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

BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

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

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 21 August 2018

RECOMMENDATION

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 21 August 2018.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

5. DEPUTATION
6. REPORTS

6.1 Waimakariri District Plan Review – Possible Council Designations – Neil Sheerin (Senior Policy Planner) and Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager)  

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee

(a) Receives report No. 181008116926;

(b) Notes the information on designations outlined in Sections 3 to 8 and Appendix 1 below;

(c) Approves the preparation of notices of requirement for Council designations, and their lodgement once the formal call for designations to be included in the proposed new District Plan is made;

(d) Notes draft Council notices of requirement will be provided to Council for review, comment and approval prior to lodgement.

6.2 Rural Residential Development Strategy – Shelley Milosavljevic (Intermediate Policy Planner)  

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee recommends:

(a) Receives report No. 180720081057.

(b) Approves the preparation of a District wide Rural Residential Development Strategy.

(c) Notes that different approaches to zoning are identified for areas within and outside of the Urban Development Strategy area, as outlined in Paragraph 4.1 of this report.

(d) Notes that matters associated with 4ha subdivision will be reported to the Committee as part of the District Plan Review within a separate report.

6.3 Structure Planning – Residential East / West Rangiora and East Kaiapoi and linkages with the review of Rangiora Town Centre Plan – Cameron Wood (Senior Policy Planner)  

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee recommends:

(a) Receives report No. 181003114567.

(b) Approves the preparation of a Structure Plan for East and West Rangiora and for East Kaiapoi as shown on Map 1 of this report.

(c) Notes that the Structure Plans for East and West Rangiora will have linkages with the review of Rangiora Town Centre Plan.
7. MATTER REFERRED FROM RANGIORA ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD

7.1 Request for Parking Restrictions on Edward Street, Rangiora – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)

This report is being considered at the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting of 10 October and the recommendation was not available at the time of preparing the agenda. The District Planning and Regulation Committee will be verbally advised of the Board’s recommendation prior to its consideration of this report.

8. PORTFOLIO UPDATES

8.1 District Planning Development - Councillor Neville Atkinson

8.2 Regulation and Civil Defence – Councillor John Meyer

8.3 Business, Promotion and Town Centres – Councillor Dan Gordon

9. QUESTIONS

10. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

Briefing

- At the conclusion of the meeting there will be a briefing regarding the Rangiora Airfield Plan Change.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE DISTRICT PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 21 AUGUST 2018 1.00PM.

PRESENT
Councillor D Gordon (Chair), Mayor D Ayers, Councillors N Atkinson, W Doody, J Meyer and S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors A Blackie, P Williams, K Barnett and K Felstead.
J Palmer (Chief Executive), N Harrison (Manager Regulation), M Bacon (Team Leader Resource Consents), W Taylor (Building Unit Manager), B Wiremu (Emergency Management Advisor), S Stevenson (ESU Acting Manager), S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement), T Ellis (Development Planning Manager), B Bray (Principal Policy Planner) A Benbrook (Development Planning Administrator), C Wood (Senior Policy Planner), A Willis (Planner), J Manhire (Policy Planner), P Kloosterman (Senior Policy Planner), K Pierson (Communications Consultant) and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

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 June 2018
Moved J Meyer seconded W Doody
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 June 2018.
CARRIED

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
There were no matters arising.

5. DEPUTATION
There was no deputation.
6. REPORTS

6.1 Annual Report to the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority 2018 – Malcolm Johnston (Environmental Services Manager)

N Harrison spoke to the report noting that the statistics from the previous year to this year were similar, which reflected reasonably mature business across the district. The report reported on the activity of the District Licencing Committee (DLC) and the performance of the Local Alcohol Policy (LAP). N Harrison noted that there was currently a review of the LAP and that would be brought back to Council in the future.

N Harrison noted there was an increasing trend in the number of DLC hearings which he suggested was a reflection of the community's acceptance of the wider alcohol policy, and growing confidence in the DLC as a means for matters to be heard.

There was a recommendation for change to Section 25 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act where it related to Special Licence events. It was believed the restrictions were unworkable for low risk events such as fairs and fetes.

Regarding the recent review of the Local Alcohol Policy and Alcohol Control Bylaw, it has been established that there was no conflict of interest for those Councillors on the hearing panel that are also members of the District Licencing committee. N Atkinson advised that when the review of the LAP report is considered by Council, these members would be able to take part in the discussion, however they would abstain from voting. In addition there was no conflict of interest in today’s report as the recommendation was to approve an activity report.

N Atkinson agreed that the DLC process was starting to work. People were aware they had powers around the control of alcohol and he raised the Silverstream off-licence application as an example. Community input to the development of the LAP provided a guide for where the district wanted premises selling alcohol to be.

N Atkinson commented that he was interested in feedback from ARLA to see what the rest of the country was doing and whether the process was working for them, he believed that in the Waimakariri District, the legislation was working.

K Barnett noted the reference to ‘mums and dads’ in the report and suggested that should be generalised. N Harrison agreed.

Moved N Atkinson seconded W Doody

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee

(a) Receives report No. 180731085418.

(b) Approves the attached 2017 2018 Report to ARLA.

(c) Circulates a copy of this report to the Boards.

CARRIED

N Atkinson acknowledged the help of staff who were extremely active with the DLC and ARLA in this role. There was great liaison between ARLA, DLC and public inspectors.
W Doody concurred and appreciated the help of staff.

D Gordon agreed with the comments made, and supported the report. In addition he believed that they were well served by the District Licencing Committee. Feedback from the community was that N Atkinson as Chair had a good common sense approach.

K Barnett was pleased that the comments related to Section 25 and low risk community fundraisers had been included.

D Ayers commented that at a recent opening of a licensed facility he had received positive feedback regarding the assistance of Council staff.

6.2 Annual Report: Dog Control 2017/2018 – Malcolm Johnston (Environmental Services Manager)

N Harrison advised that the Dog Control report was an annual statutory requirement and summarised statistics regarding animal control officer’s work through the year. The report would be forwarded to the Department of Internal Affairs (DIA).

There was an increasing trend in the number of dogs and dog owners which reflected district growth. The number of complaints for barking and roaming dogs was the same as previous years. There had been one prosecution relating to a dog attack on a girl in the Good Street Reserve.

K Barnett noted that there had been a decrease in the reports of roaming and barking dogs and asked as dog numbers had been increasing would it not be expected those numbers stay the same and was it a reflection of the public having lost faith in reporting? N Harrison did not think so. There had been a decreasing trend since microchipping was introduced in 2005 and it had become easier to identify a dog’s owner and address so matters could be addressed quickly. K Barnett commented that would still involve reporting a dog and N Harrison replied that it was the same message about increasing responsible dog ownership.

W Doody referred to messaging regarding lost dogs on Facebook and once dog owners were located were they asked to pay for microchipping? N Harrison replied yes, dog owners were required to pay for the microchip. In addition, where dog owners could not be located, Facebook was a successful means of rehoming dogs.

S Stewart asked if there were issues with dual microchip databases in particular in the case of injured animals that needed vet attention. N Harrison advised that they did not have direct access to secondary databases, however they could call a vet clinic to access. In the case of an injured animal staff would not wait and seek vet assistance immediately.

Mayor Ayers asked if it were possible to drill down into the statistics to see how many complaints were related to individual dogs. N Harrison was not sure how easy it was to extract that figure. The focus should be on recidivist owners.
Moved N Atkinson  seconded J Meyer

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180704074535.

(b) **Approves** the attached 2017/2018 Annual Report on Dog Control to the Department of Internal Affairs.

(c) **Circulates** a copy of this report to the Boards.

N Atkinson believed from feedback from the community and from viewing the work of the three animal controllers in the district that there was no question that there had been an improvement in animal control. In the past he had been critical of the work that was being done however there had been significant improvements and he congratulated staff on those improvements and the care they took of animals.

J Meyer agreed with N Atkinson, he had had experience with the staff as a dog owner. The statistics showed animal control was improving.

7. **PORTFOLIO UPDATES**

7.1 **District Planning Development** - Councillor Neville Atkinson

N Atkinson commented that updates would be covered by the team in the upcoming briefing.

7.2 **Regulation and Civil Defence** – Councillor John Meyer

Councillor John Meyer noted the reports related to regulation covered in the meeting.

Councillor John Meyer referred to the recent Civil Defence exercise and the challenges that were involved. He commented that addressing those issues that arose, and how they were handled, was the purpose of the exercise.

Mayor Ayers advised that Les Pester was in the process of retiring. He acknowledged the service of Les Pester in Civil Defence in the district over many years and noted that he had been the Regulatory Manager at Waimakariri District Council also. Civil Defence had been taken to a new level when he had taken on the role and he was recognised throughout the community as one of the leaders. During the earthquakes he had played an important role in checking buildings. D Gordon suggested that Les Pester be invited to a District Planning and Regulation Committee in order that his service to the district be formally acknowledged.

7.3 **Business, Promotion and Town Centres** – Councillor Dan Gordon

D Gordon advised that all Service Level Agreements with Promotions Associations had been signed and returned. He had attended a number of Promotions Association meetings as well as meeting the previous week to explore the possibility of a Promotions Association for Ravenswood/Pegasus/Woodend. The idea was in its early stages. D Gordon had advised that existing groups including community associations should be respected and involved.
D Gordon noted there had been a number of recent successful events highlighting The Kaiapoi Art Expo, Blackwell’s Fire and Ice, Waimakariri Winter Festival and Oxford Light Festival. He noted the recent appointment of Vanessa Thompson as Business and Centres Advisor, working with Simon Hart.

8. **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

9. **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

There was no urgent general business.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 1.31pm.

CONFIRMED


- **Briefing**
  - At the conclusion of the meeting there was a briefing to the Committee. A separate agenda was circulated for this. Speakers were:
    - W Taylor (Building Unit Manager)
    - M Bacon (Team Leader Resource Consents)
    - B Wiremu (Emergency Management Advisor)
    - S Stevenson (ESU Acting Manager)
    - B Bray (Principal Policy Planner)
    - A Willis (Planner)
    - C Wood (Senior Policy Planner)
    - P Kloosterman (Senior Policy Planner)
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: DDS-06-10-02-05-14 / 181008116926
REPORT TO: District Planning and Regulation Committee
DATE OF MEETING: 16 October 2018
FROM: Neil Sheerin, Senior Policy Planner 
Trevor Ellis, Development Planning Manager
SUBJECT: Waimakariri District Plan Review – Possible Council Designations

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to request that the Committee approve the inclusion of Council designations in the proposed new District Plan. It is considered the potential advantages of the Council using designations significantly outweigh potential disadvantages, and makes for more efficient resource management. It is therefore recommended the Committee give its approval to the preparation of notices of requirement for Council designations, and their lodgement once the formal call for designations to be included in the proposed new District Plan is made.

Attachments:
1. Appendix 1: Some Pros and Cons of Possible Council Designations.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 181008116926;
(b) Notes the information on designations outlined in Sections 3 to 8 and Appendix 1 below;
(c) Approves the preparation of notices of requirement for Council designations, and their lodgement once the formal call for designations to be included in the proposed new District Plan is made;
(d) Notes draft Council notices of requirement will be provided to Council for review, comment and approval prior to lodgement.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. There are no Council designations in the current or operative District Plan. However, there were Council designations in the preceding (transitional) district plan. The current or operative District Plan was formulated around the mid-1990’s. It would appear Council at that time did not support the continued use of Council designations, and chose not to roll Council designations existing at that time over into the proposed new district plan, and instead preferred Council projects to be subject to ‘normal’ resource consent processes.
3.2. However, the current or operative District Plan is now considerably dated. A proposed new district plan is scheduled to be publicly notified in 2020. The formal call for designations (to other requiring authorities) to be included in the new plan is likely to occur about six months before this (early 2020). By that time the current or operative District Plan will be nearing 25 years old from its first draft. The District and the planning environment have changed considerably in the interim, particularly in terms of population and development growth, and decisions on Council designations made a quarter of a century ago may no longer be relevant today, and may therefore warrant re-consideration.

3.3. A separate Council designation requirement for Rangiora Airfield has already been lodged and is currently being processed.

3.4. It is currently proposed ‘green space’ areas (or land held for parks, recreation and open space) will be zoned ‘Open Space’ in the proposed new District Plan.

4. DESIGNATIONS - OVERVIEW

What

4.1. Under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), a designation is a statutory instrument in an operative district plan. A designation overrides district plan rules, and allows parties with financial responsibility for the designation to undertake any work on the designated land that is in accordance with the designated purpose, without the need for resource consent under a district plan.

4.2. Anything not in accordance with the designated purpose is subject to the provisions of the district plan zone underlying the designation, as well as any district-wide rules in the district plan, for which resource consent may be required.

4.3. Regional council resource consent requirements will still apply. Resource consent requirements from a district council under National Environmental Standards will also still apply.

Who

4.4. A designation can be required to be included in a district plan by a “requiring authority”. Requiring authorities include a Minister of the Crown (eg, the Ministry of Education), network utility operators (eg, Mainpower), any local or regional or unitary authority (eg, Waimakariri District Council, Environment Canterbury, etc), and any other party who successfully applies to the Minister for the Environment to become a requiring authority.

4.5. Under the RMA a requiring authority has the statutory power to require, not request, land to be designated in a district plan for a specific purpose.

How

4.6. To include a designation in a district plan, a requiring authority must lodge a “notice of requirement” with the relevant local authority. If the requiring authority is also the local authority, the notice of requirement might be prepared by (say) the Operations Manager and lodged with (say) the Chief Executive or District Planner.

4.7. Requirements for new designations are usually fully publicly notified for submissions, and a hearing held. However, requirements to alter existing designations are often processed on a non-notified basis. If the requiring authority is also the local authority, it is best (and usual) practice for the notice of requirement to be considered by an independent commissioner.
4.8. Decisions on notices of requirement are made in a different way to decisions on resource consents. The local authority can only make recommendations on a notice of requirement. The requiring authority then makes a decision on those recommendations. The decision of the requiring authority may be appealed to the Environment Court by any person who submitted on the notice of requirement, including the local authority.

4.9. A notice of requirement for a designation in an operative district plan is confirmed (or becomes operative) once the notice of requirement is beyond legal challenge. However, a notice of requirement for a designation in a proposed district plan is not confirmed (or not operative) until the whole proposed district plan becomes operative.

When

4.10. Notices of requirement can be lodged at any time. It is not uncommon for a requiring authority to lodge notices of requirement for multiple designations during a district plan review e.g. by a local authority for designations over a range of existing or proposed significant Council assets. This allows multiple designations to be notified and processed and heard in one all-encompassing district plan review process.

4.11. Before a proposed district plan is formally publicly notified for submissions, the first stage in the formal 'standard' district plan review process is usually to publicly notify the opportunity for requiring authorities to lodge notices of requirement for designations to be included in the proposed district plan. This may be for new designations, or to 'roll over' existing designations from the operative district plan into the proposed new district plan with or without modification.

4.12. It is anticipated the proposed new Waimakariri District Plan will be publicly notified in mid to late 2020; the formal call for designation requirements may occur about six months before this (early 2020).

Effect of a Designation

4.13. As soon as a notice of requirement has been lodged with the local authority, no one may do anything that would preclude the exercise of the designation. However, works that would be provided for under the designation cannot be undertaken until the designation has been confirmed (see above).

Life of a Designation

4.14. Once a designation has been confirmed (see above), and given effect to by carrying out works in accordance with the designated purpose, the designation exists in perpetuity, or until the requiring authority decides it no longer needs it and uplifts it.

Matters to Include in a Notice of Requirement

4.15. The following is a list of the sort of information that may typically be included in a notice of requirement for each site to be designated:

- Name of requiring authority;
- Site name;
- Site location;
- Designated purpose;
- Legal description;
- Site plan;
- Map reference;
• Whether a designation is for a rollover of an existing designation (with or without modification) or for a new designation;
• Lapse period (or the timeframe within which the designation will be given effect to). For an existing designation being rolled over without modification, the notice of requirement should say ‘already given effect to’. However, for new designations, or for roll overs of existing designations with modification, the lapse period will usually be 10 years which is the statutory ‘life’ of a district plan; and
• Conditions (if any).

Outline Plans

4.16. Prior to works on a designated site being undertaken, the requiring authority must first lodge an “outline plan” with the local authority.

4.17. An outline plan may typically consist of detailed to-scale project plans, and a letter that explains the proposed works and demonstrates how the proposal will meet the following requirements of the RMA for outline plans:
• Location of the site and of the works on the site;
• Height, shape and bulk of the works;
• Finished contours;
• Vehicle access, circulation and parking;
• Landscaping; and
• Any other matters relevant to avoiding, remedying or mitigating any adverse effects on the environment.

4.18. An outline plan is a non-notified process and is not open to public comment or submission. A local authority cannot approve or decline an outline plan. It can only request changes, and only has 20 working days after the outline plan is lodged in which to do so.

4.19. If a local authority requests changes to an outline plan, the requiring authority may accept or reject these in full or in part. The decision of a requiring authority on the changes requested by the local authority can be appealed, but only by the local authority. Appeals on outline plans are rare.

4.20. An outline plan may not need to be lodged, if a notice of requirement is for a new designation for a project about to be built and sufficient detail on that project is able to be included in the notice of requirement.

5. SCOPE OF POSSIBLE COUNCIL DESIGNATIONS

5.1. Council designations are usually for major or significant Council infrastructure and assets, and may cover things already built, or provide for future new works either on existing sites or on new sites.

5.2. For the Council, some examples of these could include (but are not necessarily limited to):
• Roads, both existing roads, and future roading projects (e.g. proposed new roads, road widening, road realignments or major intersection upgrades);
• Water and wastewater plants, pump stations and reservoirs;
• Main central car parks;
• Council main offices, service centres and libraries;
• Solid waste management sites including landfills, refuse transfer stations and recycling plants.

5.3. Discussions about the potential inclusion of possible Council designations in the proposed new District Plan have been held with senior Council Assets, 3 Waters, Roading and
Property staff, and the District Plan Review Technical Advisory Group (TAG), who have expressed strong support for Council designations.

6. **SOME PROS AND CONS OF POSSIBLE COUNCIL DESIGNATIONS**

6.1. Some potential advantages and disadvantages of possible Council designations are outlined in Appendix 1.

6.2. On the basis of the information in Appendix 1, it is considered the potential advantages of the Council using designations significantly outweigh potential disadvantages, and overall the use of designations makes for more efficient resource management.

6.3. The Management Team has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

7. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

7.1. **Financial Implications**

Preparation and finalisation of the next District Plan will be met by existing Development Planning Unit budget as previously approved. The preparation of notices of requirement for Council designations, which includes their identification and basic supporting information, will sit with the Units within Council that will benefit from the designation once in place in the District Plan.

7.2. **Community Implications**

As outlined above, the community will have opportunities to make submissions on the designations when the district plan is notified.

7.3. **Risk Management**

No risks identified, other than any matters raised in submissions upon notification of the district plan.

7.4. **Health and Safety**

Not applicable.

8. **CONTEXT**

8.1. **Policy**

The subject of this Council report is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

8.2. **Legislation**


8.3. **Community Outcomes**

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.
Appendix 1: Some Pros and Cons of Possible Council Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROS OF USING DESIGNATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lodging multiple designations during a district plan review is efficient resource management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging notices of requirement for multiple designations during a district plan review allows the designations to be notified and processed and heard in one all-encompassing district plan review process. This makes for more efficient resource management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outline Plans are a streamlined, low cost, low risk process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Works on confirmed designations that are in accordance with the designated purpose are subject only to Outline Plans. An Outline Plan is a non-notified process and is not open to public notification or comment or submission. A local authority cannot approve or decline an Outline Plan, it can only request changes, and only has 20 working days in which to do so. Decisions of a requiring authority on changes requested by a local authority can be appealed, but only by the local authority, and appeals are rare. This is a streamlined process with relatively low cost, minimal time delays and very low risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation requirements and Outline Plans may be combined, which is more efficient and cost effective.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If a notice of requirement is for a new designation for a project about to be built and sufficient detail on that project is able to be included in the notice of requirement, an Outline Plan may not need to be lodged. That combines two processes – designation and outline plan – into one, which makes for even more efficient and cost effective resource management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designations exist in perpetuity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once designations are confirmed and given effect to, they exist in perpetuity (or until the requiring authority decides it no longer needs it and uplifts it) therefore providing confidence designated sites can be developed, used and managed over time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designations provide for seamless asset management throughout the District.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designations provide a requiring authority with the ability to manage assets throughout the District in a seamless manner regardless of potentially different zones and zone provisions underlying designations that may change over time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is opportunity for public participation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notices of requirement for new designations are usually publicly notified and subject to submissions, local authority planning hearings, and potential appeals to the Environment Court. If works are not in accordance with a designation purpose, they are still subject to the provisions of underlying zones and potentially require resource consent under the District Plan. Such resource consent applications may require written approvals and/or be notified, potentially providing further opportunity for public participation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of works are subject to scrutiny.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outline plans for works on designated sites are vetted by the local authority and changes can be requested.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There are appeal rights.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decisions made by a requiring authority on recommendations by a local authority on designations and on changes requested to Outline Plans, and on submissions on new designations, can be appealed to the Environment Court.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designations provide an advance signal to the public of future development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designations on ‘greenfield’ sites provide an advance signal to the public of the location and nature of future development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designations have important strategic value.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requiring authorities can use designation and compulsory land acquisition to protect sites or routes of future projects from other development or future changes to district plans that may significantly adversely affect the ability to undertake key projects in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certainty.
With designations, decision making lies with the requiring authority, not the local authority. This helps remove uncertainty regarding a project proceeding under designation, compared to a resource consent application process where the decision lies with the local authority and the outcome for a project may be less certain.

Overall, designations provide a requiring authority with tremendous certainty regarding the ability to develop, use and manage designated sites now and in the future.

### CONS OF DESIGNATING / NOT DESIGNATING

**Alternative planning methods to designation potentially involve significantly more time, cost, and uncertainty.**

Without designations, the ability to develop, use and manage sites and projects is dependent on either developments being permitted under the relevant district plan zone (which may not always be the case), or (more usually) on resource consent being able to be obtained. If a requiring authority is a local authority, resource consent applications for major projects are often fully publicly notified. These may attract considerable public opposition, and can be subject to very lengthy hearing and appeal processes involving high cost and significant time delay, and uncertainty regarding the final outcome for a project. In other words, not having designations can be a significant disadvantage for a project.

**Designations still involve time and cost.**

The time and cost involved in preparing designation notices of requirement will be similar to preparing applications for resource consent. Decisions on notices of requirement for new designations, and on modifications to existing designations, can be appealed to the Environment Court in the same way as decisions on resource consent, involving similar time and cost.

**Not designating may be inefficient resource management.**

Without designations, Council is not using all its available statutory resource management power.

**No opportunities for public participation once designations are confirmed.**

Once a designation is confirmed and given effect to, there is no further opportunity for public participation.

**‘Blighting effect’.**

Designations can be put in place prior to the requiring authority purchasing the land from a land owner and development under the designation occurring. Once a designation is in place nothing may be done that would preclude the exercise of the designation. If there is a long period of time between a designation being confirmed and the land being bought by the requiring authority, this can severely limit land use for the land owner in the interim. In this context a designation for a future project can have a significant ‘blighting’ effect. There is RMA case law on the ‘blighting’ effect of designations being in place long term without progress on land acquisition or project development.

**More power lies with the requiring authority.**

The ability to designate and compulsorily acquire land affords the requiring authority with a unique and significant statutory power not available to the general public. With designations, decision making lies with the requiring authority, not the local authority, and the cost of appealing decisions to the Environment Court is often a significant deterrent to a local authority, and especially to the general public, in pursuing appeals.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report outlines the preparation of a revised Rural Residential Development Strategy in order to provide for future rural residential development throughout the district. This will inform the District Plan Review scheduled for notification in 2020. It recommends that the District Planning and Regulation Committee approve the preparation of this strategy.

**Attachments:**

i. Policy 6.3.9 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180720081057.

(b) **Approves** the preparation of a District wide Rural Residential Development Strategy.

(c) **Notes** that different approaches to zoning are identified for areas within and outside of the Urban Development Strategy area, as outlined in Paragraph 4.1 of this report.

(d) **Notes** that matters associated with 4ha subdivision will be reported to the Committee as part of the District Plan Review within a separate report.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The Waimakariri District has experienced sustained growth pressures for some years. This is set to continue with growth projected to continue over the next thirty years as outlined in the Council’s District Development Strategy (DDS). Rural residential lot and household development has been a popular community housing preference within the district, such as Fernside and Mandeville North.

3.2 Where a district provides for rural residential development, the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) requires such development in Greater Christchurch to occur guided by a plan or strategy, such as a Rural Residential Development Strategy (RRDS). The CRPS also sets out a basic density average of 1 - 2 households per hectare. Rural residential development outside Greater Christchurch i.e. to the west of Two Chain Road and north...
of the Ashley River does not have to develop via a RRDS, nor achieve average density requirements under the CRPS.

3.3 Council adopted a Rural Residential Development Plan (RRDP) in 2010 that set out eight locations for future rural residential development within Greater Christchurch. Some of these sites have been developed while some have not due to a range of factors. It is timely both in terms of the provisions applying to Greater Christchurch inserted into the CRPS in 2014 and the impending District Plan Review to refresh and extend the RRDP to better provide for future rural residential development as a living option within the District.

3.4 Council adopted the District Development Strategy (DDS) in July 2018. In relation to rural residential development, the DDS outlined that Council will:

- Adopt an approach with:
  - Primary focus on creating new rural residential areas.
  - Secondary focus on enabling large lot intensification within existing rural residential areas where there is sufficient community support and servicing available.
- Review RRDP for the whole district.

3.5 The approach of the DDS reflects an overall perspective that rural living and the interface between rural living, and other activities within the rural area, should be appropriately managed to better manage effects on activities. Rural zoning, lot size and bulk and locations controls are components of this, as is the quantum, location, lot size and controls that apply to rural residential development.

3.6 The DDS also sets out the RRDS should consider the whole of the district, not just the eastern part of the district. This enables a comprehensive assessment to be undertaken of all potential locations, and factor in the location and remaining capacity of existing Residential 4A and 4B zones.

3.7 Note that the reviewed Rural Residential Development Plan (RRDP) will be renamed the Rural Residential Development Strategy (RRDS) in order to better align with Policy 6.3.9 of the CRPS (see Attachment i).

3.8 It should be noted that the RRDS will not address the full ambit of resource management matters associated with the Rural Zone (currently lot development greater than 4ha in area). Rural subdivision is being considered as part of an additional workstream.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 Meetings were held with key planning staff during May to July 2018 to discuss the various options for the new RRDS in terms of procedure, consultation, implementation and location level of detail. Options were evaluated and preferred options were identified (refer to Table 1 below). These preferred options form the recommended approach for the preparation of RRDS.

*Table 1: Options and preferred options for RRDS procedure, implementation, location detail and consultation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Preferred option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedural options for RRDS</td>
<td>1. District Plan Review first (review rural residential provisions only) then RRDS (rural residential locations) after.</td>
<td>RRDS (rural residential locations) first, then District Plan Review notification (rural residential provisions) - provides a sound and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Preferred option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>District Plan Review and RRDS at same time.</td>
<td>logical planning process that is clear and transparent process for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>RRDS (rural residential locations) first, then District Plan Review notification (rural residential provisions).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options for implementation of RRDS</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>Preferred implementation option for RRDS areas within Greater Christchurch: No rezoning, RRDS only (rural residential growth areas identified in RRDS, no Council-led rezoning in District Plan review - market driven, developer-led rezoning via private plan changes later instead).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Zone as ‘Future Urban Zone’ to indicate its potential for future development. This would consequently require plan change (either Council-led or developer-led) to rezone from Future Urban Zone to Rural Residential Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Deferred rezoning subject to an Outline Development Plan (ODP) (rural residential zoning deferred, to be uplifted via an ODP, developer-led ODP via private plan change, rezoning informed by RRDS, rural residential provisions reviewed and ready to be slotted in to a new area).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Rezoning (rezoning of new rural residential areas in District Plan Review, informed by RRDS, includes ODP).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options for area location detail</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>Cadastral boundaries.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Indicative only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preferred implementation option for RRDS areas within Greater Christchurch is to not rezone any areas, allowing market-driven development through rezoning by developers. This approach provides a greater level of certainty and protection of plan integrity and timing for providing for demand without being restricted by the timeframe limitations of private plan changes in new District Plans.

An alternative approach could be to rezone all new areas regardless of whether the site is within or outside Greater Christchurch. However, if an area has a significant constraint such as servicing upgrade requirements, then this could be given deferred rezoning subject to addressing this constraint.

The draft RRDS will identify indicative arrows of areas potentially suitable for development, as feedback will be sought from the community on preferred areas. However, it is intended that the final RRDS will identify sites in cadastral boundaries given sites will be deferred or rezoned so this detail is needed. This also
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Preferred option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Options for consultation</td>
<td>1. No consultation on RRDS, use DPR process later on for consultation instead.</td>
<td>Full consultation - this is consistent with consultation process undertaken for the current RRDP and in accordance with LGA consultation principles which requires ‘persons who will or may be affected by, or have an interest in, the decision’ be consulted with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Some consultation on RRDS – only affected landowners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Full consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. The scope of the RRDS is outlined below:

- The purpose of the RRDS will be to identify potentially suitable locations for rural residential development. This sits within the work being carried to review the rural zone provisions of the District Plan. The RRDS takes into account key drivers for anticipated future rural residential growth, within the context of urban and rural zoning provisions, based on:
  - A signalled change in the Rural Zone 4ha min lot size (set out in the DDS and based on the issues identified by the DDS), including larger lot size provision.
  - Net demand vs. existing capacity of Residential 4A and 4B Zones.
  - Market drivers.
  - Providing for housing choice.

- The RRDS will propose new areas for rural residential development that are either extending existing areas, around urban fringe of towns or intensification of existing areas only, unless these are not possible in which case it could propose new ‘standalone’ rural residential areas.

- The RRDS will identify new areas in order to ensure a comprehensive evaluation of the most suitable locations is taken. Criteria will inform these evaluations.

- The RRDS will not provide for Large Lot Residential development (i.e. lot sizes less than 0.5ha), it will focus solely on providing for rural residential growth as per the CRPS requirements, along with any relevant requirements from the National Planning Standards (the template under preparation by the Ministry for the Environment to set out district plan format).

- The RRDS will also identify how many households might be needed based on the Waimakariri Growth Model. The Waimakariri Growth Model is a model of the development needs and capacities within the District and enables changes to zoning/zoned areas and permitted densities to be assessed. The RRDS will identify when these households need to be provided by, where the demand is to be distributed and what densities are assumed. In terms of the latter, an option for the District Plan Review is that the current two-zone approach to rural residential density is reviewed. This will be tested as part of the RRDS consultation process.

- The RRDS will consider existing Rural Residential zone areas that could be rezoned at an urban density (e.g. Residential 2) because they are within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary (PIB) of a town. These are:
  - Chinnerys Rd Residential 4B Zone that is now surrounded by Residential 2 Zone and is located within Woodend’s Projected Infrastructure Boundary (PIB).
- River Rd / Ballarat Rd Residential 4B Zone in Rangiora is within the PIB.
- The undeveloped Residential 4B area on South Belt in Rangiora within the PIB.
- The Residential 4B Zone in northwest Kaiapoi within the PIB.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

Initial consultation with affected landowners will occur late 2018/early 2019. Other key stakeholders, including Environment Canterbury and Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd will be involved throughout the process.

5.2. **Wider Community**

Public consultation, via Special Consultative Procedure LGA requirements, is scheduled for the first part of 2019. This will include consultation with the farming industry, strategic partners and landowners. The RRDS is set to be completed by mid-2019. A communications plan for the RRDS will be prepared.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

The costs associated with the preparation of the RRDS will be met from within existing budgets for the District Plan Review.

6.2. **Community Implications**

The RRDS will provide for future rural residential development for the community and will influence provisions within the proposed District Plan scheduled for notification in 2020.

6.3. **Risk Management**

A qualitative approach to managing risks that may affect the project is to be taken. The areas of risk identified to date are as follows, together with planned management controls:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Risk (before)</th>
<th>Control / Risk Mitigation</th>
<th>Risk (after)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Time delay – short project timescales and personnel availability</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Scope project involvement up front and agree with appropriate managers. Effective project management to identify potential delays early.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Time delay – key data inputs (particularly feasibility calculator and data, and any market trends analysis)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Maintain high level of team awareness of need to identify data and other inputs as early as possible</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Overlap of projects • Structure Planning</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Integration between teams, regular catch-ups on progress.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, preparation of the RRDS provides an early opportunity for the community and stakeholders to influence future locations for such development. This ultimately assists with risk management in terms of the final document, but also in terms of the level of challenge to the DPR when notified for submissions.

6.4. Health and Safety

There are no health and safety implications associated with the preparation of the RRDS.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy in the sense that considerable infrastructure expenditure would follow.

7.2. Legislation

Section 75 of the Resource Management Act 1991 requires District Plans to give effect to any regional policy statement. Section 31 states that the function of a territorial authority includes the establishment of methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land. Sections 82 and 83 of the Local Government Act 2002 set out the principles of consultation to be followed.

The Council through its District Plan is also required to give effect to the CRPS, which sets out a number of requirements in relation to Rural Residential development.

7.3. Community Outcomes

The following community outcomes are relevant to this matter:

- Our rural areas retain their amenity and character.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unfavourable consultation outcomes</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Be ready to adapt and respond to the unexpected.</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Capture of process by minority interest group(s)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Maintain robust process and reporting to Council. Ensure that the consultation process is clear to all.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Process is challenged</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Ensure that the process is consistent with the Local Government Act</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delegations
The District Planning and Regulation Committee has delegated authority to approve the preparation of the Rural Residential Development Strategy.
Attachment i:

**Canterbury Regional Policy Statement - Policy 6.3.9 - Rural residential development**

In Greater Christchurch, rural residential development further to areas already zoned in district plans as at 1st January 2013 can only be provided for by territorial authorities in accordance with an adopted rural residential development strategy prepared in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002, subject to the following:

1. In the case of Christchurch City, no further rural residential development is to be provided for within the Christchurch City Plan area;

2. The location must be outside the greenfield priority areas for development and existing urban areas;

3. All 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;

4. Legal and physical access is provided to a sealed road, but not directly to a road defined in the relevant district plan as a Strategic or Arterial Road, or as a State highway under the Government Roading Powers Act 1989;

5. The location and design of any proposed rural residential development shall:

   - avoid noise sensitive activities occurring within the 50 dBA Ldn air noise contour surrounding Christchurch International Airport so as not to compromise the future efficient operation of Christchurch International Airport or the health, well-being and amenity of people;
   - avoid the groundwater protection zone for Christchurch City's drinking water;
   - avoid land between the primary and secondary stop banks south of the Waimakariri River;
   - avoid land required to protect the landscape character of the Port Hills;
   - not compromise the operational capacity of the Burnham Military Camp, West Melton Military Training Area or Rangiora Airfield;
   - support existing or upgraded community infrastructure and provide for good access to emergency services;
   - avoid significant reverse sensitivity effects with adjacent rural activities, including quarrying and agricultural research farms, or strategic infrastructure;
   - avoid significant natural hazard areas including steep or unstable land;
   - avoid significant adverse ecological effects, and support the protection and enhancement of ecological values;
   - support the protection and enhancement of ancestral land, water sites, wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga of Ngāi Tahu;
(k) where adjacent to or in close proximity to an existing urban or rural residential area, be able to be integrated into or consolidated with the existing settlement; and

(l) avoid adverse effects on existing surface water quality.

6. An outline development plan is prepared which sets out an integrated design for subdivision and land use, and provides for the long-term maintenance of rural residential character.

7. A rural residential development area shall not be regarded as in transition to full urban development.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report outlines the preparation of reviewed and extended Structure Plans for East and West Rangiora and for Kaiapoi in order to provide for future residential development in the towns. This will inform the District Plan Review scheduled for notification 2020, and for Rangiora will have strong linkages with the review to Rangiora Town Centre Plan. It recommends that the District Planning and Regulation Committee approve the preparation of these Structure Plans.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 181003114567.

(b) Approves the preparation of a Structure Plan for East and West Rangiora and for East Kaiapoi as shown on Map 1 of this report.

(c) Notes that the Structure Plans for East and West Rangiora will have linkages with the review of Rangiora Town Centre Plan.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Waimakariri District has experienced sustained growth pressures for some years especially as a result of the 2010/11 Canterbury earthquakes. This growth has been concentrated in the eastern part of the District including the townships of Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Pegasus/Woodend.

3.2 This is set to continue in this part of Waimakariri with residential growth projected to continue over the next thirty years. Defining how much growth that could occur at the District and township level has been the subject of two main processes over the past 18 months, at the greater Christchurch area via the National Policy Statement – Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) and at the District level via Waimakariri 2048: District Development Strategy (DDS). A summary of the findings from the NPS-UDC regarding residential household growth is summarised in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waimakariri Household Growth</th>
<th>Short to Medium Term 2018-2028</th>
<th>Long Term 2029-2048</th>
<th>Total 2018-2048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPS - UDC¹ (Total)</td>
<td>6,300 HH</td>
<td>9,700 HH</td>
<td>16,000 HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS – UDC² (Township)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rangiora</td>
<td>2,570 HH</td>
<td>3,960 HH</td>
<td>6,530 HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1,130 HH</td>
<td>1,760 HH</td>
<td>2,860 HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Woodend / Pegasus / Ravenswood</td>
<td>2,110 HH</td>
<td>3,240 HH</td>
<td>5,350 HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural²</td>
<td>500 HH</td>
<td>760 HH</td>
<td>1,260 HH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 More detail work is now required to confirm the quantum of residential growth which should be located within Rangiora and Kaiapoi and how it is to be integrated into these townships. This is why structure planning is required to achieve this outcome. Council last undertook structure planning in 2009 and these plans have informed subsequent development, such as at west Rangiora.

3.4 The Ministry for the Environment defines a Structure Plan as; “a high level plan that shows the arrangement of land-use types, and identifies public infrastructure, such as streets, schools, rail, reservoirs and natural features.”

3.5 Staff provided a briefing on Structure Planning at the DPRC retreat session (26 June 2018).

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The East / West Rangiora and East Kaiapoi Structure Plans are intended to be aspirational, identifying principles for the future development of these areas including good urban design and sustainability whilst ensuring that they are achievable. The Structure Plans do not provide detailed plans for these areas, more detailed spatial planning will follow through the development of individual Outline Development Plans (as required under the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement). The indicative areas are shown below:

**Kaiapoi**

---

¹ Includes a 20%/15% overprovision of households as required under the NPS-UDC
² Includes both Rural and Rural Residential development
Rangiora

4.2. The Structure Plans therefore create a framework to guide development and will be used as a basis for:

- Making future changes to the District Plan (via the District Plan Review) to cater for residential and commercial development
- Developing infrastructure programmes
- Influencing the Long Term Plan
- Non statutory guidelines

4.3. The Structure Plan Report will take a similar form to that developed for the East and West Rangiora Structure Plan (from 2009) and will include the following key elements:

- Infrastructure Boundary
- Requirements for neighbourhood centres / integration with existing town centres
- Integration of existing land use areas with proposed Greenfield areas
- Opportunities for a range of housing density / intensification
- Provision of urban water utilities – water supply / wastewater and stormwater
- Open space network – parks, reserves, sportsfields, recreation and streetscape

4.4. As committee members will be aware, Council staff (via Business and Centres team) are currently reviewing the Rangiora Town Centre Plan (and are completing the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan review). Development Planning and Business and Centre teams consider that there are a number of common processes and resources in both projects which will provide an opportunity to work together to align these projects to achieve the best outcomes for the future development. Staff will update Committee members how this is likely to be achieved before the end of the year.

Governance and Management

4.5. Appropriate governance of a project of this type is critical to ensure that:

- there is support in the development of the structure plans from Council, Community Boards and Council staff
• a transparent decision making process has been used throughout the development of the structure plans
• robust debate of issues and options can occur on all aspects of the structure plans
• there is appropriate clarity of the role and responsibilities at every level of the project

4.6. Overall project governance is the responsibility of the elected Council.

4.7. The Technical Advisory Group main role is to fulfil a project advisory role, with the Project Control Group used as a means of communicating project outputs and timelines within the Council prior to the use of the formal reporting process to DPRC and then full Council.

4.8. The roles of each parties in this structure are illustrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Is responsible for</th>
<th>Is not responsible for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Sponsor</td>
<td>• Development Planning Manager</td>
<td>• providing advice / support to project manager;</td>
<td>• making decisions on options or adopting the structure plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• reviewing progress of project on a regular basis (fortnightly / monthly).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team</td>
<td>• Senior Advisor (DPU)</td>
<td>• day to day responsibility of developing the project;</td>
<td>• making decisions on options or adopting the structure plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other members - TBC</td>
<td>• leading discussion with Landowners/ key stakeholders;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• involving staff from other Council teams and consultants when required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Advisory Group</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>• providing an effective and efficient way for the project team to inform a range of council teams on the progress of the structure plans;</td>
<td>• making decisions on options or adopting the structure plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• peer reviewing material developed by the project team before requesting DPRC/ Council sign off;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• releasing project documents to full council for endorsement;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• providing a feedback loop from Council staff to the project team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Phases and Timeframe

4.9. Three key stages have been identified for this project, with the key steps within each of these stages as follows:

- **Stage 1 – Inception Planning and Preliminary Work (to be completed by the end of 2018)**
  - Issues / Constraints / Opportunities Report
  - Internal Council workshops
  - Draft Structure Plans
  - Public Consultation on Structure Plans

- **Stage 2 – Draft Structure Plans (to be completed by the end June 2019)**
  - Issues / Constraints / Opportunities Report
  - Internal Council workshops
  - Draft Structure Plans
  - Public Consultation on Structure Plans

- **Stage 3 – Finalising Structure Plan and Implementation Plan Report with sign-off and adoption by Council (to be completed by July/August 2019).**

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

### 5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. A Consultation Strategy will be developed to ensure that the Rangiora and Kaiapoi developers / landowners, interested stakeholders / agencies, runanga, community and other stakeholders have an opportunity to provide meaningful input into the development of the Structure Plans.

Public consultation, via Special Consultative Procedure LGA requirements, is proposed. A high level summary is provided in section 5.2 and 5.3.

5.2. **Groups and Organisations**

Workshops and meetings will be held with landowners / developers to determine their views and gain their input on the future development of Rangiora/Kaiapoi. These developers/landowners will play a crucial role in providing market-based perspectives on the nature and uptake of future residential land.

Separate consultation will be undertaken with the Runanga during this project.

Consultation will be undertaken with the Police, Fire Service, St Johns, Chorus, Mainpower, and Ministry of Education to determine any particular issues or requirements.
surrounding the future development of Rangiora/Kaiapoi. This will occur in stage 1 and may need to be followed up as the project progresses.

5.3. **Wider Community**

Consultation will be undertaken using a combination of mail-out information, use of the media, public meetings, and the seeking of comments from the community. Key aspects in relation to the community consultation process include:

- Selecting a venue and associated arrangements for workshops / focus groups / public meetings.
- Organising advertising and registrations for attendees, and the design of any publicity material.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

The costs associated with the preparation of the Structure Plans will be met from within existing budgets for the District Plan Review/Rangiora Town Centre Update. Infrastructure assessments for the urban areas will draw from the Infrastructure Strategy and Activity Management Plans.

6.2. **Community Implications**

The Structure Plans will provide for future residential development for the communities of Rangiora and Kaiapoi and will influence provisions within the proposed District scheduled for notification in 2020.

6.3. **Risk Management**

A qualitative approach to managing risks that may affect the project is to be taken. The areas of risk identified to date are as follows, together with planned management controls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Risk (before)</th>
<th>Control / Risk Mitigation</th>
<th>Risk (after)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Time delay – short project timescales and personnel availability</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Scope project involvement up front and agree with appropriate managers. Effective project management to identify potential delays early.</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>- Time delay – key data inputs</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Maintain high level of team awareness of need to identify data and other inputs as early as possible</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3  | - Overlap of projects  
- Town Centre (update Rangiora Kaiapoi Red Zone)  
- Future Development Strategy  
- Regional Policy Statement Change | Red           | Integration between teams, regular catch-ups on progress. | Yellow       |
• Government Policy Statement - Transport Stage 2 / Opportunities for residential intensification / District Plan Review

4 • Unfavourable consultation outcomes Be ready to adapt and respond to the unexpected.

5 • Capture of process by minority interest group(s) Maintain robust process and reporting to Council. Ensure that the consultation process is clear to all.

6 • Process is challenged Ensure that the process is consistent with the Local Government Act.

7 • Political risk – ownership of project not secured Existing governance structured used for decision making and reporting.

• Political risk – not completing project before the end of this Council’s term Effective project management to identify potential delays early. Regular updates to Project Control Group to identify timeframe issues and find resolutions to issues.

These risks will be regularly reviewed by the project team and Project Control Group, and may be modified or extended as appropriate.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

There are no health and safety implications associated with the preparation of the Structure Plans.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy in the sense that considerable infrastructure expenditure would follow.

7.2. **Legislation**

Sections 82 and 83 of the Local Government Action 2002 sets out the principles of consultation that will be followed.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

The following community outcomes are relevant to this matter:

- The distinctive character of our takiwā – towns, villages and rural areas is maintained
• Communities in our District area well lined with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.
• The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.

7.4. Delegations

The District Planning and Regulation Committee has delegated authority to approve the preparation of the Structure Plans for East and West Rangiora and East Kaiapoi.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report asks that the Rangiora Ashley Community Board considers a request for parking restrictions to be installed at 32 Edward Street and make a recommendation to District Planning and Regulation Committee.

1.2 A request has been received asking for the establishment of a P120 time restriction for the car sales yard on the intersection of Ashley Street / Blackett Street / Edward Street.

1.3 The request received was for P120 or similar time restricted parking spaces on the corner of Ashley Street and Blackett Street outside of the car sales yard, to provide opportunities for customer parking and to restrict all day parking from occurring in the spaces in front of the business.

1.4 There are currently two P120 restricted parks along the Ashley Street frontage of the property and a P120 park on the western side of Ashley Street (shown in red on the aerial photo).

1.5 There are other businesses in the vicinity on Ashley Street which could also benefit from parking restrictions on Ashley Street, however this is not the case on Edward Street.

1.6 There are three options available to the Community Board:

- Option One – Support the establishment of three P120 time restricted parks on Edward Street outside the Car Sales Yard (shown in blue on the aerial photo);

- Option Two – Support the establishment of two additional P120 time restricted parks on Ashley Street outside the Car Sales Yard (shown in green on the aerial photo);

OR

- Option Three – Do nothing.
2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board recommends:

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180919108757;

(b) Either:

Amends the Parking Bylaw 2007 to include parking on Ashley Street as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 21b</th>
<th>Rangiora</th>
<th>Ashley St</th>
<th>Immediately north of the Blackett St Roundabout</th>
<th>East side</th>
<th>P120</th>
<th>4 Parks, East side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

OR

Amends the Parking Bylaw 2007 to include parking on Edward Street as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Item</th>
<th>Rangiora</th>
<th>Edward St</th>
<th>Immediately east of the Blackett St Roundabout</th>
<th>North side</th>
<th>P120</th>
<th>3 Parks, North side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

OR

Accepts the status quo and does not make any changes to time restricted parking in the area.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. The owner of the Car Sales Yard at 32 Edward Street, Rangiora has requested the installation of P120 time restriction parking for parking spaces that were previous unrestricted.

3.2. This request has been for parking on Blackett Street however it has since been clarified that this is on Edward Street outside the car sales yard.

3.3. Concerns have been expressed at the difficulty customers have parking in this area when it is occupied by vehicles that park there all day.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. To ensure parking in the town centre is managed to meet future demand, Council has a strategy that is used to guide the provision of time restricted parking in the town centre. This generally involves having P60 in the immediate town centre and P120 surrounding. This site falls outside of what is traditionally considered the immediate town centre area however is outside a business and therefore consideration should be given to the request.

4.2. The installation of parking restrictions in this area will cause some minor shifting in all day parking and as such will have minimal impact.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. The Parking PCG Group has reviewed the request and agrees that the installation of parking restrictions is appropriate and consistent with parking restrictions around similar businesses.

5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. Consultation with the wider community is not considered necessary as the proposed parking restrictions are directly outside of the property and should be reasonably expected outside of a business near a town centre.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. This proposal is estimated to cost $200 and is able to be met from the Traffic Services budget.

6.3. **Community Implications**

6.4. None.

6.5. **Risk Management**

6.6. N/A

6.7. **Health and Safety**

6.8. Any associated work will be carried out under the Road Maintenance Contract which includes a Health & Safety Plan.
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**

7.2.1. The Parking Bylaw was drafted under powers in the Local Government Act 1974 (section 684) and the Transport Act 1962 (section 72 (1)(k)). Amendments are similarly authorised. These matters are unchanged by the Local Government Act 2002.

"Transport Act 1962

72. Bylaws as to the use of roads—

Subject . . . to the provisions of this Act or of any other enactment in respect of any of the matters referred to in this subsection, any Minister of the Crown in respect of any roads under his control, or any local authority in respect of any roads under its control, may from time to time make bylaws for any of the following purposes:

[(k) Prohibiting or restricting, subject to the erection of the prescribed signs, the stopping, standing, or parking of vehicles on any road; limiting the stopping, standing, or parking of vehicles on any road to vehicles of any specified class or description; limiting the period of time that vehicles may park on any part of the road where parking is limited to such vehicles; and providing that a vehicle used for the time being for any specified purpose shall be deemed for the purposes of the bylaw to be of such class or description as is specified in the bylaw, notwithstanding that the vehicle may belong to any other class or description for any other purpose;]"

7.2.2. The Parking Bylaw clause 4 permits the Council, by resolution, to amend parking restrictions.

“4 The Council may from time to time by resolution impose parking standing or stopping restrictions on any road or other area controlled by the Council…”

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

*There is a safe environment for all*

- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised. ¹,²,³,⁴
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised. ¹,³,⁴

*Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable*

7.4. **Delegations**

7.4.1. The Board, under delegation S-DM 1042, has specific jurisdiction for:

“Approving traffic control and constraint measures on streets, and recommending to Resource Management & Regulations Committee; matters relating to Council parking by-laws"