

24. 9. 2009

**REGULATORY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
3 SEPTEMBER 2009**

**A meeting of the Regulatory and Planning Committee
was held on 3 September 2009 at 9am.**

PRESENT: Councillor Chrissie Williams (Acting Chairperson),
Councillors Ngaire Button, Sally Buck (absent from 12.10-12.17pm),
Yani Johanson, Claudia Reid, and Mike Wall.

IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Norm Withers (until 10.59am).

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received and accepted from
Councillors Helen Broughton, Bob Shearing and Sue Wells.

The Committee reports that:

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

1. VARIATION 96 AND PLAN CHANGE 46 – WIGRAM AIRFIELD

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8281
Officer responsible:	Team Leader, District Planning
Author:	Andrew Long, Senior Planner, District Planning

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. This report describes a Council initiated variation and change (“the change”) to the City Plan and seeks a decision from the Council whether or not to notify the change. The change seeks to delete or amend provisions relating to the former Wigram Airfield.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The purpose of the variation and change is to delete or amend City Plan provisions which protected the functionality of the former Wigram Airfield (**Attachment 1**) and sought to mitigate the adverse effects of airfield operation. The change relates largely to aircraft noise contours and airport approach slopes, with numerous minor amendments deleting reference to the airfield. The airfield closed on 1 March 2009, and there is no discernible reason for retaining the provisions relating to flying activities.
3. It is proposed that the City Plan provisions at (**Attachment 2**) be deleted or amended as indicated. Amendments to operative parts of the Plan are referred to as Plan Change 46, and amendments to part of the Plan not yet operative are referred to as Variation 96. The City Plan is not operative in relation to existing variations 48 (flood plains), 93 (Clearwater) and Section 293 appeal on the notified plan relating to land at Belfast (to rezone land to Living G). Variation 86 is now beyond challenge, but yet to be formally made operative in the Plan. Variation 96 (this variation) proposes to amend clauses the subject of variations 86 and 93.
4. The Section 32 assessment (**Attachment 3**) prepared by the Council finds that the proposed amendments are efficient and effective in achieving the objectives of the City Plan. Some aviation related activity may continue within the 35 hectare area containing the Air Force Museum, which is still owned by the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF). This 35 hectare area is that gifted by Sir Henry Wigram. The provisions proposed to be amended or deleted do not protect aviation activities on the museum site. NZDF will need to initiate its own plan change or amend its existing designation to protect such uses.

1 Cont'd

5. The change is part of a larger project to rezone the airfield for business and residential use (Private Plan Change 24). Wigram Aerodrome Limited (via Ngai Tahu Property Group Ltd) has requested that this change be promoted independently of their Plan Change 24 to facilitate redevelopment of the former airfield land sooner. The Council is undertaking this to separate the formalising of the closure of the airfield in the City Plan from the redevelopment of the former airfield, and because the Change affects provisions that apply to land outside the former airfield. Owners of adjoining land would also potentially benefit from removal of development restriction as proposed by this change. While the cost of Variation 96/Plan Change 46 will be met by the Council because of its wider impact, the actual rezoning of the airfield (Change 24) will be met by Ngai Tahu.
6. NZDF has recently removed that part of the designation which encompassed the former airfield. The museum site still owned by NZDF retains the designation.

CONSULTATION

7. The Council has discussed the matter with the current landowner and with NZDF. The matter will be presented to the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board for its comment.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. The proposed plan change and variation are of a minor technical nature, and have no significant policy risks or implications. It is anticipated that costs will be in the order of \$25,000 and will be within the existing City Plan budget.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

9. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

10. The process set out in the RMA must be followed. It includes public notification, submissions, reporting, hearings, decisions and possible appeals.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

11. The proposal is part of the district planning levels of service in the LTCCP.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

12. The Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy seeks greater intensification and development in and around existing urban centres and this change would enable intensification in the Wigram area. The site is within the urban limits proposed by Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement and is also identified as a greenfield urban development area, for business and residential uses.

1 Cont'd

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Regulatory and Planning Committee **recommend** to the Council that it:

- (a) Adopt the section 32 assessment for Variation 96 and Plan Change 46.
- (b) Agree to publicly notify Variation 96 and Plan Change 46 pursuant to Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Regulatory and Planning Committee recommends to the Council that it adopt the staff recommendation.

The Committee also instructed staff to provide the information provided by the New Zealand Defence Force and the staff response be provided to the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board and the Council.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

13. The NZDF has operated from the site since 1917, largely for flight training purposes. The military use effectively ceased in 1995, with the airfield permanently closed on 1 March 2009. NZDF sold part of the site including the airfield, but retains the 35 hectare museum site, which was land gifted by Sir Henry Wigram in 1932.
14. The variation and plan change relate to the provisions in the City Plan protecting the functionality of the former Wigram Airfield and mitigating adverse effects on adjoining land. The related provisions are no longer required. All proposed deletions and amendments are included in **Attachment 2**.
15. The amendments relate specifically to airfield protection surfaces, building setbacks and limitations, height control within protection surfaces, aircraft noise, air safety, development of the airfield, airport services and activities and transport.
16. The change was previously part of Plan Change 24, which seeks to rezone the former airfield for residential and business uses. Plan Change 24 does not seek to rezone the parcel of land still owned by NZDF containing the Air Force Museum. NZDF disposed of the bulk of the land, retaining only the area encompassing the museum.
17. This proposed change seeks to remove impediments to development in advance of Plan Change 24 by deleting or amending provisions relating to the former airfield. Plan Change 24 is a private plan change but the Council is preparing the change (via an external consultancy). This is a change that the Council is likely to have promoted independently of Plan Change 24, had that change not arisen. The proponent of Plan Change 24 and others have requested this change be separated from Plan Change 24 and made a priority, and Council staff have agreed to promote the change. The change would therefore be at the Council's cost.
18. The attached Section 32 assessment finds that the proposed amendments are the best way to achieve the objectives of the City Plan. The site is within the urban limit proposed by Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement, and the former airfield site (excluding the museum area) is identified as a greenfield outline plan development area. The proposed removal of provisions relating to the former airfield will facilitate the development of these greenfield areas.
19. The Council's Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy promotes intensification and the type of development likely to result from this change at and adjacent to the former airfield site is considered to be in accordance with this.
20. NZDF has recently amended its designation at the site to remove that part of the designation over the airfield. The museum site still owned by NZDF retains the designation. NZDF may make a submission on the change (if the decision on this report is to notify), outlining its requirements, if any.

1 Cont'd

OPTIONS

21. The Council may:

- (1) Adopt the Section 32 Assessment for Variation 96 and Plan Change 46, and agree to publicly notify Variation 96 and Plan Change 46 pursuant to Clause 16a of Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991.

OR

- (2) Not proceed with the variation and plan change and retain the City Plan provisions relating to the former Wigram Airfield in the Plan.

PREFERRED OPTION

22. Option One.

2. **CHRISTCHURCH CITY SPEED LIMITS BYLAW**

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Malcolm Taylor, Traffic Engineer –Community

PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1. The purpose of this report is to summarise the review of the current speed limit bylaws and to recommend the adoption of a new speed limits bylaw to the Council for consultation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2. The Council currently has two bylaws relating to speed limits:
 - (a) Christchurch City Speed Limits Bylaw 2005
 - (b) Banks Peninsula District Council Speed Limit Bylaw November 2005.
- 3. The purpose of these bylaws is to provide the mechanism¹ to enable the Council to set speed limits for all roads under its jurisdiction, which it does in accordance with the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2003 (Rule 54001), (the Rule).
- 4. The two existing bylaws are made under the powers in both the Local Government Act 1974 and the Local Government Act 2002. The Local Government Act 2002 (section 158(1)) requires that bylaws made under the 2002 Act are reviewed no later than five years after being made, in the first instance, and every ten years thereafter (section 159). As such, these two bylaws need to be reviewed by 7 April 2010 and 9 November 2010, respectively. Commencing the review process now should ensure that the April 2010 date is met.
- 5. A review of the bylaws has been undertaken by way of an analysis of the clauses in both of the existing bylaws. This systematically sets out each clause in the two existing bylaws, and states whether the clause should be retained, altered or removed. This also serves as part of the consideration under section 155 of the Local Government Act 2002, as to whether a bylaw is the most appropriate way to address the problem and is an appropriate form. The proposed new bylaw can be found in **Attachment 1**.

¹ Required by the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2003

2 Cont'd

6. This report recommends the revocation of both bylaws, and their replacement with a new bylaw covering the whole of the new Christchurch City Council district. There are a number of other changes in the bylaw, including that all of the Banks Peninsula speed limits, which are currently included in a schedule to the Bylaw, will be transferred to the Christchurch City Register of Speed Limits. This register sits outside the bylaw and is required to be kept under section 7.3 of the Rule. The bylaw has also been modernised, resulting in a shorter, clearer bylaw, with clauses added to align it with other Council bylaws. Existing clauses that are covered by other legislation have been removed from the bylaw or moved to explanatory notes to the bylaw.
7. The proposed new bylaw will be made under section 684(13) of the Local Government Act 1974 and section 145 of the Local Government Act 2002, and as required by the Rule. Such a bylaw can only be made to cover roads within the Christchurch City Council's district where the Council is the road controlling authority (ie not roads over which the New Zealand Transport Agency is the road controlling authority eg state highways). Any amendment, revocation or new bylaw must be made using the Special Consultative Procedure set out in the Local Government Act 2002.
8. The bylaw is the mechanism for setting speed limits and a breach of a speed limit is not a breach of the bylaw itself, but a breach of other transport-related legislation². Enforcement in relation to breaches of speed limits is the responsibility of the Police, not the Council, as only the Police can enforce moving vehicle offences.
9. Council staff have been reviewing many of the speed limits across the city, and on Banks Peninsula in particular, using the guidelines and calculation process in the Rule (called Speed Limits New Zealand). Following the adoption of the new bylaw, the Council will be in a position to carry out consultation on speed limits that, in accordance with the review, indicate they should be changed. That consultation will be carried out in accordance with the requirements in the Rule. The likely process will be that all the roads in a Community Board area that are recommended for a speed limit or urban traffic area change will be put to the Community Board first and then a report prepared to Council seeking approval to consult on those proposed speed limit changes. Any changes will then be reflected in the Christchurch City Register of Speed Limits.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10. There are no specific financial implications from this bylaw review other than the cost of the special consultative procedure.

DO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THIS REPORT ALIGN WITH 2009-19 LTCCP BUDGETS?

11. The estimated cost for the review, consultation and hearings process is to be funded from the 2009/10 Traffic Network Operations budget.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

12. This process is being carried out in accordance with:
 - (a) The bylaw-making powers in section 684(13) of the Local Government Act 1974 (i.e. the power to make bylaws concerning roads).
 - (b) The bylaw-making powers in the Local Government Act 2002 (s 145) ie the power to make bylaws for "protecting, promoting, and maintaining public health and safety".
 - (c) The requirements set out in the Local Government Act 2002 for establishing, amending or revoking bylaws (ie sections 83, 86, 155 and 156).
 - (d) The requirements in the Rule.

² A breach of a speed limit is a breach of section 5 of the Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004, which is an infringement offence against the Land Transport Act 1998, and may be liable to an infringement fee as specified in Section 1B of the Land Transport (Offence and Penalties) Regulations 1999.

2 Cont'd

13. Section 7.2 of the Rule provides that a road controlling authority that is empowered by an enactment to make bylaws must set a speed limit under the Rule by making a bylaw in accordance with that enactment. The powers the Council uses to make such a bylaw are found in both the Local Government Acts 1974 and 2002. In particular, section 684(13) of the Local Government Act 1974 empowers the Council to make bylaws "concerning roads and cycle tracks and the use thereof, and the construction of anything upon, over, or under a road or cycle track", while section 145 of the Local Government Act 2002 contains a more general bylaw-making power which includes for the purpose of "protecting, promoting, and maintaining public health and safety". Setting appropriate speed limits for roads relates to maintaining public health and safety.
14. The Local Government Act 2002 also requires that bylaws are reviewed within five years of when they were first made³. The Christchurch City Council Speed Limit Bylaw 2005 must be reviewed by 7 April 2010 and the former Banks Peninsula District Council Speed Limit Bylaw 2005 must be reviewed by 9 November 2010.
15. The process in the Local Government Act 2002 for making, amending or revoking bylaws is outlined in sections 83, 86, 155 and 156 of the Act. If the Council agrees to adopt the attached proposed bylaw, it is required to approve the draft Statement of Proposal (**Attachment 2**) and Summary of Information (**Attachment 3**) for consultation, agree a submissions closing date and should appoint a hearing panel to hear any oral submissions on the proposal and deliberate on any matters raised in submissions.
16. The Council must comply with the matters in section 155 of that Act, which requires that the local authority must determine whether the bylaw is the most appropriate way of addressing the perceived problem(s), and once that has been determined, that the bylaw is in the most appropriate form and it does not give rise to any implications under the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990.
17. Given that this bylaw must be made to provide the mechanism required by the Rule for the setting of speed limits, it is not difficult to show that a bylaw is the most appropriate tool in this instance. However, it is clear that not all of the clauses found in the current bylaws are necessary, and the form of some of the clauses can be improved.
18. There are no implications in terms of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act as the bylaw only provides the regulatory means by which speed limits and urban traffic areas can be set and then the Council must apply the Rule in determining the appropriate speed limits, carrying out consultation new or amended speed limits, and on urban traffic areas, which are then listed in the Christchurch City Register of Speed Limits.

HAVE YOU CONSIDERED THE LEGAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE ISSUE UNDER CONSIDERATION?

19. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

20. Aligns with the Streets and Transport activities by contributing to the Council's Community Outcomes -Safety and Community.

DO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THIS REPORT SUPPORT A LEVEL OF SERVICE OR PROJECT IN THE 2009-19 LTCCP?

21. As above.

³ s.158(1) - Review of bylaws made under this Act or the Local Government Act 1974

2 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

22. The recommendations align with the Road Safety Strategy 2004 and the Safer Christchurch Strategy 2005.

DO THE RECOMMENDATIONS ALIGN WITH THE COUNCIL'S STRATEGIES?

23. As above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Regulatory and Planning Committee **recommend** to the Council that:

- (a) The attached proposed bylaw meets the requirements of section 155 of the Local Government Act 2002.
- (b) The attached Statement of Proposal (which includes the proposed Bylaw) and attached Summary of Information be adopted for consultation in accordance with the Special Consultative Procedure.
- (d) Public notice of the consultation be given in The Press and Christchurch Star newspapers and on the Council's website, and that public notice of the proposal be given in the Akaroa Mail and other community newspapers distributed in the Christchurch area, as close as possible to the approval of these recommendations.
- (e) The period within which written submissions may be made to the Council be between 30 September and 2 November 2009.
- (f) A hearings panel be appointed to hear submissions, deliberate on those submissions and to report back to the Council on the final form of the bylaw.
- (g) That Council note that once the new bylaw is adopted there will be a number of speed limits reviews that will need to be consulted on.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Regulatory and Planning Committee recommends to the Council that the staff recommendation be adopted.

BACKGROUND

Introduction

24. Speed limit bylaws are the mechanism through which the Council sets speed limits, and is a requirement of the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2003 (the Rule). The speed limits themselves must be specified in a register which is also required to be kept by the Rule. When amending the bylaw, the special consultative procedure (as set out in the Local Government Act 2002) must be used. When amending or establishing speed limits, the consultation specified in the Rule must be used. This consultation process is to make a new bylaw. Changes to some speed limits will be consulted on, using the process in the Rule, once the new bylaw is in place. This will result in changes to the Christchurch City Register of Speed Limits.

Changes to the bylaw

25. The proposed new bylaw will replace the Christchurch City Speed Limits Bylaw 2005 and the Banks Peninsula District Speed Limit Bylaw November 2005. The main changes in the proposed new bylaw include:

2 Cont'd

- (a) The proposed new bylaw will apply to the whole of the Council's district (whereas the existing two bylaws cover the old Christchurch City district area and the now amalgamated Banks Peninsula District Council area, respectively);
- (b) The speed limits set on the roads in the former Banks Peninsula District Council area will be recorded in the register and not in a schedule to the bylaw, as was done previously. If necessary, speed limit amendments can be made by amending the register, in accordance with the consultation specified in the Rule;
- (c) The bylaw has been simplified and modernised, resulting in a shorter, clearer bylaw;
- (d) Those clauses covered by other legislation have been removed from the bylaw or moved to explanatory notes to the bylaw;
- (e) New clauses have been added to align the bylaw with the Council's other bylaws.

How the bylaw, the setting of speed limits and the speed limits register relate to each other

- 26. The bylaw is the mechanism through which the Council sets speed limits. This sets out, for example, the ability of the Council to alter a speed limit by resolution and indicates that this can be done if the Rule has been complied with, which includes complying with the consultation obligations specified in the Rule.
- 27. Any proposed changes to a speed limit must also comply with the Rule in terms of the technical aspects of how speed limits are calculated (ie the function of a road, the number and nature of side roads, roadside development, etc).
- 28. The speed limits themselves (once consulted on) are then specified in a register (the Christchurch City Register of Speed Limits) which is required to be kept by section 7.3 of the Rule. As the speed limits are specified in a register, they can be amended, subject to the consultation requirements in the Rule, without the bylaw itself needing to be changed. This is because the register is not part of the bylaw, but complements it. Whereas if the bylaw has to be changed, the special consultative procedure under the Local Government Act 2002 must be used.

Proposed timetable

- 29. The proposed timetable for the completion of this review amend Statement of Proposal / Summary of Information timeframes as required as well.

3 September 2009	Report to Regulatory and Planning Committee
24 September 2009	Regulatory and Planning Committee report to Council seeking agreement to undertake consultation
30 September to 2 November 2009	Consultation period
2 November 2009	Closing date for written submissions
Early November 2009	Preparation of summary and analysis of submissions
23 November to 1 December 2009	Public hearings
December 2009	Preparation of hearing panel report
10 December 2009 or February 2010	Hearing panel report to Council recommending the adoption of the Bylaw

2 Cont'd

THE OBJECTIVES

30. To create one speed limit bylaw to cover the whole of the Council's district and to provide the mechanism required by the Rule to enable the Council to set speed limits for all roads under its jurisdiction.
31. To be able to set new speed limits, or alter speed limits, by resolution, following the consultation requirements in the Rule (ie by specifying them in a register, rather than in a schedule to a bylaw).
32. To complete the legal requirements to review bylaws within five years.

THE OPTIONS

33. **Option 1.** Status Quo, retain the two existing bylaws and review them to comply with legal requirements in the future.
34. **Option 2.** Revoke the former Banks Peninsula District Council Speed Limit Bylaw 2005 and amalgamate it with the Christchurch City Speed Limits Bylaw 2005 and retain the existing speed limits and review them at a different time.
35. **Option 3.** Revoke the two existing bylaws and create a new bylaw to cover all roads under the Council's jurisdiction (transferring the speed limits currently within the Banks Peninsula bylaw schedule to the Christchurch City Register of Speed Limits) and review the existing speed limits at a different time.
36. **Option 4.** Revoke the two existing bylaws and create a new updated bylaw that would cover all roads under the Council's jurisdiction and to review and update the existing speed limits and urban traffic areas concurrently.

PREFERRED OPTION

37. **Option 3** is the preferred option as it:
 - (a) Provides a single bylaw to cover the whole district (i.e. the Christchurch City Council district, post amalgamation with the former Banks Peninsula District Council area in 2006)
 - (b) Moves the Banks Peninsula speed limits from the bylaw schedule into the Christchurch City Register of Speed Limits, thus allowing them to be altered using the process set out in the bylaw, in compliance with the Rule, rather than through an amendment to the bylaw (and undertaking a special consultative procedure)
 - (c) Will update the bylaw so that it is simpler, clearer and aligns with other Council bylaws
 - (d) Will meet the legal requirements to review the speed limit bylaws within five years of when they were last made
 - (e) Will not overlap consultation on the bylaw with consultation on speed limit changes, which can then be done in Community Board area groups of roads, and
 - (f) When reviewing the speed limits, instead of consulting the community generally through a special consultative procedure, the local community considered to be affected by the proposed speed limit will be consulted with directly in accordance with the consultation requirements of the Rule.

2 Cont'd

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**The Preferred Option**

Option 3 – Revoke the two existing bylaw and to create a new bylaw to cover all roads under the Council's jurisdiction and to review the existing speed limits at a different time and to transfer the speed limits currently within the Banks Peninsula bylaw schedule to the Christchurch City Register of Speed Limits.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Will provide a single easy to understand bylaw.	Nil
Cultural	Revoking two bylaws and replacing them with one easier to understand bylaw may have cultural benefits	N/A
Environmental	Bylaw allows for the setting of speed limits in accordance with the legal requirements	N/A
Economic	Nil.	N/A
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>The creation of a single bylaw will allow the Christchurch City Council to make speed limit changes by resolution, following the consultation process in the Rule (rather than the special consultative procedure). The proposal to review speed limits at a later date aligns with Council's Community Outcomes - Safety and Community. The fact that this is not done at the same time as the bylaw review is likely to simplify the consultation process for the community, even though updating the speed limits will be delayed slightly.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>This option means the Local Government Act 2002 requirement to review the bylaw no later than five years will be met.</p> <p>Effects on Māori:</p> <p>No specific effects identified</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>The Council does not have policies on the bylaw review process or setting speed limits, but previous practice is that these processes are kept separate.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>Consultation on the new bylaw will be carried out in accordance with the special consultative procedure and then the speed limits reviews, to be done later, can be consulted on using the process in the Rule. Some people may prefer that the speed limits be reviewed sooner rather than later, but in the interests of a more straightforward consultation process, carried out appropriately under the two different consultation regimes, it is considered appropriate to review the bylaws first and then in a few months, once the bylaw is adopted, begin the speed limit reviews.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p> <p>Nil.</p>		

Other Options

Option 4 – To revoke the two existing bylaws and create a new updated bylaw that would cover all roads under the Council's jurisdiction and to review and update the existing speed limits and urban traffic areas concurrently.

2 Cont'd

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Will provide a single easy to understand bylaw, and will also update speed limits on the road under the Councils jurisdiction.	Nil
Cultural	Revoking two bylaws and replacing them with one easier to understand bylaw may have cultural benefits	N/A
Environmental	Bylaw allows for the setting of speed limits in accordance with the legal requirements and for speed limits to be set considering the environmental developments.	N/A
Economic	Nil.	N/A
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>The creation of a single bylaw will allow the Christchurch City Council to make speed limit changes by resolution. Reviewing the speed limits at the same time will maintain the setting of consistent speed limits in the Christchurch district due to new subdivision developments, the changing use and environment of other roads, and provide appropriate amendments to urban traffic areas to reflect the area more appropriately. This aligns with Community Outcome: Safety and Community.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>This option means the Local Government Act 2002 requirement to review the bylaw no later than five years will be met.</p> <p>Effects on Māori:</p> <p>No specific effects identified</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>The Council does not have policies on the bylaw review process or setting speed limits, but previous practice is that these processes are kept separate.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>Consultation would be carried out as required by the Local Government Act 2002 for a bylaw review and by the Land Transport Rule, Setting of Speed Limits 2003 for speed limit changes.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p> <p>Nil.</p>		

Option 1 – Maintain Status Quo.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Maintaining the Status Quo would not provide any additional social benefits.	N/A
Cultural	N/A	N/A
Environmental	N/A	N/A
Economic	N/A	N/A

2 Cont'd

<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>This option is not recommended as both bylaws must be reviewed within five years of being made. (Local Government Act 2002) Currently both bylaws require a different process to set or change a speed limit.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>If the Status Quo was maintained the Council would not be complying with legal requirements.</p> <p>Effects on Māori:</p> <p>N/A.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>To maintain Status Quo would not be consistent with Council policies.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>N/A.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p> <p>Nil.</p>
--

Option 2 – Revoke the former Banks Peninsula District Council Bylaw. To retain the existing speed limits and review them at a different time.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	To create one bylaw enables the Council to set consistent speed limits on roads under its jurisdiction.	N/A
Cultural	N/A	N/A
Environmental	N/A	N/A
Economic	N/A	N/A
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>To create one bylaw would allow the Council to set consistent speed limits on the roads under its jurisdiction. However, speed limits must also be reviewed due to new subdivision developments, and the changing use and environment of other roads.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>Would not support the Council's responsibilities to the community.</p> <p>Effects on Māori:</p> <p>N/A.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>Would not support the Council's Community Outcomes - Safety and Community.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>N/A.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p> <p>Nil.</p>		

3. AKAROA HARBOUR BASIN SETTLEMENTS STUDY

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8281
Officer responsible:	Programme Manager Healthy Environment
Author:	Carolyn Bonis, Senior Planner

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The Akaroa Harbour Basin Settlements Study has been completed, with the production of two documents: an 'Issues and Prospective Projects' document (**Attachment 1**) and its accompanying Implementation Plan (**Attachment 2**). The purpose of this report is to seek the Council's endorsement of these documents as guides to assist future operational decision-making.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Study Scope

2. The Akaroa Harbour Basin Settlements Study (the Study) was initiated in early 2007. The Study identifies the strategic issues facing the eight rural settlements of the Akaroa Harbour Basin, with the aim of achieving strong and sustainable communities and settlements over the next 20-30 years. The eight settlements are listed below and the attached reports include a map showing their associated study areas.

Akaroa	Barrys Bay
Takamatua	French Farm
Robinsons Bay	Tikao Bay
Duvauchelle	Wainui

Study Process and Findings

3. The Study entailed a comprehensive planning exercise, involving information-gathering, mapping, identification of issues, evaluation of options, cross-Council discussion and community consultation. A large number of issues (ranging from locality-specific to harbour-wide) were identified and are listed in Part II of Attachment 1. These issues cover:
 - (a) Natural Environment (including coastal issues, landscapes, freshwater resources, climate change, slope stability)
 - (b) Social Environment (including historic character, population, community facilities)
 - (c) Physical Environment (including water, wastewater, stormwater, transport)
 - (d) Economic Environment (including housing affordability, business growth, tourism)
 - (e) Subdivision, Land Use, Managing Urban Change (including settlement patterns, capacity for urban growth).
4. The preferred options to address the issues have now been identified as 'prospective projects' in the attached documents. Some projects are multi-disciplinary (for example, 'Detailed Planning Studies', 'Akaroa Places and Spaces Plan') but most are more confined in their scope. These projects are listed in Part III of Attachment 1, under 18 topic areas. The relative timing for each of these is identified by a symbol in Attachment 1 and in more detail in **Attachment 2**. The majority of projects are shown for commencement in 2012 or beyond, although work will begin on the following funded projects this financial year:
 - B Akaroa Places and Spaces Plan
 - Q.2 Cruise Ship Protocol
 - R.1 Project Implementation and Monitoring
5. The identification of prospective projects within the attached documents does not commit the Council to commencing each project. Projects that are identified as commencing in 2012 or later will be contestable as part of the review of the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP).

3 Cont'd

Ongoing monitoring

6. Although the Study has been completed, ongoing work will be undertaken to oversee implementation of the programme and to monitor trends and impacts of development.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The principal financial implication is for operational budgets in future years. There is scope within projected immediate budgets for commencing some of the projects, as identified in **Attachment 2** and paragraph four above.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

8. This Study was identified as a project in the current LTCCP and its outcomes aim to inform the development of future LTCCP budgets. The Settlements Study and Implementation Plan provide a framework to guide future actions, and to ensure the opportunities, priorities, linkages and dependencies are identified and managed. The timing and funding of all or any projects in the Implementation Plan is dependent on decisions made as part of the current and future Long Term Council Community Plan.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. The Study takes into consideration the requirements of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA 2002) and the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA 1991) through the development and use of evaluation criteria. These criteria were used to assess the desirability or otherwise of the project options and included the degree to which a project met legal requirements. This process has ensured that higher scoring and therefore higher priority projects are in accordance with legal requirements.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

10. Yes, as above. As the Council gives effect to the higher priority projects there will be additional legal implications, particularly in relation to any District Plan changes under the RMA 1991. The work already undertaken to gather and analyse relevant information will go some way toward satisfying future Section 32 requirements.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Where existing Activity Management Plans address issues identified in the Study, this has been noted in background technical documents. The projects identified in the two attachments will likely inform future Activity Management Plans across various Council units.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

12. This Study was identified as a service in the 2009-19 LTCCP and its outcomes will inform the development of future LTCCP budgets.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

13. Assessment of the project options against various evaluation criteria has ensured alignment of the projects with strategies applying to Banks Peninsula (e.g. Biodiversity Strategy, Social Housing Strategy, and Sustainable Energy Strategy). As a result, the projects listed in the two attachments do not conflict with existing strategies and their associated implementation plans.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

14. Yes, as above.

3 Cont'd

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. Two public consultation exercises were conducted during the course of the study. The first was in November 2007 to assist with issue identification for the eight settlements of the harbour basin. The second was in March-April of this year and enabled prioritisation and fine-tuning of the project options. Separate meetings were also held with the two local rūnanga, via Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd (MKT).

Akaroa/Wairewa Community Board response

16. The Akaroa/Wairewa Community Board discussed the final reports at its 12 August meeting. The staff recommendation was that the Community Board:
- (a) Support the approach taken in preparing the two documents: 'Issues and Prospective Projects' and its accompanying Implementation Plan.
 - (b) Recommend that the Council endorse the documents as guides to assist future operational decision-making.
17. The Board adopted the staff recommendation but made the following suggestions:
- Add a comment to the Implementation Plan explaining that partners to projects:
 - (a) Have been provisionally identified where they have statutory responsibilities, noting that other stakeholders will be involved in the course of the project.
 - (b) Have been informed of their potential involvement in the project.
 - (c) Will be further involved as projects are commenced.
 - Bring forward the timing of projects K.3 (Walkway routes) and M.2 (Water intakes on private land).
18. Staff views are as follows:
- It is preferable for the Walkway routes project (K.3) to await completion and adoption of the Christchurch Public Open Space Strategy.
 - Water intakes on private land are not causing any immediate issues but if they do cause problems then this can be brought forward as necessary, given that the Implementation Plan is a living document.
19. Therefore staff would recommend that the additional text regarding partners be added to the Implementation Plan but that the timing of projects remains as currently indicated.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Regulatory and Planning Committee recommends to the Council that it:

- (a) Endorse the two documents ('Issues and Prospective Projects' and its accompanying Implementation Plan) as guides to assist future operational decision-making,
- (b) Incorporate the following amendment to the Implementation Plan, as recommended by the Akaroa/Wairewa Community Board:

Add a comment to the Implementation Plan explaining that the identified partners have statutory responsibilities, have been informed of their potential involvement in the project and will be further involved as projects are commenced.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

The Committee invited Mr Stewart Miller, Chairperson of the Akaroa-Waiwera Community to address the Akaroa Basin Settlement Study. Mr Miller thanked Council staff for their work on this issue and considered that it had been carried out very well.

3 Cont'd**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

The Regulatory and Planning Committee recommends to the Council that it adopt the staff recommendation pending the following changes to the Akaroa Basin Settlement Study document:

- (a) That "peak summer population" be clarified.
- (b) That an alternative phrase for "alternate modes of transport" be used.

4. CHRISTCHURCH CITY STRATEGIC INTENSIFICATION REVIEW – WORK PROGRAMME

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8281
Officer responsible:	Programme Manager Liveable City
Author:	Carolyn Ingles

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to establish a process with the Regulatory and Planning Committee to provide advice and input into the Strategic Intensification Review. The Strategic Intensification Review is to be adopted by the Council in June 2010.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS), and subsequently the Regional Policy Statement Change No.1 (PC1), sets the overall future growth pattern for Christchurch to 2041. A key component of this future pattern is the move towards more compact residential development (intensification). However, the UDS and PC1 contain only high level direction for Christchurch. There is now a requirement for the Council to put more specific programmes and processes in place to enable successful intensification to occur.
3. To achieve this, a work programme has been developed in order to ensure the Council is examining the actions it can take in order to achieve UDS and PC1 intensification objectives. These actions will be within the Council's key areas of influence which are developing and implementing a vision, creating and enforcing regulation, advocacy, providing capital investment and potentially working as a developer or development partner.
4. The intensification programme has distinct, but interlinked work streams that set the foundations for the Council to deliver on the UDS and PC1 objectives. One of the five work streams, the Strategic Intensification Review (SIR), has been under investigation by staff and now requires regular input and advice from Councillors before the completion deadline in mid 2010.
5. The primary objectives for Strategic Intensification Review are to:
 - (a) Identify future areas of change
 - (b) Identify areas of character protection
 - (c) Recommend possible tools to stimulate successful intensification, and
 - (d) Determine which area of change will be the first examined through an Urban Intensification Plan.
6. Ultimately, the Strategic Intensification Review will guide the location of detailed planning through the production of Intensification Plans for each of the areas identified and shape future policy direction including possible changes to the City Plan. The Strategic Intensification Review will also provide strategic direction around future funding decisions as made through LTCCP's.

4 Cont'd

THE PROCESS

7. Early input and advice is desired to ensure that the Strategic Intensification Review is developed in a manner consistent with Councillor expectations and aspirations. It is proposed that the Regulatory and Planning Committee would act as a sounding board for staff in the development of the Strategic Intensification Review. The Committee would also provide a vehicle for information sharing between Councillors and staff. It is proposed that a series of workshops are held, utilising the existing Committee workshop schedule, following the timeframe and topics listed below:
- October 2009 – Project Context and background including capacity studies.
 - November 2009 – Proposed outcomes and outputs from SIR (what should be adopted in 2010).
 - February 2010 – Background Projects including Urban Character Study, Brownfield Land Study, Natural Hazards and Infrastructure.
 - March 2010 – Intensification Toolbox.
 - May 2010 – Review workshop (outcomes, outputs and next steps).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. There are no financial implications in establishing this process with the Regulatory and Planning Committee.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

9. Yes, funding for the development of the intensification programme is budgeted for within the 2009-19 LTCCP.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. There are no legal implications resulting from establishing this process. Any legal implications of the Strategic Intensification Review will be addressed as part of its development and implementation.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

11. Yes.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

12. Yes, this activity aligns with the "city planning and development" activity.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

13. Yes. In the "City planning and development" activity there is the following levels of service:
- *The Strategic Intensification Review (SIR) is completed and adopted by Council by end of June 2010.*
 - *First Intensification Plan started by end of December 2010.*

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

14. Development of the Strategic Intensification Review aligns with the intent of the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy, the Regional Policy Statement Change No.1 and the Central City Revitalisation Strategy.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

15. Yes, see above.

4 Cont'd

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. There is no consultation requirement to establish this process.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council adopt the proposed process as the basis for Committee input into the development of the Strategic Intensification Review.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Regulatory and Planning Committee recommends to the Council that it adopt the staff recommendation.

PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

5. ADOPTION OF ANNUAL REPORT TO THE LIQUOR LICENSING AUTHORITY FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 30 JUNE 2009

The Committee received the Annual Report to the Liquor Licensing Authority for the period ending 30 June 2009.

The Committee **decided** to receive this report for information and requested that the Annual Report be appended to the Council agenda (**Attachment 1**).

6. INSPECTIONS AND ENFORCEMENT UNIT: PROSECUTION UPDATE

The Committee received a report from the Council's Inspection and Enforcement Unit on the recent outcome of a prosecution against Mr Chou and the Council's successful conviction for illegal building work and breach of the City Plan.

The Committee **decided** to receive this report for information.

7. PARKING ENFORCEMENT ISSUES ARISING FROM THE 2008 REVIEW OF THE TRAFFIC AND PARKING BYLAW

The Committee received a quarterly report on the implementation and enforcement of the Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008, including requests for service.

The Committee **decided** to receive this report for information and asked staff to provide a report on the operation and enforcement of each Christchurch City Council Bylaw to the Regulatory and Planning Committee on an annual basis (rather than a quarterly basis), as per the Council resolution of 27 August 2009.

8. PLANNING ADMINISTRATION MONTHLY REPORT (DECEMBER 2008 TO JULY 2009)

The Committee received a monthly report to provide information about resource consent applications received and processed by the Planning Administration and Subdivision teams. It contained information from December 2008 to July 2009.

The Committee **decided** to receive this report for information.

PART C - REPORT ON DELEGATED DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE COMMITTEE

9. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON

It was **resolved** on the motion of Councillor Wall, seconded by Councillor Buck, that Councillor Williams be elected as Chairperson for this meeting of the Regulatory and Planning Committee.

The Committee discussed the need to appoint a deputy chairperson for the Regulatory and Planning Committee at the next available opportunity.

10. REQUEST FOR PUBLIC PLACES POLICY WORKING PARTY TO REPORT DIRECTLY TO THE COUNCIL RE TIMELINES FOR THE REVIEW

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Regulatory and Planning Committee **resolved**:

- (a) That a report setting out a timeline for the reviews can go directly to the Council, without first being considered by the Regulatory and Planning Committee.
- (b) That Councillor Claudia Reid be appointed to the Public Places Policy Working Party.

11. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

It was **resolved** on the motion of Councillor Williams, seconded by Councillor Reid, that the draft resolution to exclude the public set out on page 230 of the agenda be adopted at 12.13pm.

Councillor Johanson requested that his vote against the above motion be recorded.

Councillor Buck was absent when this resolution was made.

The Committee **resolved** to readmit the public at 12.38pm.

PART A – MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION (CONT'D)

12. DRAFT BELFAST AREA PLAN

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy and Planning Group, DDI 941-8182
Officer responsible:	Programme Manager Healthy Environment
Authors:	Matt Bonis, Consultant Planner

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Council's approval of the draft Belfast Area Plan for public consultation. The Belfast Area Plan (the Area Plan) provides the framework for land use planning and Council expenditure, reflects how both the local community and the wider City wishes the area to develop, and ensures that growth is integrated and collaborative.
2. Following consultation, the Council will be presented with a final Area Plan. If adopted by the Council, the Area Plan will lead to changes in future LTCCPs, capital programmes, budgets, development contributions, and changes to the Christchurch City Plan to implement the Area Plan. The development of the Belfast area is Christchurch's second key greenfields development area behind South West Christchurch.

Note: This report was considered by the Regulatory and Planning Committee in the Public Excluded section of its meeting. Staff advise that this report can now be considered by the Council in the open section of the agenda.

12 Cont'd

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. The Council is required to consult with affected and interested parties on issues, plans and strategies that may directly or indirectly affect them. Since 2004 the public have been consulted on a series of outcomes and visions for the Belfast area, concurrently the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy and its enactment pursuant to Proposed Plan Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement ('RPS') have identified the land use and staging for the area. Overall, the land use options, staging and visions were supported by respondents, and have since been developed into the draft Area Plan. It is acknowledged that: *there are submissions against the staging identified within Change 1 to the RPS; and Plan Change 22 identifies a 'Sub Regional Centre' for that area adjoining Radcliffe and Main North Road.*
4. Greater detail and direction as to how the area will be managed over the next 35+ years is provided in the draft Area Plan. The purpose of this next phase of consultation is to gain community feedback on this detail. While the draft Area Plan does not bind the Council in any way, it is a non-statutory document that will have potential implications for future LTCCPs, and as an 'Other Matter' with regard to RMA statutory plans and processes. Consequently, Council approval to commence consultation on the draft Area Plan is important in this regard.
5. The draft Area Plan promotes new centres, high quality business environments and employment opportunities. New neighbourhoods will be developed around: an extensive open space network built on the existing natural values of the Styx and Kaputone River system: *providing recreation opportunities; and facilitating ease of movement between centres, employment destinations and public open space.*
6. The uniqueness of the Belfast area will be celebrated through restored habitats and its tangata whenua values. The Plan also fosters the incorporation of key landscape features and European heritage into urban development and public open space. Neighbourhoods will be supported by a range of services and facilities and people will have genuine multi-modal transport choices. Infrastructure and services will be designed, constructed and managed to be resilient and adaptable to the unpredictability of factors such as climate change, the global economy, and energy supply. **Attachment A** includes the draft text of the Area Plan; **Attachment B** provides the vision statement of the draft Area Plan.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The Area Plan has no financial implications, its implementation will be addressed through changes to the City Plan, and through the 2009/19 LTCCP capital infrastructure programme through which service funding aligned with the UDS has already been placed.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

8. The Area Plan will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under both the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and Local Government Act, by:
 - (a) Ensuring sustainable management of the area's natural and physical resources
 - (b) Facilitating the integrated planning of Council-managed services
 - (c) Identifying opportunities for land development
 - (d) Providing direction for Council's acquisition of strategic land areas
 - (e) Providing a framework for the collection of development contributions.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-19 LTCCP?

9. Yes. The draft Area Plan will assist in achieving a number of community and Council outcomes under the LTCCP, in particular planning for the future growth of the city.

12 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

10. The relevant Council strategies are as follows:
- (a) Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS) – Belfast has been confirmed as a major Greenfield urban growth area under this strategy. The draft Area Plan demonstrates how the level of urban growth projected under the UDS will be managed and accommodated.
 - (b) Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and Proposed Plan Change 1 – The draft Area Plan takes into account the wider regional objectives of the RPS and Proposed Plan Change 1 (as amended by Variation 4), in particular those relating to settlement and the built environment, the urban limit, transport, matters of regional significance to tangata whenua, landscape, ecology, heritage, and rivers.
 - (c) Christchurch City Plan – The objectives and policies of the draft Area Plan have been influenced by the relevant objectives and policies of the City Plan, in particular those relating to urban growth, flood risk, open space and recreation, Tangata Whenua, European heritage, and natural values. The Area Plan will also provide a basis for any new objectives, policies and rezoning introduced through changes to the City Plan.
 - (d) The Styx Vision 2000 – 2040 - The Five 'Visions' for the Styx Catchment and River Corridor has influenced the outcomes anticipated by the Area Plan. In particular, the need to ensure the retention of increased natural character and ecological enhancement for the Styx River, Kaputone Stream and other spring fed tributaries.
 - (e) Waterways and Wetlands Asset Management Strategy – Objectives 1 to 6 of the draft Area Plan provides further grounding to the initiatives promoted in this strategy, namely achieving a value-based approach to land development and the restoration of waterways and wetlands.
 - (f) Christchurch City Biodiversity Strategy – The Strategic Vision identifies the Styx River Corridor as “An outstanding example of riparian and estuarine wetlands with high potential for re-establishment of native wetland birds and increased protection of existing species such as bittern and marsh crane”.
 - (g) Proposed Natural Resources Regional Plan and the Surface Water Management Protocol – Objective 1 contained in the draft Area Plan represents the Integrated Catchment Management Plan, is considered to meet the objectives of the proposed Natural Resources Regional Plan and Surface Water Management Protocol.
 - (h) Canterbury Regional Land Transport Strategy (CRLTS, 2005-15) – Objective 9.1 and 9.3 of the draft Area Plan is considered to meet the objectives and policies of the CRLTS.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

11. The engagement of key stakeholders (i.e. affected and/or interested parties) at this stage of the Area Plan process, is fundamental to the Council meeting its duty under the first schedule of the RMA and sections 78 (Community views in relation to decisions) and 82 (Principles of consultation) of the LGA.

12 Cont'd

12. A consultation plan has been prepared for this final phase of the consultation process, and sets out a programme (over October and November 2009) and methods of consultation. Key steps will include:
- (a) Continuation of the provision in the next series of newsletters informing key stakeholders about the draft Area Plan and how to provide feedback. Accompanying the newsletter will be a summary brochure of the draft Area Plan.
 - (b) Belfast based information sessions with the general public and media releases.
 - (c) Hui with local hapu and runanga. This will be undertaken principally by Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited (MKT).
 - (d) Presentations to Environment Canterbury, New Zealand Transport Agency, Waimakariri District Council, and the Urban Development Strategy Implementation Committee. These organisations have been kept informed throughout the Area Plan process and involved on relevant matters.
 - (e) An update to the Belfast Website.
13. It is not intended to formally hear feedback to the draft Area Plan, but written feedback will be received and considered. If the feedback suggests that any significant variance to the draft Area Plan is warranted, these matters will be referred to the Regulatory and Planning Committee for direction. It is intended that the final draft of the Area Plan will be presented to the Council for adoption in early December 2009.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Regulatory and Planning Committee recommend to the Council that it **approve** the draft Belfast Area Plan for consultation with key stakeholders (including directly affected landowners, land developers, and community, government and environmental organisations), subject to staff conducting an editorial review of the draft Belfast Area Plan and associated maps to ensure they are suitable for a public audience prior to consultation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Regulatory and Planning Committee recommend to the Council that it **approve** the draft Belfast Area Plan for public consultation.

The Committee requested staff provide legends for maps and demarcate constrained and unconstrained aquifers on relevant maps.

12 Cont'd

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

14. Belfast is identified in both the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy, and the Christchurch City Plan, as a major urban growth area. Over the next thirty-five years the area is expected to accommodate over 2,900 new houses, and approximately 110 hectares of new industrial development. The sequencing of land development will be broadly as follows (in accordance with the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy):
 - (a) Applefields (Belfast s293) to be mostly developed in the short term (2007–2016);
 - (b) Development of a moderate scale (3 hectares) District Centre at Radcliffe Road to be developed in the short term (2007–2016);
 - (c) Development and redevelopment of central and north eastern Belfast Industrial Areas in the short term (2007–2016).
 - (d) The extension of residential development to the east of the Main North Rail corridor in the Medium term (2017–2026);
 - (e) Small scale residential development close to the Styx Mill Reserve to be developed in the Medium term (2017–2026).

15. The Area Plan establishes a vision for the area, and objectives based on sustainable development and management principles. Page 25 of the draft Area Plan establishes a vision for the area and sets out the main goals and objectives to achieve the vision. A series of plans support the objectives and policies, representing the proposed stormwater management scheme (which in time will form part of the wider Styx Integrated Catchment Management Plan), public open space network, land-use pattern (including residential neighbourhoods, activity, neighbourhood and local centres, business land and community facilities), roading hierarchy, and the public transport network.

16. The Area Plan will be accompanied by an Implementation Plan which provides a detailed programme of the actions and key tasks to achieve the Area Plan objectives and policies, prioritisation of actions, timeframes for delivery, required resources, and performance measures.

The meeting concluded at 12.40pm.

CONSIDERED THIS 24TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2009

MAYOR