safety Inspectors, there is an ongoing conversation on what is the appropriate balance of in-house staff and using outsource contractors. It was noted that other Council’s do outsource some of this function. The Council wants to maintain some elements of this area internally, for the convenience of customer enquiries and for guidance and direction to the resources in health and food safety. There will be a continued contract element. J Palmer advised that it is not intended to do a service review in advance of a new Manager being appointed and would want the Manager to be part of any review, and having this scheduled for 2020 would allow this. It was confirmed that this review has already been delayed previously and now it is being delayed a further 18 months.

Moved Councillor Felstead seconded Councillor Barnett

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No. 190416056702.
(b) Approves the attached S17A Review for Valuation Services.
(c) Agrees that the reviews of Graphic Design, Alcohol Licensing and Food Registration be deferred until October 2020.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson is disturbed that this review of the Environment Services Unit is being delayed again, and does not want to see the unit put under any more pressure. This review could take place without a Manager being in place and Councillor Atkinson is disappointed that the review is being put out this far and would like to see a review done as quickly as possible.
6.3 Outcomes of the WDC Health and Safety Risk Register Review September 2018 – Liz Ashton (Manager Organisation Development and HR)

C Browne (Health, Safety and Quality Manager), presented this report on behalf of L Ashton. This presents the outcomes of the April 2019 WDC Health and Safety Risk Register review. There has been a full review of the Council's risk ratings and for that reason there has been a reduction in high risks and also because there has been a series of control measures implemented over the past six months. There has been four new risks added around water safety of the public; Water Safety in stormwater and stock races; corporate accommodation project and fatigue in the workplace (impairment). Three highest risks identified in this review are contractor health and safety management, driver safety and traffic management. There is an action plan associated with each of these high risk elements.

Regarding the identification of risks that the Council has no control of, Councillor Felstead asked is this a risk in itself. Mr Palmer noted that there are risks in many assets that the Council owns including roads and drains. In exercising responsible governance, the Council should identify the risk and the Act requires the Council to think about any practical, feasible or affordable mitigation measures that can be put in place. In some cases there aren’t and there can be serious consequences because of this.

Councillor Williams questioned the situation of a contractor working on a Council site, then sub-contracting out some of the work, with the risk of the subcontractor not meeting the Council’s health and safety requirements. C Browne said the Council endeavours to maintain control of contracts and asks that contractors provide the names of subcontractors and their levels of competence. J Palmer noted that there has been an issue recently when a sub-contractor was working on a Council site, without the knowledge of the Council. All parties involved when working on Council sites have a health and safety responsibility (i.e. sub-contractors, contractors and the Council as principal).

Mayor Ayers noted that some of the risks are not health and safety but about vehicles or property. C Browne noted there has been some discussion about whether some of these risks could get transferred to departmental risk registers.

Moved Councillor Williams seconded Councillor Barnett

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No 190506064281,
(b) Reviews the outcomes of the WDC Health and Safety Risk Register Review April 2019, and
(c) Receives Risk Register Action Plan outcomes from April 2019 and notes the next steps for implementation.

CARRIED
6.4 **Non-Financial Performance Measures 3\textsuperscript{rd} Quarter Results as at 31 March 2019 – Helene Street (Corporate Planner)**

H Street presented this report and provided two updates that had been advised since the report was submitted. Section 3.4 District Development, the number of Land Use Consents audited, this had been achieved in December, but had been incorrectly recorded as not met. Secondly, Community Protection, it was advised that there are still some inspections of licenced premises being undertaken each week, but the numbers of these are not known.

Councillor Barnett asked about the recurrence of water related matters that are not meeting the targets. Drain maintenance level of service is to respond within five working days, K Simpson confirmed that this is an appropriate measure and that the Council can achieve it. Currently there are two issues that staff are working through. There are instances where the Council is responding within the five working days but the current system is not reflecting this. Secondly, it is important to have all the systems and processes in place to meet the target. A new system now provides an update every 15 minutes and this is seeing a change in ownership with staff and making sure these service requests are keeping front of mind. There is also now both rural and urban land drainage staff resource, which will provide better responses.

Some wastewater schemes do provide issues and there are a number of things which make it challenging. K Simpson noted that regional councils are under more pressure to make sure that wastewater consent compliance is actually being enforced and council staff have noticed a stricter line from the Regional Council in this respect. Staff are working with the regional council and looking at upgrading the systems to address the issues. G Cleary added that there has been quite a drive in the whole Utilities and Roading department on customer service request response rates and this has seen an increase in responses from 73\% to 83\% in the last 12 months. There has been more staff resources directed at these service request responses. There has been some improvements in systems, and there is still scope to be working on.

Councillor Stewart spoke on the stormwater service requests following the February 2018 storm, asks if all these have been dealt with now. K Simpson confirmed all requests had been dealt with, though noted that there are still isolated groups that the Council is working with at Waikuku Beach and The Pines Beach. It was agreed that there will be an overall update provided to the next Utilities and Roading committee meeting.

Councillor Barnett asked about the community protection that has showing as not been undertaken and was there any legislative requirements that the Council was not meeting at this time. J Palmer agreed to source information on this and circulate this to all members.

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Atkinson

**THAT** the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) **Receives** the report Non-Financial Performance Measure 2\textsuperscript{nd} Quarter Results as at 31 March 2019, TRIM No. 190506064258.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Barnett comment on the improving trend noted in the report. Water issues in the district will always be challenging, both stormwater and wastewater. The Council has faced some fairly significant storm and flooding
events in the past few years and appreciates the allocation of more resources in this area and the comprehensive information provided in the report.

6.5 Financial Report for the period ended 31 March 2019 - Paul Christensen (Finance Manager)

P Christensen presented this report and the financial result to the end of March 2019. The key results are the surplus was $11.8 million against a budget of $11.3 million. External debt remain at $145 million which hasn’t changed since August 2018 and the capital spend was $45 million, which is 51% of the budget. One key point to note is the operating cost is slightly over budget by 1% ($700,000). Two items highlighted are both non-cash items, the council was $800,000 over budget in depreciation, the largest area of this was roading and also had $800,000 of disposals which come from renewals work. J Millward provided an explanation on the roading depreciation.

Councillor Barnett asked why there has been an increase in interest on debt increased? P Christensen said interest doesn’t change much as interest rates are fixed rates with hedging and the loan interest budget may not have been calculated appropriately.

Moved Councillor Felstead seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No. 190502062626.
(b) Notes that progress is tracking favourably in comparison to budget;
(c) Notes that the Council has maintained its AA credit rating, with an outlook of negative from Standard & Poors.

CARRIED

6.6 Capital Projects Quarterly Report – Year to Date ended 31 March 2019 – Don Young (Senior Engineering Advisor), Chris Brown (Manager Community and Recreation), Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), Paul Christensen (Finance Manager)

G Cleary, D Young, C Brown and P Christensen presented this report. D Young provided an explanation on the difference in the reporting of this information noting that most of the information relates to capital expenditure in Utilities and Roading department. There has been significant effort put into reporting against individual projects This report is a work in progress, this allows managers to manage their projects on a daily basis, and secondly this provides good high level management information on a higher level to department managers, thirdly this presents information to the Council on what is happening behind the scenes.

D Young noted that when going through this process, it has become clear that there needs to be a standardisation in the reporting regime. There are many projects that do not fit within the normal delivery framework and so these may not show up as being the true performance as what is reflected in the report (possible due to timing). This may take a year or two for the true performance to be reflected in the reporting. Staff are endeavouring to give as truer picture as they can with this new reporting methodology.

Staff would appreciate any feedback from Councillors on the information that has been presented and any way this could be presented better. Following
discussion, Councillor Atkinson confirmed that any feedback could come directly to D Young.

Councillor Stewart questioned if the completion time for projects was being pitched too ambitiously and could these not be “pulled back”. This is a concern she has raised previously. The new system being delivered to the Council was commended at delivering far more accurate information. G Cleary added that the U&R staff submission to the Annual Plan, to approve some projects that staff will be asking the Council to move to outer years, particularly in the drainage areas. In some cases because it is apparent that they would not be met in the timeframe originally, or that there is hold ups from developers.

D Young advised a new spreadsheet that is being developed will show Project Managers have a pre-planning stage, to show what resources will be required, any land purchases required etc. The aim of this is to be in a good position by 1 July and know where there are any problems. Council needs to be cleverer about allocating the budgets over multiple years and for people to be more realistic about what will be spent each year, rather than spreading it randomly.

Councillor Gordon asked about when will the Council get the opportunity to have a discussion about Standard and Poor’s rating. J Millward said at the moment Standard and Poors are working on the rating factors which will make it more difficult to get a double AA rating. There proposal involves changing eight factors that they use for assessment, down to six. J Millward noted that Development Contributions is not taken into account by Standard and Poors and also spoke on the factor that is a challenge for this Council, which is the debt percentage to operating revenue. There was also comment made on other credit rating agencies that the Council could use.

To provide some information, Mr Palmer said an introductory presentation will be made to the Annual Plan Deliberations meeting next week (May 28).

Councillor Barnett questioned the delays which show up in community and recreation items. C Brown noted the difficulty with reserves to be vested to Council in residential subdivision developments and development contributions. Mr Palmer said it is a foible of the LG Act and setting development contributions, but often doesn’t relate to the reality of the situation.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No.190510066661
(b) Notes the progress of the capital projects as detailed below and in the attached spreadsheets
(c) Notes the improvement plan actions proposed as per Section 6 below.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson thanked staff for the report and the level of information provided. Over the coming years the reporting will provide a more clearer picture of projects and what can truly be accomplished in a year.

Councillor Stewart also thanked staff for this report and also looks forward to discussion regarding the Standard and Poor’s rating.
Councillor Barnett thanked staff for the level of reporting that is now being provided, noting that this has improved significantly over the recent years.

Councillor Atkinson noted that this reporting will improve each time and looks forward to the future of it.

7 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 Audit, Risk, Long Term Plan and Excellence Programme – Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead

Councillor Felstead had nothing to report

7.2 Communications – Councillor Neville Atkinson

Councillor Atkinson had nothing to report.

8 QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

9 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no urgent general business.

10 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Barnett

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Report of Maree Harris (Customer Service Manager)</td>
<td>Request to Remit Statute Barred Rates</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10.1    | Protection of privacy of natural persons  
|         | To carry out commercial activities without prejudice | A2(a)  
|         |                                                 | A2(b)ii |

**CLOSED MEETING**

**Resolution to resume in Open Meeting**

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Barnett

**THAT** open meeting resumes and the business discussed with the public excluded remains public excluded.

**CARRIED**

**OPEN MEETING**

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 6.10pm.

CONFIRMED

_____________________________
Chairperson

_____________________________
Date
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY AND RECREATION COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH
STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 21 MAY 2019 AT 1.02 PM.

PRESENT

Councillor K Barnett (Chair), Mayor D Ayers, Councillors R Brine, W Doody and D Gordon.

ATTENDING

Councillors N Atkinson, J Meyer, S Stewart and P Williams.
C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation), J Palmer (Chief Executive), M Greenwood
(Aquatic Facilities Manager), P Eskett (District Libraries Manager), G MacLeod
(Greenspace Manager), T Sturley (Community Team Manager), D Wiggins (Community
Development Facilitator), Daniel Cox (Policy Analyst) S Kong (Community Facilities
Coordinator) and E Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

1 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest were reported.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held
on Tuesday 26 March 2019

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Doody

THAT the Community and Recreation committee:

(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Community and
Recreation Committee, held on Tuesday 26 March 2019, as a true and
accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS

5.1 Tag Busters

N Atkinson provided an update on the activities of Tag Busters past year. Tag
Busters was an operating arm of Kaiapoi Community Care and Employment
Trust. N Atkinson noted that Tag Busters covered a wider area than Kaiapoi.

N Atkinson highlighted the differences that had occurred over the last couple
of years. Currently there was not so much trouble in the CBD with tagging as
offenders knew where cameras were – offenders had moved outside of the
CBD to areas like bridge abutments and walkways. They were also targeting
new subdivisions such as Sovereign Palms. Another change was the size of
tags had increased with tags now sometimes requiring 10L of paint to cover and Tag Busters were removing 400m² of tags a month.

N Atkinson advised that since the Christchurch shootings there had been a spate of racial slurs. These were removed particularly quickly.

N Atkinson advised they had not changed their systems over the past few years. They had stepped away from reporting to police as they did not appear to be interested and police had not followed up with them.

Questions

Councillor Williams asked if there had been success with anti-graffiti paint. N Atkinson commented that there were a number of different anti-graffiti products however they were more expensive and had to be replaced after three graffiti attacks. They found it was best to use one of the seven readily Council colours as they could paint over quickly.

Councillor Barnett asked with areas that were getting repeatedly hit, could cameras be considered. N Atkinson replied that those areas often had no power and were dimly lit.

Councillor Barnett asked if Council should start a dialogue with Police around prosecutions and follow-ups. N Atkinson commented that Tag Busters was there to remove the tags, not police. They would help where they could. He noted offenders were clever and now sold their tags.

Councillor Barnett asked from where they received funding. N Atkinson replied it was mostly through Council. The Trust also ran a building company and was financially sustainable.

6 REPORTS

6.1 Community Facilities exemption from fees and charges – Simon Kong (Community Facilities Coordinator)

S Kong noted that this was the fourth such report. There were eleven individual applications in addition to the 20 that had already been approved. The applications were a mixture of recurring bookings and one-off events, some were from events from the previous financial year and one was for the following year. The applications included requests to retain an existing relationship with a flat fee, or to have no fees for a fundraising event.

Councillor Barnett asked when the group applied for an exemption did they supply financial information. S Kong advised they did not go so far as looking at financial information. There was a question regarding legal status of the group and most referred to their group as a ‘community group’.

Councillor Williams noted that ANZAC Services were not charged for the facility and asked if that applied to ANZAC organisation meetings. S Kong advised they are looking to create consistency around that, where he was aware a booking was for ANZAC organisation the fee was waived however there were some bookings he was not aware of. There was currently no defined policy although traditionally they did not charge.

Councillor Williams noted Fernside Hall organisers had been charged and asked if that could be noted so they were not charged in future. C Brown commented that the working group had been created to look at fees and charges and ANZAC day had been discussed at that first meeting. The working group would consider the issues and bring back to the Committee.
THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No.190501062054

(b) Notes the submissions for exemption from fees received from users.

(c) Approve a fixed fee of $500 per annum for Mothers Supporting Mothers booking of the Rangiora War Memorial Hall. That the waiver is backdated to 1st July 2018 and is valid until the 30th June 2019.

(d) Approve a fixed fee of $165 per annum for Loburn Women's Institute. That the waiver is backdated to the 1st July 2018 and is valid until the 30th June 2019.

(e) Approve a full waiver of $60 for the Woodend Lions running of the Woodend ANZAC Service.

(f) Note that all other ANZAC services in the district are not charged for facilities bookings.

(g) Approve the full waiver of the booking fee of $137.50 for the one-off fundraising film screening of the Tour De France for Mental Health movie.

(h) Approve a flat fee of $160 per annum West Eyreton Small Bore Rifle Club for their 2019 bookings. Recommend that the Rifle Club transfer to a Lease arrangement with the Cust Community Centre.

(i) Approve a 50% waiver of booking fees for one Rockers of Ages concert held in the 2019 financial year.

(j) Approve a 50% waiver of booking fees for the Rangiora Wool Craft Group for the 2019 financial year.

(k) Notes that if all approvals for this report are accepted the financial implications are an estimated total of $3373.75 for the 2018/19 financial year.

(l) Notes that the combined total financial implications of fee exemptions that have already been approved is estimated at $13173.75 for the 2018/19 financial year.

(m) Notes that fees increases are split over two years with the final increase occurring on the 1st July 2019.

(n) Circulates the report to the Boards for their information.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon was supportive of the recommendation. He noted the undertaking of the subcommittee to address the issues and the good work of Councillor Doody of chairing that group. It was looking at the process around considering applications and looking at fees more broadly. He acknowledged the current process was messy and was difficult for staff. It needed to be tidied up.

Councillor Doody reiterated the concern of staff needing to deal with issues raised and commented that it come back on to the Councillors as representatives to resolve. She noted the financial implications of $13,000 that had been approved and as a Committee they needed to find the best way forward.

Councillor Brine also referred to the $13,000 financial implications. He noted that fees had not been raised since 2012 and that the increase had been staged over two years to ease the burden. The door had been left open for exemptions and this was the result. He looked forward to the working group returning with solutions. Someone was paying for these facilities and this is either the users or the general community.
Councillor Barnett commented that certain groups did not have the ability to pay for the use of facilities. There was a potential motion to the Annual Plan to freeze fee increases until after the recommendations from the working party. There was the danger exemptions would still be coming to the Committee in the new financial year.

6.2 Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Actions – Daniel Cox (Policy Analyst)

D Cox spoke to the report noting the purpose was to present the Bylaw Research and Monitoring Programme, Intercept Survey 2019 and Infographic and ECan Patrol Records 2016-2018 as part of the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw review.

D Cox outlined the reasons for the recommendations were so that the Community Boards and community in general was aware of the work of Council and the basis of evidence for how well the Bylaw was working.

Councillor Barnett asked if it were possible to circulate to all Community Boards and D Cox replied yes.

Councillor Brine asked how many of the respondents were fisher folk. D Cox replied at Kairaki it was most respondents, at the estuary it was a handful and none from Waikuku.

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 190412055403.

(b) Receives the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016: Intercept Survey 2019 [TRIM No: 190311030062], Intercept Survey 2019 Infographic [TRIM No: 190221020360], and Environment Canterbury Patrol Records 2016 to 2018 [TRIM No 19040404980].

(c) Notes that staff will implement the recommendations outlined in the Intercept Survey 2019 and Environment Canterbury Patrol Records 2016 – 2018.


CARRIED

6.3 Community Team Updates – Neighbourhood Park Events – Tessa Sturley (Community Team Manager)

T Sturley and G MacLeod presented the report. T Sturley explained the report covered the neighbourhood park events from November 2018 to March 2019 and detailed information on activities, feedback and next steps.

T Sturley highlighted that while the events did not fit under business as usual they were deemed successful by both teams and reinforced the Canterbury Wellbeing index survey results around neighbourhood connection and sense of community. She was looking forward to partnering with Neighbourhood Support (NS).

G MacLeod commented a key benefit of these events as a way to humanise the team as a business unit and thanked T Sturley and the team. It built trend analysis and was a monitoring opportunity helping with efficiencies in design to drive the future capital programme to enhance reserves. It built key rapport with localised communities.
Councillor Brine asked how much Neighbourhood Support were receiving for the events. T Sturley advised that the memo to the last Committee meeting noted that existing resourcing to Neighbourhood Support was $3500 for the Mandeville Old Fashioned Picnic. This was now being diverted to six neighbourhood park style events and provision to cover setup costs to around $5400.

Councillor Gordon asked if staff were confident with Neighbourhood Support running the events that it would retain the impact of a Council led approach, and were they happy to take the lead. T Sturley replied they were very happy to. Staff would hand over but continue to add support and encourage them to apply a similar model. A community led approach was an opportunity for Neighbourhood Support to build capability as currently coordinators did the bulk of work. By identifying emerging leaders it would help create something sustainable.

Mayor Ayers commented that he had attended 2-3 events and asked what were the reasons some reserves were more central to a community than others. For those less well-off areas the events were better subscribed, in wealthier expectations were higher. C Brown commented that it was part of the aim of Greenspace to activate those reserves and some attendees had commented that they had not been aware of the reserve beforehand.

Councillor Barnett referred to emerging leaders and asked if there was a way to apply this to a wider area. T Sturley advised that they would like to further promote and the trailer was available for anyone to use.

Councillor Gordon commented that the event was initially a Greenspace model for reserves. He asked if it were possible for Greenspace to remain involved, not just the Community team. G MacLeod concurred it was a good way of data gathering and relationship building with the community and regular reserves users.

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Doody

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 190508065620
(b) Notes that staff have expressed their appreciation of the support from elected members at these events.
(c) Notes the appreciation expressed by the community that Council sought to engage with them in this fashion.
(d) Notes that, while Neighbourhood events will now be led by Neighbourhood Support, community development and greenspace staff will continue to partner in the delivery of the community-led neighbourhood park events.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon believed it was a highly worthwhile event. He did not have a problem with Neighbourhood Support taking the lead but thought it was important to engage with the community where they didn’t have those connections. There was value in Council attending. He had learnt a lot of little things that made a big difference.

Councillor Doody advised the Neighbourhood Support team were pleased to be involved. It was an opportunity to promote the Gets Ready campaign. There was a lot of work to be done to engage. It was also important for community and greenspace staff to attend. She noted it was important the six events were held during the warmer summer months.
Councillor Barnett saw huge value with engagement in an informal open setting as a way of getting valuable feedback. She had some hesitation for the events to be led by a different group as the community may not find that agenda as attractive, however Neighbourhood Support provided good service to the community. Councillor Barnett suggested the events could be expanded to community facilities to include midwinter events and gain feedback on facilities.

Councillor Doody explained the role of Neighbourhood Support to run the park events.

6.4 Community Team Update – Migrant and Newcomers – Tessa Sturley (Community Team Manager)

T Sturley introduced D Wiggins who looked after Community Development, Migrants and Newcomers portfolio. She noted the report provided an update on key activities and detailed the community led approach that was applied. The aim was to engage partners to add value to facilitate connections and empower with skills and opportunities.

T Sturley advised the group was established in 2016 and since then there had been a significant increase in number of nationalities. Funding for this work was through the Office of Ethnic Communities and Lotteries.

D Wiggins spoke to a Powerpoint presentation (Trim 190528075272). Since establishment of the group in 2016, there had been a focus on engaging with Ngai Tuahuriri as well as government organisations including the Office of Ethnic Communities and locals Councils, City, Selwyn and Hurunui.

D Wiggins highlighted that in Citizenship Ceremonies there had been 50 different ethnicities in the last 10 years. Staff had worked alongside event organisers including Festival of Colour, Waitangi Day and the Winter Festival. Local International ‘bring a plate’ events had 50-100 attendees and celebrated culture. Cooking classes were successful in bringing people together. D Wiggins provided examples and photos from these events. A multicultural celebration at the Marae was planned for later in the year.

D Wiggins highlighted the Migrants Stories Video, the Chinese Information Evening and Photo exhibition and the Philippines Passport Service and Filipino Foot Festival and film. More events showcasing multi-culturalism were being explored. The CAB employment expo had increased from 20 attendees to 350. It was an example of empowering support agencies. English Language classes were going from strength to strength and were able to direct attendees to additional support.

D Wiggins highlighted the upcoming suitcase exhibition in June where a range of cultures would showcase what they would pack if they had 10 mins to leave their country.

T Sturley noted the cultural connection education facilitated by D Wiggins that provided employees with a better understanding on how to support migrant employees.
Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Gordon

**THAT** the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190508065908

(b) **Notes** that the initiatives developed and delivered by the Waimakariri Migrants and Newcomers group are externally funded by Office of Ethnic Communities, Lotteries and Creative Communities

(c) **Notes** that in the past 12 months an increasingly migrant-led approach has been applied to this work, in line with best practice for community development.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Doody believed the work of the team was wonderful and thanked them for their efforts. They were passionate about their role and getting the migrant group well established.

Councillor Gordon believed the work was an important role in Council. He thanked the team and commented on how valued D Wiggins was. He believed T Sturley could be proud of the ideal community development model that she had developed.

Councillor Brine noted 20 years ago Neighbourhood Support had setup a newcomers network. This was a process that had come out of the work by Neighbourhood Support and had evolved thanks to the passion of those involved.

Mayor Ayers noted the upcoming Art Exhibition in Kaiapoi Library.

**6.5 Libraries Update – Paula Eskett (District Libraries Manager)**

P Eskett noted that she had been away for several weeks and the report had been the work of her team. She wished to draw the committees attention to a number of points.

Item 4.1.1 - despite the recent challenges in the community, Libraries had hosted 182 events with 2000 children and 1600 adults at an average of nearly 20 per session. Staff had also hosted 93 training sessions.

Item 4.2.2 - there had been a nearly 10% increase in visits to the Library website over the past 12 months. The average search time was 4-5 minutes.

Item 4.3.1 – the public access computers at the library had been replaced with Google Chromebooks. The benefit to users was that everything was saved in the Cloud and could be accessed from anywhere. Rangiora had 9, Kaiapoi 7 and Oxford 4. There was also a new printer, separate scanner and book in system. The complete library team underwent training and upskilling including using Linda.com for their training modules. Chromebooks were a significant player in education and schools and Google Classroom was a paperless education provision. P Eskett had huge praise for Debbie Lambert and Jennifer Kirkwood for the rollout. They had delivered the setup and rollout without IT resource. The feedback from the public had been positive.

P Eskett commented on central government direction on digital inclusion and the libraries role to deliver on that.

Mayor Ayers asked if it was anticipated that there would be Local Government Act changes on reporting. P Eskett replied yes there were new opportunities for reporting and demonstrating value. There needed to be a conversation around that.
Mayor Ayers asked if there was concern that the sole source of digital information came from one Company – Google. P Eskett replied yes. Libraries had a role in educating the public in that space.

Councillor Barnett referred to Item 4.2.1 and asked if there could be a breakdown in the future between the libraries. She asked if there could be an explanation of the depreciation variation.

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Brine

**THAT** the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190510066606.

(b) **Notes** the events and activities customer service improvement, customer feedback, and activities offered by the Waimakariri Libraries in Term 1 2019.

(c) **Circulates** the report to the Boards for their information.

**CARRIED**

Mayor Ayers commented it had been another good report for libraries.

Councillor Barnett commented it was excellent to have P Eskett’s experience on Board and asked if there was potential for a briefing session.

Councillor Doody expressed thanks to C Brown and K Livingstone for their assistance with Creative Communities.

### 6.6 Aquatic Facilities Update – Matt Greenwood (Aquatic Facilities Manager)

M Greenwood spoke briefly to the report noting the omission outlined in Item 4.3. A 50c increase was recommended to the Aquarobics class which would keep it consistent with other changes.

Item 4.4 and 4.5 explained continued support for Waikuku Beach Surf Lifesaving Club and NZRT12 members. They were seeking changes to ongoing arrangements to best support those groups.

M Greenwood advised that the pools had opened slightly off-temp – but on time following the recent maintenance programme. Additional work had been identified which would be cost offset by savings in operating costs. The main area of concern had been the temperature issue which had been resolved as part of maintenance.

Councillor Williams asked what the percent satisfaction was for the pools and was advised it was 89%.

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Brine

**THAT** the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190507064831.

(b) **Notes** Aquatic Facilities progress against its key performance indicators for Facility Attendance and Water Quality.

(c) **Recommends** a $0.50 increase, effective from 1 July 2019, to the Aquarobics Casual Community Services/Senior rate for Council deliberations on fees and charges.
(d) **Approves** changes to the levels of support offered to Waikuku Beach Surf Lifesaving club being free hire of three lanes and a 50% discount for club members to purchase concessions or memberships.

(e) **Approves** recommendations to increase support of the NZRT12 team from eight to fifteen passes.

(f) **Notes** additional works identified as part of programmed maintenance closure will contribute to a $15,000 overspend in Dudley Parks maintenance budget.

(g) **Circulates** the report to the Boards for their information.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers agreed with the changes to support the Waikuku Beach Surf Lifesaving club and NZRT12 as they played an important role.

7 **PORTFOLIO UPDATES**

7.1 **Greenspace (Parks Reserves and Sports Grounds) – Councillor Robbie Brine**

Councillor Brine advised that Oxford-Ohoka Community Board had been looking at the Mandeville parking issue.

Rangiora-Ashley Community Board were negotiating a way forward with regard to NPD landscaping.

A report was going to Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board regarding re-grassing the domain.

The Sloan Avenue issues were being resolved by the Greenspace team.

7.2 **Community Facilities (including Aquatic Centres, Halls, Libraries and Museums) – Councillor Wendy Doody**

Councillor Doody provided an update on Creative Communities.

Councillor Doody advised she had taken over as temporary Chair of the Ashley Gorge Advisory Board to help clear an issue and move forward. She had also taken on an interim Chairs role at North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support. She was now also the deputy Chair of Social Services Waimakariri and had been impressed with a meeting with the migrants group.

7.3 **Community Development and Wellbeing – Councillor Kirstyn Barnett and Councillor Wendy Doody**

Councillor Barnett had met with Martin Pinkham from the Wellbeing North Canterbury Board.

Councillor Barnett has recently attended a Youth Networking Group in Oxford. She noted there was an Employment Expo at Rangiora High School on 11 June. There would be a wide range of employment opportunities represented.
8 QUESTIONS
There were no questions.

9 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS
There was no urgent general business.

As there was no further business, the meeting closed at 2.26pm.

CONFIRMED

_______________________
Chairperson

________________________
Date

WORKSHOP
At the conclusion of the meeting there will be a workshop to discuss the North Canterbury Academy of Music lease
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE DISTRICT PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 18 JUNE 2019 AT 1.00PM.

PRESENT
Councillor D Gordon (Chair), Councillors N Atkinson, W Doody, J Meyer, S Stewart and Mayor Ayers (ex officio).

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors K Barnett, K Felstead and P Williams
J Palmer (Chief Executive), M Bacon (Planning Manager), T Ellis (Development Planning Manager), K Pierson (Communications Consultant), W Taylor (Building Unit Manager), S Markham (Strategy and Engagement Manager), A Benbrook (Development Planning Administrator), L Beckingsale (Policy Analyst), C Goldsmith (Senior Animal Management Officer), M O’Connell (Senior Policy Analyst), and E Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

D Gordon advised M Bacon would be present for the meeting in the absence of N Harrison (Planning and Regulation Manager).

1. APOLOGIES
There were no apologies.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 19 February 2019

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Mayor Ayers

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 19 February 2019.

CARRIED

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
There were no matters arising.

5. DEPUTATION
There were no deputations.
6. REPORTS

6.1 Review: Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw – Lynley Beckingsale (Policy Analyst) and Nick Harrison (Manager Planning and Regulation)

L Beckingsale and C Goldsmith presented the report. L Beckingsale noted the report was to seek agreement to consult on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy, and for delegation to the hearing panel.

L Beckingsale noted the key changes including,
- All dogs to be on leads in town centres,
- Dogs to be under effective voice control or on a lead around horses – to align with Pegasus Bay Bylaw, and
- Fees for microchipping for impounded dogs.

L Beckingsale advised that since the briefing the previous week she had spoken to representatives of the two farmers markets. Feedback had been that they were supportive of the Dog Control Bylaw and that it performed sufficiently. They would like education around dogs allowed at Farmers Market. L Beckingsale advised that the feedback would be included as a submission as part of the consultation process.

L Beckingsale noted the hearings were set down for 15 August 2019 and they anticipated the deliberations could be held the same day.

Questions

Councillor Atkinson asked about the wording regarding dogs that are not able to be kept under effective voice control around horses. C Goldsmith advised that the inclusion aligned with the Pegasus Bay Bylaw.

Councillor Atkinson asked how it could be proved a dog was under effective voice control. C Goldsmith commented there were reserves around the district where dogs could run off lead in a controlled manner. The other option was to tether the dog.

Councillor Stewart referred to dogs being prohibited in all cemeteries except Kaiapoi Anglican Cemetery Reserve. She acknowledged members of the public may wish to take a dog to a gravesite and asked the reason for prohibition and the reason why Kaiapoi Anglican was not included in that. C Goldsmith replied that dogs were prohibited due to the issue of fouling in a sacred area. The Kaiapoi Anglican Cemetery Reserve was an exception as the majority was a reserve rather than a cemetery.

Councillor Doody asked if whistle control could be included and C Goldsmith acknowledged there were different ways to control dogs.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee

(a) Receives report No. 190530076703.
(b) Initiates the Special Consultative Procedure in terms of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA 2002) sections 159 and 83A and the Dog Control Act 1996 section 10AA.
(c) Approves the attached Statement of Proposal, draft Dog Control Policy 2019 and draft Dog Control Bylaw 2019 for notification and consultation.
(d) **Delegates** the consideration of submissions to the Hearing Panel comprised of: Councillor Meyer (Regulatory Portfolio holder), Councillor Stewart and Councillor Doody for the hearing and deliberations meeting to be held on Thursday 15 August 2019.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson commented that the consultation had to be undertaken. He was concerned with the wording around ‘effective voice control’ and how that would be assessed by officers. He suggested that wording be improved through the process.

### 6.2 Review of the Gambling Venue and Board Venue Policies – Lynley Beckingsale (Policy Analyst) and Nick Harrison (Manager Planning and Regulation)

L. Beckingsale spoke to the report. It was proposed that no changes be made and it was reviewed on papers only. It was suggested that the next review include a full social impact assessment. The assessment could be undertaken next year in order that it was carried out and completed in time for a review in 2021.

Questions

Councillor Doody asked if Social Services Waimakariri could be consulted through the social impact assessment. L. Beckingsale advised they would be, it was a very broad assessment that included consultation with key stakeholders.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Mayor Ayers

**THAT** the District Planning and Regulation Committee

(a) **Receives** report No 190606080102

(b) **Retains** the Gambling Venue Policy unchanged (Trim 190606079820)

(c) **Retains** the Board Venue Policy unchanged (Trim 190606079821).

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson believed the policy was working well with sufficient numbers. He welcomed a review in the next triennium.

### 6.3 Review of Parking Bylaw 2007 – Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)

It was advised this report was withdrawn. A report would come to the Committee in August or September 2019.

**Memo:** DP&R Agenda 18 June: Withdrawal of report 190604078036 ‘Review of Parking Bylaw 2007’ and withdrawal of the Proposed Parking Bylaw from public consultation (Trim 190617084623).

### 7. PORTFOLIO UPDATES

#### 7.1 District Planning Development - Councillor Neville Atkinson

Councillor Atkinson noted the recent briefings.

#### 7.2 Regulation and Civil Defence – Councillor John Meyer

Councillor Meyer noted the Regulation reports to the Committee.
Councillor Meyer noted the invitation to Councillors from B Wiremu (Emergency Management Advisor) to attend the Civil Defence exercise in Oxford on 27 July 2019.

Councillor Gordon noted the Civil Defence planning exercise at Glentui.

7.3 Business, Promotion and Town Centres – Councillor Dan Gordon

Councillor Gordon advised he had attended the recent AGMs for the Kaiapoi (KPA), Oxford (OPAC) and Rangiora (RPA) Promotion Associations. KPA had had an encouraging turnaround from a $28,000 deficit to $25,000 surplus. They were running good events including the Carnival. A new Chair, Martin Pinkham had been elected. The current chairs for OPAC and RPA had been re-elected. Both those associations were also performing well. There was an upcoming joint promotions association chair and coordinators meeting the following week.

Councillor Gordon advised he had met with NZRT12 and was impressed with the group. The district was lucky to have that organisation.

The upcoming Big Splash and Oxford Festival of Lights events were noted.

There was general agreement to the suggestion from S Markham that there be a deputation from the Promotions Associations at the Audit and Risk Committee Meeting.

8. QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

9. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no urgent general business.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 1.21PM.

CONFIRMED

__________________
Chairperson

__________________
Date

--- Briefing ---

At the conclusion of the meeting,

(a) Trevor Ellis and Kate Pierson discussed Natural Hazards relating to the District Plan Review.
(b) James Thompson (Regional Civil Defence Office) spoke on Alpine Fault Magnitude 8 Science Assessment.
(c) Alex Sutherland, from Lines of Sight Ltd, Tauranga, spoke on the results of regulatory department customer surveys recently completed.
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD HELD IN THE OHOKA COMMUNITY HALL, MILL ROAD, OHOKA ON THURSDAY 6 JUNE 2019 AT 7PM.

PRESENT
D Nicholl (Chair), M Brown (Deputy Chair), J Ensor, S Farrell, K Felstead, J Lynn and T Robson.

IN ATTENDANCE
S Markham (Manager Strategy & Engagement), S Morrow (Rates Officer Land Information), K Rabe (Governance Adviser) and ten members of the public.

1 APOLOGIES
Moved T Robson seconded J Ensor
That the apology, received from W Doody, be accepted.
CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 16 May 2019
Moved M Brown seconded T Robson
(a) THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
   Confirms the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, held 16 May 2019, as a true and accurate record subject to the amendment in clause 7.1 Mandeville Village Car Parking Concern, page 3; comment by J Lynn “…reminded members that the Board could not commit the Council to financial expense”; should read “No further financial commitment should be undertaken until after the public consultation has been carried out.”
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
D Nicholl informed members of a conversation with Councillor K Barnett regarding the Board’s request for an increased budget for its 2019/2020 Discretionary Grant funding reminding members that this increase would be funded by ratepayers.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
Noel Fraser – Canterbury Landscapes Ltd, Diversion Road
5.1 Noel Fraser (Chair of the Eyre District Environmental Association Incorporated (EDEAI)) was in attendance and spoke regarding the land use consent for Canterbury Landscapes Ltd (CLS), Diversion Road site.
5.2 N Fraser spoke to his tabled presentation (Trim Ref: 190607080270) which discussed the current status of Environment Canterbury’s consents CRC175344 and CRC175345 which allows for processing, CLS would now need an amendment to its WDC land use consent RC185251 which only allows stockpiling.
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5.3 Concerns raised included compliance issues, fire hazards, forestry/tree issues, access to water and no electricity on site.

Questions:

5.4 J Lynn enquired about odours during the summer months and was told that there had been an improvement in odours emanating from the site, and was only really noticeable when piles compost were disturbed or loaded on trucks.

5.5 S Farrell clarified that there was no electricity currently on site and was told that there appeared to be plans for solar power and generators. Residents were concerned if this would be suitable for 24/7 monitoring of the site in case of fire. S Farrell then asked if the lack of electricity would impact on the amendment to the resource consent application. Staff were unsure as the application had not yet been received and the scope of change unknown.

5.6 T Robson asked if the wind or truck movements caused the most dust disturbance and was told that when the south east wind blew there was a problem as there was a gap in the tree screen in that direction. D Nicholl suggested that ECan should be contacted immediately to report the issue rather than photographing and mentioning the problem at a later date. There was discussion of the consequences to the ‘filter and screening’ effect of the forest when the trees were harvested in approximately five years.

5.7 A general discussion ensued regarding concerns relating to the threat of fire starting in compost and/or sawdust storage piles when no one was on site. Due to the screening effect of the trees it would be too late by the time the alarm was raised. The lack of water on site was also a concern and although CLS had an agreement with a neighbour for use of a nearby water tank that tank would take two days to refill once emptied. There was a desire to see a proper monitoring system in place so as to detect fire early and this would require a consistent, dependable electrical supply.

5.8 S Farrell asked if the consent could be delayed while further investigations took place. Staff explained that consents were ruled by the Resource Management Act (RMA) which determined what checking and criteria had to be investigated, and there was a set time period for consents to be issued. Also this was a legal process and that other factors (staff or elected members) could not influence the outcomes of any consent.

5.9 EDEAI had two requests for the Board as they acknowledged that WDC had little control over ECan resource consents. N Fraser requested that the Board encourage the Council to assign resourcing to mitigate issues on the site to address non-compliance, and to support EDEAI in requesting that the amended resource consent from CLS be notified.

5.10 M Brown asked staff what could be done to help EDEAI and to mitigate the concerns and issues regarding the site on Division Road. Members were told that staff were in the process of setting up regular stakeholder meetings which would include representatives from WDC, ECan, CLS, the residents, and board members if they would like to be included, to talk about issues and solutions in a timely manner in an attempt to get better understanding and outcomes to issues raised. Residents agreed that this would be appreciated.

5.11 T Robson asked if the Board could support a request for a notified consent. Staff advised that this was governed by the RMA and there were very stringent criteria that determined whether or not a consent was notified and that elected members could not circumnavigate the process.

Moved T Robson seconded J Ensor

That the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board supports the Eyre District Environmental Association Incorporated in its request to have the amendment to RC185251 - Land use at Diversion Road be notified due to the concerns raised regarding the fire threat, lack of water supply and no electricity on site i.e. no monitoring of the site out of hours.
CARRIED

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Road Naming – Dawe Construction Limited, Mandeville North – Scott Morrow (Rates Officer Land Information)

S Morrow spoke to his report.

D Nicholl mentioned that Peter Harris, one of the original landowners in Mandeville had indicated a willingness to have a street named after him. S Morrow informed the members that there was already a ‘Harris Street’ in the district. K Felstead commented that maybe the full name i.e. ‘Peter Harris Street’ could be used so as not to cause confusion.

Moved J Lynn seconded T Robson

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 190523072561.
(b) Approves the names Beale, Foulton and Brennan as marked as Roads 1-3 on the attached plans.

CARRIED

J Lynn stated that it was appropriate George Beale’s name be used as he was a former Councillor heavily involved in drainage and flooding issues in the area. Gordon Foulton be acknowledged as one of the original farmers and business owners in the area and that Jane Brennan be acknowledged as she was the Mistress in charge of the Mandeville Plains and Public School.

7.2 Applications to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

K Rabe spoke to the report.

M Brown requested clarification that the balance of $727 was available for allocation, and that $500 was tagged for the 2019-2020 Oxford-Ohoka Discretionary Grant fund.

D Nicholl asked if the Ohoka Women’s Institute were aware that there were plans to install five new benches in the domain. It was established that the Women’s Institute had been requesting a bench for some years now and that to date nothing had been achieved.

K Feldstead moved, that as the 2019-20 financial year started on 1 July 2019 and this was the last meeting allocations could be made against the 2018-19 fund, the balance of the fund be allocated to the Ohoka Women’s Instituted towards the cost of a bench for Ohoka Domain to commemorate 88 years of service to the district.

Moved J Lynn seconded S Farrell

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 190430061056.
(b) Approves a grant of $727 to Ohoka Women’s Institute towards the purchase of a park bench for Ohoka Domain to commemorate 88 years of service to the district.
7.3 Report back on New Zealand Community Boards' Conference 2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

Moved K Feldstead seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 190430061114.

CARRIED

J Ensor mentioned that the rural connection was a great breakthrough.
S Farrell mentioned that there was real support to include the youth in decision making and would like the Board to consider inviting the Youth Council to attend a future board meeting to hear their point of view.
T Robson found the predator free presentation inspiring and would like to incorporate ideas to the Ashley Gorge initiative. He also was supportive of the Youth Voice initiative and would like to see these principals incorporated in consultation to make it relevant to youth and would like to be involved with this project.
K Felstead remarked that joining the Sister City Organisation mentioned in J Ensor’s notes was problematic given that the Wiamakariri district did not have a city but that staff were investigating options to be more involved.

7.4 Ratification of the Board’s Comments on the Reviewed District Plan – ‘What’s the Plan’ – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

Moved M Brown seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No 190521071246.
(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s Comments on the Waimakariri District Council Reviewed District Plan (Trim Ref: 190516069434).

CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE

8.1 A presentation by Mandeville Residents’ Association to Council on Tuesday 4 June was tabled for information.

8.2 Correspondence from Ohoka Women's Institute regarding parking outside St Albans Church in Mill Road was tabled for information. This matter has been sent to appropriate staff.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for May 2019

Moved T Robson seconded M Brown

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No 190523072432.
CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 13 May 2019
(Trim No 190509066000).

10.2 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 20 May 2019
(Trim No 190514067740)

Moved J Ensor seconded M Brown

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.2

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

The purpose of this exchange is to provide a short update to other members in relation to activities/meetings that have been attended or to provide general Board related information.

J Ensor
- Update on Health Care hub
- Wester Marie Hui
- Drainage Advisor Group Meeting

J Lynn
- Gatehouse and Ohoka Domain update and photos circulated of progress made – upgrades to the Domain expected to be finished shortly

S Farrell
- Nothing local but impressed by Canada’s recycling methods and clean and tidy streets

T Robson
- Attended Opac meeting – Friday family night update
- Attending a Leadership day at Woodend Beach over the weekend

M Brown
- Attended Mandeville Sports Complex meeting – update on lights for rugby field

K Feldstead
- Update on Council matters

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

13.1 Board Discretionary Grant

Balance as at 29 May 2019: $727 (note $500 commitment to Waimakariri Arts Trust).

13.2 General Landscaping Fund

Balance as at 29 May 2019: $1,060.
14 MEDIA ITEMS

15 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

16 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Thursday 4 July 2019 commencing at 7.00pm, in the Oxford Town Hall.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.28pm.
CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date

---

Workshop
- Climate Change – Simon Markham (Manager, Strategy and Engagement)
- Members Forum
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE PEGASUS COMMUNITY CENTRE, PEGASUS MAIN STREET, PEGASUS
ON MONDAY 10 JUNE 2019 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
S Powell (Chairperson), A Thompson (Deputy Chair), A Allen, J Archer (arrived at 7.06pm
during item 7.1), R Mather and J Meyer.

IN ATTENDANCE
D Ayers (Mayor), C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation), G Stephens (Green
Space Engagement Officer), S Morrow (Rates Officer Land Information), S Markham
(Strategy and Engagement Manager), T Kunkel (Governance Team Leader), K Rabe
(Governance Advisor) and E Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved S Powell seconded A Allen
An apology was received and sustained from A Blackie.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 13 May 2019
Moved R Mather seconded A Thompson
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community
Board meeting, held on 13 May 2019, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY
There were no deputations.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
There was no adjourned business.

J Archer arrived at 7.06pm
7 REPORTS

7.1 Road Naming – Pegasus Town, Stages B8 and B8A – Scott Morrow (Rate Officer land Information)

S Powell noted that the names had been verified for use by the Rūnanga and asked what this process entailed. S Morrow advised that the Rūnanga was provided with the list of names at a meeting with Council staff, where they had confirmed that the names were acceptable.

R Mather asked if it was possible for the name Todd to be included in the list of potential names for this street. Staff advised that there was already a Todd Road in the district and the name could therefore not be included.

Moved A Allen seconded S Powell

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190529076128.

(b) Approves the name Waituna Street for the new road as marked as Road #1 on the plan attached to the agenda.

(c) Notes the Community Board may replace any proposed names with a name of its choice.

CARRIED

A Allen commented she appreciated that Waituna referred to waterway. She was concerned that Māuru could have different meanings to other iwi.

S Powell noted the eels in the lake were reflected in the Waituna name and concurred with A Allen around the different meanings for Māuru. R Mather commented that Māuru had been in the original list with the meaning Norwest wind but had since been left out.

7.2 Waikuku Entrance Sign – General Landscaping Budget – Grant Stephens (Greenspace Community Engagement Officer)

G Stephens spoke to the report, noting that using General Landscaping funds for a Waikuku entrance sign was previously discussed with the Board when the Board approved consultation on three (3) sign designs. That had generated good interest and feedback from the community with 111 responses received. These responses have been collated and from the information received, the revised design as displayed on page 29 of the agenda was developed. The revised design was based on submitted ideas from local artist Marley Biggins which encompassed community feedback. The design was taken to the Roading Department to ensure that it was not overly distracting and fit the required criteria. The Waikuku entrance sign was designed to be robust, strong and durable.

G Stephens noted that community feedback had suggested the design should incorporate the ecology of Waikuku, and so the revised design included the cabbage tree, flax plant, Fantail, Wrybill and Pukeko. During the revision of the design, the sign had become more complex, and to ensure its durability there was an associated price increase. The initial allocation was $4,300 and the revised design costing was $6,200, an additional $1,900 was therefore needed. The Board had funds remaining in its Landscape Fund, which it had previously approved to carry over to the following financial year.

R Mather commented that it was an excellent report and asked if the final cost included installation. G Stephens confirmed, that this was included in the pricing.
R Mather expressed a concern regarding the cost, and asked if the plants depicted on the sign could be replaced with real plants, planted at the base of the sign, to decrease the cost. G Stephens replied that was an option but that there was a risk the plants could eventually obscure the sign or the plantings become unsightly due to lack of maintenance. He noted that the original design cost had been $8,000 and staff reduced the cost as much as possible.

R Mather asked about public reaction to scaling back the design, but G Stephens could not speak on behalf of the community.

A Allen asked if Marley Biggins would be provided a koha by Council. G Stephens explained that there had been no indication during consultation that there would be an expectation of funding.

J Archer suggested that recycled materials such as an old surfboard or concrete in a chimney flue could be used for the sign to reduce cost. G Stephens advised that if the sign was hit by a car, the sign needed to give/break, therefore a concrete filled flue as a post would be a health and safety risk. A recycled surfboard would still require the digital image printed on it and was therefore not likely to decrease cost, in addition it would not have the required durability.

J Archer asked if the birds in the design added to the cost. G Stephens replied the Wrybill and Pukeko were included in the main design but the Fantail would add minimal cost due to the additional lazer cut.

Moved A Allen seconded A Thompson

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190529076573
(b) Notes the Board has previously allocated $4,300 towards an entrance sign for the Waikuku Beach Community in December 2018
(c) Notes That staff have undergone consultation on the sign and the results from this feedback are included within this report.
(d) Notes the Revised Design proposed by staff has been approved by the Roading and Greenspace Teams and would cost $6,200 to construct and install.
(e) Approves the allocation of $1,900 of the General Landscaping Fund which was previously approved to carry over to the 2019/20 financial year (December 2018 Board Meeting) in order to meet the shortfall between the cost of the Revised Design Sign and that previously allocated.
(f) Approves the remaining $602 of 2018/19 General Landscaping Budget be carried over into the following 2019/20 financial year.

CARRIED

R Mather against

A Allen noted funding had been spent in Sefton and Pegasus. It was therefore an important gesture that funding should also be spent in Waikuku. There had been good engagement and supportive feedback from the community. She commented that the sign was beautiful and captured the community feedback. She suggested Marley Biggins should be a part of the unveiling of the sign in recognition of her design.

A Thompson supported the staff recommendation and noted the sign was comparable with others around the district. There was funding remaining from this year. Tinkering with the design to reduce the cost could upset the harmony of the design and change the whole feel of the sign.
R Mather opposed the extra funding. She believed a decent sign could be created for less, considering it was a static object. She agreed that Marley Biggins should receive recognition and thanks regardless of outcome.

J Meyer commented as a Councillor he had seen nice signs around the district that cost more than that proposed sign. The funding was still within this financial year’s budget, although he noted that funding had been marked for the wind break in Pegasus. While cost was a factor it was a nice sign of a standard to be proud of.

J Archer commented that he liked the design.

S Powell believed the birds reflected on the design were essential, the feedback showed the community wanted recognition of wildlife. It had been good to see the engagement from the community. She appreciated that the cost was an issue, however the funds were in the budget and it was important the sign was of a good standard. She undertook to write to Marley Biggins on behalf of the Board.

A Thompson believed it was a great outcome from conflicting demands. The revised design addressed various concerns and it was tremendous that a local person had come up with it.

7.3 Karen Eastwood Memorial Trees – Grant Stephens (Greenspace Community Engagement Officer)

G Stephens reminded the Board that a decision to purchase and plant a large established tree for shading had been made. The cost of which would be covered by the remaining $1,800, from the private fundraising done by family and friends. The initial plan had been to ‘drag and drop’ a large tree out of the red zone, however advice from arborists suggested planting may be more successful with a smaller tree from a nursery due to the harsh nature of the wind and environment. With this change there was now enough funds to plant two (2) trees.

G Stephens advised he had picked out three Liquidambar trees with the overseer of the fund, however they had since been advised that this species might have issues with losing branches and may not be the best option in the location chosen.

G Stephens advised that the Board would need to approve the change in the scope for the project. The Board would also need to approve that staff and the overseer of the fund, investigate and source suitable trees from the list contained on page 43 of the agenda. Advice would be taken from nursery staff and all costs would be met through private funds. However, Board approval was required due to the location of the proposed trees on Council reserve.

R Mather clarified that the locations shown on the map were approximate and that sufficient space would be given to the trees for growth in the future.

R Mather was concerned about Elm disease effecting the weeping / horizontal Elm tree options. G Stephens replied there had been no indication from the nursery staff that there was a concern regarding this in the south island.

Moved R Mather seconded A Thompson

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190530077180

(b) Notes the Board has previously approved the planting of a large established tree in memory of Karen Eastwood.

(c) Approves two trees being planted within the area indicated within this
report (190530077180) and staff selecting these trees alongside the overseer of the funds.

(d) **Notes** where possible Staff will choose trees from the list within this report which have been proven to be successful and will not select species which have been identified within this report (190530077180) as not suiting the Pegasus environment.

(e) **Notes** that any costs associated with purchasing and planting these trees will be met through private funding left over from public fundraising for the Karen Eastwood Memorial.

**CARRIED**

R Mather noted there was no cost to the Council and was happy to let G Stephens and the fund overseer decide on the best trees.

A Thompson concurred with R Mather.

S Powell commented that the trees were in a good location and would help provide shade.

J Archer expressed a concern regarding some trees durability in salt wind.

### 7.4 Report Back on New Zealand Community Boards’ Conference 2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)

K Rabe spoke briefly to the report which recorded the final expenses and arrangements made for the New Zealand Community Boards’ Conference held in March 2019. The Board concurred that J Archer provided a good report.

*Moved R Mather seconded A Allen*

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190430061132.

**CARRIED**

### 7.5 Ratification of the Board’s Comments on the Waimakariri Bus Service Review – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)

*Moved R Mather seconded A Thompson*

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190523072606.

(b) **Retrospectively ratifies** the Board’s Comments on the Environment Canterbury Waimakariri Bus Service Review (Trim Ref: 190524072996).

**CARRIED**

R Mather thanked S Powell for her work on the submission on behalf of the Board.

### 7.6 Ratification of the Board’s Comments on the Reviewed District plan – ’What’s the Plan’ – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)

*Moved A Allen seconded R Mather*

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190509066148.
(b) **Retrospectively ratifies** the Board’s Comments on the Waimakariri District Council Reviewed District Plan (Trim Ref: 190508065614).

CARRIED

8 **CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no correspondence.

9 **CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

9.1 **Chairpersons Report for May 2019**

Moved S Powell seconded J Archer

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190604077902.

CARRIED

10 **MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**

10.1 **Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 16 May 2019 (Trim No. 190509065991.)**

10.2 **Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 20 May 2019 (Trim No. 190520070602)**

10.3 **Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes 15 May 2019 (Trim No. 190508065504)**

Moved R Mather seconded A Allen

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.03.

CARRIED

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

11.1 **May Diary for J Archer, R Mather** (Trim No. 190530076795)

75-76

11.2 **A Allen**

- Noted the meeting of Waimakariri Health Advisory Group where the increased funding for mental health was raised. They were still awaiting progress on an after-hours facility.

11.3 **J Meyer**

- Noted progress on the District Plan.
- Commented that staff was working hard and there was a good standard of reporting.
- Noted that the new road to west of Rangiora was open. It would relieve pressure on Southbrook Road.
- Assisted with tree planting and thanked those others attending.
- Community Fees and Charges Working Group – a number of issues to address.
11.4  R Mather
- Attended Age Friendly Steering Group – looking at what type of group would implement the plan.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

About Parking By Laws
https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/about-parking

Hurunui Reserve
Consultation closes Friday 21 June 2019.

It was asked if the Pegasus Residents Group would be requested to provide feedback on the Hurunui Reserve. C Brown advised that as it was a small reserve consultation would generally be with the surrounding neighbours. However, anyone including the Residents Group was welcome to make a submission.

There was general agreement that the Board would not make a submission on the parking By Laws consultation.

13 FOSTERING COMMUNITIES

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 4 June 2019: $1,136

14.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 4 June 2019: $5,260.

It was noted that the money could be carried forward.

15 MEDIA ITEMS
Waikuku Welcome Sign and new street name.
Continuing to submit an item to Woodpecker.

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 8 July 2019 at the Woodend Community Centre.

There being no further business the meeting concluded at 7.57pm.
Workshop

- Climate Change – Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)
- Members Forum
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET,
RANGIORA ON WEDNESDAY 12 JUNE 2019 AT 7PM.

PRESENT
J Gerard (Chair), D Lundy, K Barnett, R Brine (Departed at 21:00 during Item 10), M Clarke, K Galloway, D Gordon, J Hoult, S Lewis, G Miller, C Prickett and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE
J Millward (Finance Manager), N Harrison (Manager Regulation), Gary Blay (Resource Management Planner), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement), D Ayers (Mayor), T Kunkel (Governance Team Leader) and E Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

The meeting adjourned for a workshop from 7.15pm to 7.37pm. The meeting adjourned for briefings from 7.37pm to 8.38pm.

1 APOLOGIES
An apology was received and sustained from R Brine for early departure at 21:00

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 7.1 D Lundy declared that he was assisting with the Loburn School’s Centennial celebration.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board – 15 May 2019
Moved D Lundy seconded R Brine

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Confirms the circulated Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting, held on 15 May 2019, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

3.2 Minutes of the Public Excluded portions of meetings of the Rangiora Ashley Community Board held on Wednesday 10 April and Wednesday 15 May 2019
Moved J Gerard seconded K Barnett

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:

(a) Confirms the circulated Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting, held on 10 April 2019, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED
Moved J Gerard seconded K Barnett

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(b) Confirms the circulated Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting, held on 15 May 2019, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
There were no deputations.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS
7.1 Application to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/19 – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

J Gerard noted that the funds available in the Discretionary Grant Fund was $1,605, however the total funds required if the applications were granted was $1,950.

The Community Board had a number of options, either not approve all the grant applications, hold over the payment of one (1) of the grants until the next financial year, or to reduce the amounts allocated to the various groups.

J Gerard advised that he had concern with the Soroptimist application. While the organisation fulfilled a fantastic role, they would be passing the funding on to another group which was capable of applying for a grant themselves.

Moved K Galloway seconded G Miller

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:

(c) Receives report No. 190508065223.

(d) Approves a grant of $370 to Salvation Army – Just Brass towards the cost of music stands for its school programme.

(e) Approves a grant of $411 to Soroptimist North Canterbury towards advertising costs for the annual craft fair.

(f) Approves a grant of $411 to North Loburn Home and School Association towards materials for building a seating/pergola area.

(g) Approves a grant of $411 to Loburn School Board of Trustees towards the cost of signage for Loburn School’s 150 Jubilee

K Galloway stated that he could not see the advantage in carrying over a grant application to the next financial year for payment.

G Miller concurred with K Galloway.

Amendment:
Amendment becomes the substantive motion:
Moved C Prickett seconded J Hoult

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190508065223.

(b) Approves a grant of $450 to Salvation Army – Just Brass towards the cost of music stands for its school programme.

(c) Approves a grant of $350 to Soroptimist North Canterbury towards advertising costs for the annual craft fair.

(d) Approves a grant of $350 to North Loburn Home and School Association towards materials for building a seating/pergola area.

(e) Approves a grant of $500 to Loburn School Board of Trustees towards the cost of signage for Loburn School’s 150 Jubilee

CARRIED

D Lundy abstain

C Prickett commented that the Soroptimist North Canterbury and North Loburn Home and School applications were for events that happened every year. Thus the recommendation for granting a lesser amount. However, the music stands and the Jubilee would be one off expenditures.

J Hoult noted that North Loburn School had already received $500 in the current financial year and she was therefore in support a lesser amount.

7.2 Ratification of the Board’s Comments on the Reviewed District Plan – ‘What’s the Plan’ – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

T Kunkel spoke briefly to the report.

Moved C Prickett seconded D Lundy

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190520070774.

(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s comments on the Waimakariri District Council Reviewed District Plan (Trim Ref: 190509066110).

CARRIED

7.3 Ratification of the Board’s Comments on the Waimakariri Bus Service Review – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

Moved D Gordon seconded M Clarke

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190521071198.

(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s comments on the ECan Waimakariri District Bus Review (Trim Ref: 190521071176).

CARRIED
8 CORRESPONDENCE

Moved D Gordon seconded J Gerard.

THAT the Rangiora Ashley-Community Board:
(a) Receives the information regarding potential for a sculpture at Townsend Fields (Trim No 190614084087).

CARRIED

D Gordon noted that it was good that the through road was now open.
J Gerard advised that J McBride would come back to the Board with further information on the route in due course.
K Barnett expressed a concern that the proposed sculpture was not vetted by the Public Art Committee. J Millward however advised that process was currently underway.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for May 2019

Moved J Gerard seconded D Lundy

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 190531077538.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 16 May 2019 (Trim No. 190509065991).

10.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 13 May 2019 (Trim No 190509066000).

10.3 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 20 May 2019 (Trim No 190510467740)

Moved J Gerard seconded D Lundy

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board receives the information in Items 10.1-10.3.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 M Clarke
- Attended Drainage Committee meeting. Improvements to Lehmans Road were discussed.
- Attended Waimakariri Health Advisory Group meeting it was interesting to see the number of services available.
- Attended Health Hub meeting.

11.2 J Hoult
- Timebank – COGs project completed, another $10,000 was available to extend the initiative into the district. A strategy was required to maximise the benefit of the $10,000. Advised of upcoming workshop.
- Observed Driver Mentoring Programme session and have volunteered to become a mentor.
11.3 **S Lewis**
- Assisting with Waimakariri Winter Festival – they were looking for volunteers on the day.
- Assisted with planting at Kaiapoi Honda Forest.
- Excited by the building of a bike park for children in Kaiapoi. Noted enthusiasm of P Allen for the project. Assisting with donation of signs for the track.
- Commented her daughter had recently turned 13 years old and had accompanied her on a tour of Rangiora High School. Had been impressed with facilities and especially noted importance of the farming facilities.
- Noted the building of the North Loburn School bike track and invited Board members to attend the opening of the track.
- Supporting Open Mic Night at Port and Eagle in Kaiapoi and commented on the community the event was creating.

11.4 **G Miller**
- Attended workshop on District Plan, had been very worthwhile, there could have been a greater cross-section of participants.

11.5 **C Prickett**
- Receiving many comments on Rangiora-Woodend Road delays. Noted conversation on social media.
- Commented was great to see Garrymere water come to a conclusion. Staff had been exceptional.

11.6 **P Williams**
- Meeting with Selwyn District Council. Both Councils seems to have similar issues when dealing with Christchurch City Council.
- Attended District Licencing Training, noted results of checks on businesses.
- Attended Airfield meeting and noted feedback from increase in rates.
- Concurried staff working on Garrymere water had completed a brilliant job.
- Noted the deep water well in Kaiapoi that was proposed to supply Rangiora with water. Expressed a concern regarding the quality if the water.

Concerns were expressed by various members that the Board was not briefed about the deep water well in Kaiapoi and requested that this matter be followed up.

11.7 **R Brine**
- Due to the recent rain most sporting codes had cancelled games and the fields had drained well. A process had been introduced where clubs made the decision on field condition which meant clubs took ownership of the fields.
- There was a tagging issue in Dudley Park, it seem to be a cyclic issue. Offences have however being reported to the police.
- Bin rollout – there had been a larger uptake than expected. Bin delivery was progressing well.

It was suggested residents might need further information on what went into each bin. R Brine advised this advice was on the bins and on the website.

11.8 **K Galloway**
- Suggested there should be acknowledgment to staff on the display of fairy lights on High Street in Rangiora.
- Commented on video to be created of Rangiora in the 1950s.
11.9  D Lundy
- Attended Garrymere Water Scheme and Drainage Committee meetings.
- Attended Loburn School Centennial meeting.
- Attended Civil Defence Exercise.

11.10 D Gordon
- Commented on opening of new Rangiora Eyecare building. The owners had invested in a stunning building including mural.
- Noted work continuing with BNZ corner. Rental apartments were to be above Burger King.
- Joined NZRT12 Sefton Tug of War team and expressed gratitude for the work of that group.
- Attended McAlpines Pipe Band AGM, they were planning their 100th Jubilee.
- Noted Ivan Button’s latest exhibition in Chamber Gallery.
- Attended Honda Forest planning.
- Noted Annual Plan deliberations, rates rise across the district was 4.8% with Rangiora urban 4.3%. Grants to Rangiora Croquet Club and the tennis court development were approved. In response to the Rangiora Museum submission, museum storage throughout district would be looked at.
- Attended Hours Health Care Facility meeting. Potential for extension of hours. The taxi chit issue had been raised.
- Noted the range of new services that would be provided at the Health Hub Facility.
- Attended Rangiora Promotions Association AGM the Chair was re-elected.
- Attended Rangiora Town Centre Plan Workshop with key stakeholders. There would be a second workshop.

11.11 K Barnett
- Attended Youth Network Forum. Career Expo at Rangiora High School was an incredible event. Local businesses attended. Following success were looking to repeat.
- Attended Youth Council and Wai Youth Workshop team building and leadership event.
- In response to the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee ZIPA, a Land and Water Working Group was established by the Council to look at how to progress improvement of waterways and biodiversity.
- Commented on ‘Just Eat It’ documentary regarding food waste and recommended that the Board viewed the documentary.
- Noted upcoming Big Splash to be held in the Rangiora RSA.
- Noted surprise at increased security measures continuing in Christchurch and asked about security measures in Waimakariri.

12  CONSULTATION PROJECTS

**About Parking**

https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/about-parking

**Hurunui Reserve**
Consultation closes Friday 21 June 2019.
13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

13.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 4 June 2019: $1,604.

13.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 4 June 2019: $26,160 (including carry forward).

14 MEDIA ITEMS

15 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved J Gerard seconded D Lundy

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

CARRIED

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public was excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the Public Excluded portion of the Rangiora Ashley Community Board meeting of 10 April 2019</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>Minutes of the Public Excluded portion of the Rangiora Ashley Community Board meeting of 15 May 2019</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This resolution was 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 the Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons</td>
<td>A2(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLOSE MEETING**

See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

**OPEN MEETING**

15.1 **Further update to the Cust Community Centre Advisory Group Terms of Reference and appointment of community members to the Group – Greg Barnard (Parks Community Asset Officer)**

G Barnard outlined that the report was to approve the appointment of local Cust residents to the recently reinvigorated Cust Community Centre Advisory Group. The originally approved Terms of Reference were standard and allowed for seven (7) members from the Cust Community. G Barnard explained that eight (8) high calibre nominations were received from the community and staff therefore recommended increasing the maximum number of members to ten (10) to allow for all the nominees to become members. There would be no differences to the resources required or the work involved.

Moved P Williams seconded K Galloway

**THAT** the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(b) **Receives** report No. 190321037990.

(c) **Notes** that the Cust Community Centre Advisory Group terms of reference approved on 13th November 2018 allows for the appointment of up to 9 members, 7 of which are members of the Cust community.

(d) **Approves** an amendment to the Cust Community Centre Advisory Group Terms of Reference Section 6.1 to allow the appointment of a maximum of 10 members to the Group.

(e) **Approves** an amendment to the Cust Community Centre Advisory Group Terms of Reference Section 6.2 to allow the appointment of up to 8 members from the wider community.

(f) **Approves** the appointment of Kirstyn Barnett, Peter Boerlage, Craig Steele, Margaret Austin, Chris Neason, Jennifer Howard, Natasha Donoghue and Bernard Kingsbury to the Cust Community Centre Advisory Group as community representatives.

(g) **Notes** that Board members Dan Gordon and Duncan Lundy have already been appointed as the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board representatives to the Advisory Group at the 13th November 2018 board meeting which brings the total number of Group members to 10. The Board should further note that the staff member is appointed as an advisor to the Group and is not included in the total number of appointees

CARRIED
15.2 **Trees Lineside Road, NPD development – Grant MacLeod (Community Greenspace Manager)**

*Moved D Gordon seconded M Clarke*

**THAT** the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) **Requests** engagement with representatives of NPD (or its agent) along with the Green Space Manager, Dan Gordon as Councillor with the relevant portfolio, and the Chair of the Community Board.

(b) **Notes** the discussion would be to seek to try and save the specimen Oak tree. The Board agrees to the removal of the remaining six trees.

(c) **Seek** compensation or in kind landscaping of the general area to compensate for the removal of the other trees.

(d) **Requests** that NPD meet the costs of relocating Rangiora Promotions signs subject to agreement from Rangiora Promotions.

(e) **Requests** a report on the outcome of the engagement and, if possible, Board input on the amenity landscaping for the new NPD site.

(f) **Requests** that staff provide a report back to the Board, that outlines changes to the processes and required documentation that ensure the Council avoids future reoccurrences.

**CARRIED**

K Galloway abstain

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

There were no questions under standing orders.

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

There was no urgent general business.

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Wednesday 10 July 2019 in the Council Chambers at the Rangiora Service Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 9.17pm.

**CONFIRMED**

__________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date
Workshop
- Nuisance Bylaw – Nick Harrison (Manager Regulation)
- Members Forum

Briefing
Note a briefing is public excluded
- Garrymere – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)
- Climate Change – Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN MEETING ROOM 1 (UPSTAIRS), RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE,
176 WILLIAMS STREET, KAIAPOI ON MONDAY 17 JUNE 2019 AT 4PM.

PRESENT

J Watson (Chairperson), C Greengrass (Deputy Chair), R Blair, J Meyer, M Pinkham,
P Redmond, S Stewart

IN ATTENDANCE

J Palmer (Chief Executive), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), G Cleary
(Manager Utilities and Roading), C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation),
S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement), G McLeod (Greenspace Manager),
B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer), G Stephens (Green Space Community Engagement
Officer), S Hart (Business and Centres Manager), T Kunkel (Governance Team Leader),
K Rabe (Governance Adviser) and C Fowler-Jenkins (Governance Support Officer)

1 APOLOGIES

Moved J Watson seconded N Atkinson

An apology for absence was accepted and sustained from A Blackie.

Apologies for early departure were received and sustained from R Blair who left at
5.03pm and was absent for Items 7.2 – 17 and M Pinkham who left at 5.29pm and
was absent for part of item 7.3 and items 7.4 – 17 inclusive.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 20 May 2019

Moved P Redmond seconded M Pinkham

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Confirms the circulated Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community
Board meeting, held 20 May 2019, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Harper Robinson - Rugby Goal at Pines Oval

Harper Robinson was in attendance and spoke to the Board regarding the
possible installation of rugby goal posts at the Pines Oval. H Robinson
explained that he and other children would like to practice their rugby skills
during their free time. At present this required a parent to take them to the
Kaiapoi rugby fields.
N Atkinson suggested a combination rugby/soccer goal post might be a good idea, so that both sports could be practices. H Robinson agreed that this might be a better idea.

J Watson asked if there were quite a few children that liked to play and when this was an affirmative she speculated that it would be good for visitors to the Oval as well.

N Atkinson asked staff to explain the process to Harper as to how the Board could act on this request. C Brown therefore explained the application process to H Robinson and highlighted the way forward. C Brown added that he thought a rugby goal at the Pines Oval was a good idea.

The Chairperson thanked Harper for bringing this matter to the Board’s attention and for coming to speak to them.

5.2 Loraine Fuller – Silverstream Toilets

L Fuller was in attendance to speak to the Board regarding the location of the public toilets at the Tirikatene Reserve in Silverstream.

L Fuller presented a petition (Trim Ref 190618085533) signed by 42 residents which stated “We the undersigned are opposed to the prospect of the building of a public toilet next to the Villas and other houses along that part of Footbridge Terrace. We also have no objection to a public toilet, but would prefer it be relocated away from residential homes.”

L Fuller discussed the three (3) options presented in the Council’s report, indicating the L3 as shown on the map attached to the report would be the residents preferred location.

Questions:

R Blair clarified that the objection was to the location of the public toilets and not the toilets itself.

P Redmond clarified that the residents would prefer L3 over both L1 and L2. L3 being central to shops, bus stops, the car park and playground, as well as being away from residential dwellings and was not in any home’s direct line of sight.

M Pinkham asked that if residents were concerned about the look of toilets in the reserve how that was reconciled by it being visible from Silverstream Boulevard, the main road running past the reserve. L Fuller stated that in her opinion, with landscaping surrounding the toilets it should fit well into the landscape of the reserve.

The Chairperson thanked L Fuller for her attendance.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS

7.2 Silverstream toilet installation – Grant MacLeod (Greenspace Manager)

With the agreement of the Board, this item was considered out of sequence.

Correspondence from S Cole, a resident of Silverstream was tabled (Trim Ref 190617084724) and read out. S Cole objected to the proposed location (L2),
as shown on the map attached to the report. If the toilets were built at this location it would be in the direct sight of her main living areas.

G MacLeod spoke to the Council report regarding the repositioning of the public toilets, recounting the background information on why the original location was selected for the erection of public toilet. He advised that he met with S Cole and confirmed that public toilets situated at the L2 location would overlook both S Cole and her neighbour.

G MacLeod advised the Board that services for the toilets were currently located at L1, the original location but due to the proximity to the Villas it was no longer deemed a suitable location. Locating the toilet at L2 would require the services to be extended and could increase the cost by approximately $30,000. Moving the toilets to L3 would require the services to be extended even further and could therefore increase the cost by approximately $50,000 to $60,000.

Questions

J Watson asked if the toilets could be screened by landscaping. G MacLeod advised that planting enough vegetation surrounding the building might render the building unsafe under the CPTED requirements and that the roof would still be visible.

P Redmond asked if the sewage line running along the Silverstream Boulevard could be used instead of extending services from the L1 location. G MacLeod reported that there were extensive power cables between L3 and the road and Council was advised not to cross those services.

C Greengrass asked if the building could be reoriented so that the doors were not visible to residents but faced the roadway, and was told that it was possible.

M Pinkham asked if there was a requirement for there to be public toilets in this area. G MacLeod confirmed that it was part of the developer’s requirement to provide public toilets. L1 was established as the designated spot on the original plan which was why the services were sited there. It was only later after the Villas had been built that it became apparent that this location would not be suitable. The developer was still disposed to locate the toilet at L1, however Council understood residents’ concerns.

Moved J Watson seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(b) Receives report No. 190604078006

(c) Recommends staff proceed with the installation of the toilet at Approx L2 following consultation with direct neighbours. This can be viewed in attachment i and is located towards the corner of Silverstream Boulevard and Footbridge Terrace. With appropriate screen planting the impact of this option could be mitigated for the nearest dwellings.

(d) Notes staff will continue to update the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board on progress including discussion with neighbours along Footbridge Terrace and with the wider community that have fed into the process thus far.

(e) Notes further funding can be allocated from within existing land development budget to cover the increase in cost of Approx L2.

(f) Notes a consented option that was approved through early development stages exists and this can be seen as Approx L1 in the attachment i.

P Redmond stated that he visited the reserve and observed other locations which could be investigated and that this exercise should be carried out with the residents most affected by the toilets’ location. P Redmond believed that
the toilets should not be the focal point in the reserve and as this matter was not urgent it was prudent to take time to getting the right outcome.

*P Redmond moved an amendment seconded by M Pinkham*

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190604078006
(b) Request that further investigation and consultation occur with affected residents and an amended report come back to the Board with further location options and costs.

**CARRIED**

M Pinkham observed that originally, before the land was developed, the location of the toilet looked appropriate, but now the area was developed it was obvious that the location was not suitable.

N Atkinson was supportive of the L3 location and thought that the cost should not be a consideration in this matter as the whole outlook of the development was more important and should take precedence. However he was not opposed to further consultation and investigation. He therefore supported the amendment.

7.1 **Kaiapoi Town Centre - Request for Approval to Undertake Footpath Improvements on Williams Street at the Charles Street intersection**

-Joanne McBride (Roading & Transport Manager) & Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities & Roading)

J McBride spoke to this report.

N Atkinson raised a concern that this item was being brought to the Board, as this matter should be covered in the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan. If it had been omitted or overlooked, then more work should be done to rectify this oversight.

He was also concerned if this was not captured in Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan the main street could end up with a ‘mishmash’ of styles instead of the consistent finish the Council was aiming for.

P Redmond agreed with N Atkinson, and said that the whole point of the Town Centre Plan was to create a similar look throughout the town and this should include areas around the corners of side streets.

N Atkinson requested that a workshop be arranged for this matter to be investigated further.

*Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond*

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190606080258;
(b) Approves the extension of the high amenity paving to tie in with the new Riverview development boundary;

**AND**

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board recommends:

**THAT** the Council:

(c) Approves the extension of the high amenity paving to tie in with the new Riverview development boundary;
(d) Approves $22,000 of budget for the extension of the high amenity footpaths outside Riverview Development from the Kaiapoi Town Centre budget;
(e) **Notes** that following this allocation there will be $572,000 unallocated in the Kaiapoi Town Centre Budget and that future projects have been identified to be carried out from this unallocated budget;

(f) **Notes** that the timing of the work will need to be carried out prior to the opening of the new development on 1 September 2019;

(g) **Circulates** this report to the Utilities and Roading Committee for information.

18 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

*With the agreement of the Board, this item was considered out of sequence.*

M Pinkham requested that the report ‘Belfast to Kaiapoi Cycleway Consultation’ scheduled to be included in the Utilities and Roading Agenda of 18 June 2019, be brought to the Board under ‘Urgent General Business Under Standing Orders’.

He noted that the report stated that “… the report has been presented to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board at its June meeting.,” however the Board had a workshop on this matter at its June 2019 meeting and conducted a subsequent site visit due to various concerns raised, but had not been presented with the report.

Moved **P Redmond** seconded **M Pinkham**

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190412055544

(b) **Notes** the report ‘Belfast to Kaiapoi Cycleway Consultation’ be included for discussion on the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board agenda of 17 June 2019.

**CARRIED**

B Rice spoke to the report summarising the findings of the assessment done to choose the preferred route. M Smith, Road Safety Engineer, had also been consulted on the best and safest route option(s). B Rice also emphasised that this was to determine the best commuter route rather than a recreation cycle path.

**Questions**

P Redmond noted the assessment document, and asked why the business and residents impacts were weighted the lowest when this route could impact them the most. B Rice replied that even if the weight of these categories was increased by 10% the preferred route would still score the highest.

P Redmond stated that in his opinion that cycleways should be separated from roadways and that introducing on-road cycleways would be detrimental to the safety of road users and businesses.

M Pinkham wondered what data was used to determine that this should be a commuter route as most cycleways were routinely used more for recreation. B Rice advised that funding from NZTA was dependent on this being described as a commuter route so as to encourage people to use alternative methods to commute to work.

M Pinkham enquired if the results from the public consultation would be brought back to the Board for consideration. B Rice assured the Board that the results would be presented to the Board.

N Atkinson asked if cyclists were using a commuter route, why were they not getting the same consideration as vehicles. Cyclist were being diverted away from business. B Rice pointed out that cyclist were being directed onto roads that were not as busy for safety reasons.
Moved P Redmond seconded N Atkinson

That the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190412055544;

AND

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board recommends:

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(b) Notes the Board’s concern as to the proposed location of various options.

(c) Notes whichever option is chosen, that the effects on businesses be mitigated as far as possible.

(d) Notes that if adjacent to the carriageway, steps be taken to ensure safety of all road users.

CARRIED

P Redmond stated that the best route should be chosen rather than the easiest route to build.

N Atkinson stated his support of cycleways staying off roads and reminded members that cycling was not the only way of commuting. Electric scooters seem to becoming a popular choice and that the WDC would need to take this into account when considering other options of commuting round the district. He stated that the option using Hall/Wilcox Roads was not an option he would support.

M Pinkham commented on the fact that a cycle plan had been requested from Council on several occasions and wondered how it had suddenly materialized now when this report is ready to be presented.

P Redmond stated that he was supportive of cycleways in general but acknowledged that there were problems that needed to be taken into account such as safety, reduction of parking and business interruption.

R Blair left the meeting at 5.03pm.

7.2 General Landscaping Budget – Grant Stephens (Green Space Community Engagement Officer)

G Stephens spoke to his report outlining the reason the report was initiated and the options explored in the report.

G Stephens advised that Council would prefer a formed path following the informal track with steps down from the top of the bund to the footpath. This would mean that the bund would not need to be disturbed and no resource consent required. He suggested that the work required should be funded from the Board’s General Landscaping budget.

J Watson informed the Board that the school preferred Option 2, which was to block the informal track forcing people/students to use the formed pathway already on site.

N Atkinson asked if a six (6) foot fence could be erected from the existing fence down to the pavement. G Stephens felt that this would hinder visibility for residents when exiting their driveways.

S Stewart asked if staff were aware of the history of the reserve as there had been some disagreement between residents and parents dropping off children
for school. G Stephens admitted that they were unaware of any previous tensions regarding the reserve.

J Meyer stated he was in support of Option 2 but felt that the bollards did not need to extend all the way to the pathway to discourage children from using the short cut.

J Watson moved an amendment seconded by N Atkinson that Option 2 – block the track be adopted, therefore:

Moved J Watson seconded N Atkinson

THAT the Kaiapoi- Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No: 190507064628.

(b) Notes the health and safety concerns raised by neighbouring residents and Kaiapoi North School relating to the existing informal pathway to Allison Crescent

(c) Approves the allocation of $2,200 from the General Landscaping Budget towards the installation of blocking the informal track completely by installing a line of bollards with chain to discourage people biking through the plantings on the bund.

(d) Notes the Board currently has $46,420 available to allocate to general landscape projects within the Kaiapoi -Tuahiwi Ward.

CARRIED

N Atkinson enquired why a path and ramp could not be constructed without damaging the bund. G Stephens explained that the gradient was too steep for cyclists to safely exit on to the footpath.

N Atkinson requested that Council put a sign at the barrier stating that this was a public reserve so that there was no confusion that this was part of the school grounds.

7.3 Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – Update Report – Simon Hart (Business & Centres Manager)

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi - Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190606079809

(b) Notes the progress made on various projects within the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond.

(c) Circulates this report to Council and the other Community Boards for their information).

CARRIED

7.4 Application to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s Discretionary Grant 2018-2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

J Watson reminded members that the current balance of the Discretionary Grant was $2,878 and the requests made to the Board totalled $2,000 which left a remaining balance of $878. The Board had the option of carrying the balance over to the next financial year or increasing some or all allocations to the applicants.
C Greengrass asked how much the first aid courses cost for the Community Patrols of New Zealand. K Rabe confirmed that the course cost $80 and the Community Patrols had 10 people attending.

C Greengrass proposed that the allocation to the Community Patrols New Zealand be increased to $800 to fully cover the cost and the remaining balance of $578 be carried over to the 2019/20 financial year.

Moved J Watson seconded S Stewart

THAT the Kaiapoi - Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190516069178.

(b) Approves a grant of $500 to Kaiapoi Toy Library towards the cost of new toys.

(c) Approves a grant of $500 to Person to Person Help Trust towards the cost of resources to enable an interactive programme.

(d) Approves a grant of $800 to Community Patrols of New Zealand towards the cost of first aid courses for members.

(e) Approves a grant of $500 to All Stars Marching Teams towards the cost of a training camp to be held at Spencer Park.

(f) Notes the remaining balance of its Discretionary Grant fund be carried over to the 2019-20 financial year.

CARRIED

7.5 Ratification of the Board’s Comments on the Waimakariri Bus Service Review – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi - Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190521071265.

(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s Comments on the ECan Waimakariri Bus Service Review (Trim Ref: 190520070237)

CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE

Tabled correspondence from S Cole (Trim Ref: 190617084724) item 7.2 refers.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for June 2019

Moved J Watson seconded N Atkinson

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 190611082006.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION

Note: Items have been circulated via emailed agenda links to Board members as they have become available.
11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

S Stewart

- Council to ratify the Annual Plan on 18 June 2019
- Plan Change notified at the end of the month, Horrelville contamination monitoring continuing, downstream contamination occurring and concern regarding contamination of private wells.
- Land and Water Working Party Update

P Redmond

- 27 May attended Social Services Waimakariri Forum at Riverside Church – covered family violence and restorative justice. Poorly attended.
- 29 May attended Kaiapoi Museum AGM – well attended
- 30 May attended organised cycleway field trip with C Greengrass and M Pinkham
- 4 June attended Waimakariri Health Advisory Group meeting
- 5 June attended emissions reduction presentation at the Town Hall – part of the sustainability strategy
- 6 June attended Woodend by-pass/safety meeting at Woodend and CDHB presentation on progress on health hub
- 11 June attended Kaiapoi Wellbeing networking at Baptist Church and Coastguard North Canterbury meeting
- 12 June attended cycleway field trip with B Rice, Councilors and board members.

J Meyer

- Cycleway site visit
- Update on extension of Townsend Road
- Work progressing on Long Term Plan
- Winding up end of term projects

C Greengrass

- Attended Honda tree planting
- Met with political students with P Redmond
- Attended Social Services Wamakariri Forum at Riverside Church – covered family violence and restorative justice. Poorly attended.
- Met with Dame Sylvia Cartwright re EQC debrief
- Cycle way site visit
- Attended Access Group meeting – footpaths in Silverstream retail area
- Museum AGM

N Atkinson

- Flooding of Kaiapoi – new pond worked well – bark not helpful during flooding
- Rural Residential Strategy passed by Council
- Planting at Honda Forest
- Christchurch Greater Transport Group update
- Concern that cycleways proposed to utilize unlighted areas
12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

**About Parking**
https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/about-parking

**Hurunui Reserve**
Consultation closes Friday 21 June 2019.

13 REGENERATION PROJECTS

13.1 **Town Centre, Kaiapoi**
Updates on the Kaiapoi Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be accessed using the link below:

13.2 **Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group**
The next meeting of the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group will be held in Meeting Room 1, Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 4pm on Monday 1 July 2019. This meeting is open to the public.

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**
Balance as at 11 June 2019:$2,878.

14.2 **General Landscaping Budget**
Balance as at 11 June 2019: $46,420.

15 MEDIA ITEMS

16 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

*Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987*

*Moved J Watson seconded C Greengrass*

**THAT** the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each 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:
Item No | Minutes / Report of: | General subject of each matter to be considered | Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter | Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
15.1 | Simon Hart (Business & Centres Manager) & Raymond Qu (Property Assets Advisor) | Property purchase | Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7 | Section 48(1)(a)

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 which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

CLOSE MEETING

See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

OPEN MEETING

17 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board is scheduled for 4pm, Monday 15 July 2019 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 6.15PM.

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date
Workshop

- Draft Kaiapoi Marine Precinct Management Plan and Terms & Conditions – Vanessa Thompson (Business and Centres Advisor)
- Members Forum

Briefing

(please note a briefing is public excluded)

- Climate Change – Simon Markham (Strategy and Engagement Manager)
## SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 28 May</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQC Public Inquiry Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Council Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 29 May</td>
<td>ENC Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENC Farewell to Nick Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi Historic Society AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 30 May</td>
<td>Church Organ with Jean Booth for 100th Birthday Wish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opening of Canterbury Museum Exhibition – Breaking the Ice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 31 May</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Museum draft Annual Plan submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Police Honours And Awards Ceremony attended on behalf of the Mayor by Cr Atkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 4 June</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 5 June</td>
<td>Rangiora Men's Shed - acknowledgement of service to Peter Cornelius and Janet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enshi Sister City Advisory Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday-Friday 6-7 June</td>
<td>LGNZ Rural Provincial Meeting, Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 9 June</td>
<td>Attended concert to recognise National Day of Italy, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 10 June</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age–friendly Waimakariri Community Steering Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Museum Trust Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 11 June</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Youth Careers Expo at Rangiora High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 12 June</td>
<td>Waimakariri Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Harland (NZTA) meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakariri Passchendaele Advisory Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 13 June</td>
<td>Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art on the Quay Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 14 June</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 17 June</td>
<td>Earthquake Insurance Tribunal Launch, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting (briefly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking engagement at Kaiapoi Promotions AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 18 June</td>
<td>NZ Transport Agency NLTP workshop, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 19 June</td>
<td>Joint Council / Rūnanga meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 20 June</td>
<td>Governance Overview - New Employee Induction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Launch of new collection trucks, Southbrook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday 21 June</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participated in Big Splash. Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 24 June</td>
<td>All Boards briefing, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THAT** the Council:

a) **Receives** report No. 190619086528.

David Ayers
MAYOR