

#21

**COMPLETE****Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)**Started:** Friday, May 12, 2017 12:10:12 PM**Last Modified:** Friday, May 12, 2017 12:27:32 PM**Time Spent:** 00:17:20**IP Address:** 115.189.99.89

PAGE 2

Q1: The Draft Growth Management Strategy approach for the Timaru urban area seeks to utilise existing residential and business (commercial and industrial) capacity already available to provide for growth to 2043. No additional new residential or business land is identified. Residential intensification is proposed adjacent to Highfield and the areas around the Timaru Town Centre to provide for modest increases in housing density (such as two – three storey apartments), and Rural Residential opportunities are identified at Elloughton South, Kelland Heights and Gleniti North. How much do you agree or disagree with this approach?

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: The Draft Growth Management Strategy approach for Geraldine is to better use the existing Town Centre land, rather than rezone any additional land; provide for increased residential densities close to the Town Centre as well as provide for low density new residential at Orari Station Road; Rural Residential zoned opportunities at Main North East and Cascade Plan; and a new Light Industrial area at Tiplady. How much do you agree or disagree with this approach?

(no label)

Strongly agree

Q3: Under the Draft Growth Management Strategy, we are seeking to consolidate the existing Town Centre of Pleasant Point for commercial activities and not rezone any additional land. Residential growth at Pleasant Point is to be accommodated through existing opportunities in terms of infill development, as well as a new Rural Residential zone adjoining Manse Road. How much do you agree or disagree with this approach?

Respondent skipped this question

Q4: For Temuka, we are seeking to utilise existing residential and business capacity already present in the settlement area. Rural Residential opportunities will be provided for in areas at Thomson Road and Guild Road. How much do you agree or disagree with this approach?

Respondent skipped this question

Q5: The Draft Growth Management Strategy seeks to provide a more focused approach to Rural Residential development, through focusing opportunities for rural residential and lifestyle allotments at specific zones peripheral to Timaru, Geraldine, Temuka and Pleasant Point, instead of the current dispersed approach throughout the Rural zone. How much do you agree or disagree with this approach?

(no label)

Strongly agree

PAGE 3

Q6: Overall, how much do you agree or disagree with the overall direction of the Draft Growth Management Strategy?

(no label)

Strongly agree

Q7: How much do you agree or disagree with the following direction of the Draft Growth Management Strategy?

Infrastructure
Comment:

Strongly disagree
Infrastructure trunk extension - refer document attached. seeking full cost recovery from developers will compromise development economics

Rural

Agree

Residential
Comment:

Disagree
What if land owners do not make the land available?

Leadership and partnership
Comment:

Disagree
Needs to be a more explicit focus/partnership approach upon facilitating development into areas that are in accordance with the GMS

Q8: The Draft Growth Management Strategy identifies three key challenges (page 21) that it is seeking to provide direction on for growth in the district to 2043. These include: Managing the challenges associated with a modest level of forecast population growth, and an increase in the elderly population; The Council discharging its legal responsibilities under the Resource Management Act (1991) and the Local Government Act (2002); A community expectation that the Council takes an active role in integrating and managing growth, including that the costs of growth are fairly distributed and do not fall predominantly on the wider community. How much do you agree or disagree with this approach? How much do you agree or disagree with these challenges?

(no label)

Disagree

Can you let us know what additional key challenges we should consider, if any.

Refer attached document Population assumptions flawed Population likely to grow more strongly than forecast Costs of infrastructure extension will need to be funded in order to encourage development and not compromise economics of subdivision or development

PAGE 4

Q9: Any other general comments relating to the Draft Growth Management Strategy?

Respondent skipped this question

Q10: Your contact details

Name

John Shirtcliff

Address

584 Orari Station Road, Geraldine

Telephone

021474334

Email

john.shirtcliff@xtra.co.nz

Q11: Supporting documents

Submission Timaru District Growth Strategy 2017.docx (89.1KB)

Submission re Timaru District Growth Management Strategy 2017 (GMS)

I am generally supportive of the managed growth strategy and its suggestions subject to the following caveats and remarks.

The comments provided below in response to the recently released GMS are primarily made in relation to the issues surrounding the Geraldine portion of the document and the associated underlying assumptions. I have provided a summary of points followed by supporting discussion and evidence.

Summary of points:

1. The statistics used as a base for population and housing projections are structurally flawed and therefore significantly inaccurate.
 - a. The Geraldine settlement population is **already** at or about the level projected in the GMS assumptions for 2043.
 - b. Correspondence with Statistics NZ (refer email thread below) confirms their concern at the validity of the population estimates used and their view that the Geraldine area unit is unlikely to be a basis for future census data for Geraldine.
 - c. It is likely that provisions now identified in the GMS for future residential use, for example, will be inadequate if projected growth and demand has been underestimated as seems to be the case.
2. Being a more active partner in managing growth will require Council to adopt a more proactive bringing more public sector funding to co-invest in the implied private/public development partnership, which the GMS approach seems to clearly envisage, in financing the initial costs of infrastructure trunk expansion.
 - a. Avoid compromising the economics of desirable development
 - b. Spatially direct development in an orderly and affordable fashion
 - c. Integrate infrastructure planning with the land use planning identified in the planning scheme
 - d. Provide transparency regarding TDC's intentions for the provision of trunk infrastructure
 - e. Enable TDC to estimate the cost of infrastructure provision to assist its long term financial planning
 - f. Ensure that trunk infrastructure is planned and provided in an efficient and orderly manner
 - g. Provide a basis for the imposition of conditions about infrastructure on development approvals.
3. Provide planning alternatives should owners of the land identified for zone change not respond to market or planning signals and not wish to release the land for development within the necessary time horizon to meet growth requirements and demand for whatever reason.

Assumptions

I have previously submitted, in response to the 2015 report “District Plan Review Growth Strategy: Issues and Options”, expressing my concerns as to the apparent underestimation of the Geraldine community’s statistical base and the consequential population and growth estimates.

That submission was apparently discounted and Council have continued to rely upon Statistics NZ figures which, as I have attempted to demonstrate, are fatally flawed due to the inconsistency between the definition of the Geraldine area unit (based upon the traditional and now outgrown town boundary) and the rather wider Geraldine settlement’s area which includes a significant and contiguous (with the Geraldine area unit) population and urbanisation but counted within the surrounding Orari area unit.

My previous view has not changed and, importantly this time, I have also sought validation and comment for my analysis and views upon the base statistics and consequent projections from both Statistics NZ (Richard Spiers) and Prof. Natalie Jackson both of whom have provided data and demographic trends to inform the GMS. Their views support my assessment as to the fundamental disconnect between the base statistics used and the true extent of the community being discussed in the report.

In the simplest of terms: The area of the Geraldine settlement and urbanisation is NOT the same as that contained within the Geraldine area unit.

The result of not acknowledging or accounting for this disconnect is that estimates based upon an inaccurate base will be quite inaccurate. My own estimate (supported by discussion with Statistics NZ, their present view and updated projections) is that **the Geraldine settlement and its associated urbanisation is already at or about the level projected in the GMS assumptions for 2043.**

Such an error in the projections can only result in a significant under-estimation of Geraldine’s likely future growth and, therefore, its forecast need for land over the ensuing 30 year period.

Correspondence (see email thread) with Statistics NZ is attached in which they advise that the Geraldine area unit will very likely no longer be measured in the forthcoming 2018 census as a direct acknowledgment of its lost relevance as a statistical unit able to accurately account for and assist in estimating Geraldine’s growth. This problem is likely to apply to a number of other communities facing the same challenge in obtaining statistically relevant and useful information upon which to base important district planning decisions. Statistics NZ have also expressed concern that the latest and revised population estimates (released in March 2017) are not being used as the baseline estimate.

Infrastructure – provision, expansion and financing¹

The GMS will inevitably have implications for the existing Infrastructure Strategy.

¹ A useful discussion of these matters is to be found in the 2014 Bismarck Growth Management Plan at <http://www.bismarcknd.gov/DocumentCenter/View/22126>

There is, within the GMS and the existing District Plan, a continuing and explicit focus to insulate all the costs of infrastructure extension to accommodate development and growth from the existing ratepayer base.

It seems likely that such a continuing focus on full cost recovery will be ultimately frustrating of the planned and orderly growth that Council is now seeking in its managed growth approach to land use planning. Failure to pro-actively extend utility trunk infrastructure is unlikely to spatially direct development initiatives into locations that are supportive of Council's planning objective of managed growth in a fiscally prudent fashion.

Being a more active partner in managing growth will, I believe, require Council to bring more public sector funding to the implied private/public development partnership, which the GMS approach clearly envisages, in financing the initial costs of infrastructure expansion. Costs of trunk extension can simply be mitigated by levying infrastructure connection charges in conjunction with a long term approach to trunk infrastructure cost recovery. This is an issue that has been identified in other communities adopting a managed growth strategy.

Additionally, the existing approach of developer pays all costs may well fatally compromise the economics of development in an environment where relatively small scale development is likely to be the order of the day.

Land zoning designations should also be made in a manner that minimises infrastructure extension costs and are considerate of future likely intensification of the Geraldine settlement (beyond the 30 year planning horizon presently being contemplated) – i.e. more intensive development should be zoned in relatively close proximity to existing main trunk utility services that are accessible at fiscally prudent cost.

Thus a rural residential development immediately adjacent to the existing urbanisation will likely, at a future date, be subject to intensification pressure and will require future access to infrastructure presently denied it. Otherwise, the settlement will become hemmed in by development not serviced by the infrastructure necessary to support later intensification.

Availability of land

The GMS has identified certain areas of land surrounding the existing urbanisation and ascribed a land use designation to them.

The question arises as to what will Council's response be if existing landowners do not wish to develop their land in, say, the short to medium term for the land use proposed in the GMS?

Meshblock data for "Geraldine"

Meshblock (2013 Areas)	2001 Census, occupied private dwelling type					2006 Census, occupied private dwelling type					2013 Census, occupied private dwelling type				
	Separate House	Two or More Flats/Units/Townhouses	Other Occupied Private Dwellings ⁽¹⁾	Occupied Private Dwelling Not Further Defined	Total occupied private dwellings	Separate House	Two or More Flats/Units/Townhouses	Other Occupied Private Dwellings ⁽¹⁾	Occupied Private Dwelling Not Further Defined	Total occupied private dwellings	Separate House	Two or More Flats/Units/Townhouses	Other Occupied Private Dwellings ⁽¹⁾	Occupied Private Dwelling Not Further Defined	Total occupied private dwellings
MB 2759203	12	0	0	0	12	12	0	0	0	12	18	0	0	0	18
MB 2759204	12	0	0	0	15	12	3	0	0	12	12	0	0	0	15
MB 2759205	21	3	0	0	24	21	0	0	0	24	24	0	0	0	24
MB 2759206	12	0	0	3	12	18	0	0	0	18	18	3	0	0	18
MB 2759207	21	0	0	0	24	27	0	0	0	27	30	0	0	0	30
MB 2759208	18	0	0	0	21	21	0	0	0	21	33	0	0	3	36
MB 2759209	15	3	0	0	15	30	0	0	0	30	30	0	0	0	33
MB 2759300	45	0	0	0	48	75	0	0	0	78	93	0	0	0	99
MB 2759400	18	3	0	3	24	30	3	0	0	36	36	3	0	0	36
MB 2759500	24	3	0	0	27	27	0	0	3	27	27	0	0	3	30
MB 2761000	15	0	0	3	18	15	0	0	0	15	24	0	0	0	24
					240					300					363
Geraldine	801	90	0	81	972	855	102	3	24	984	927	96	3	33	1056
Total Geraldine & Periurban					1212					1284					1419
										Growth	10.5%				

Statistics NZ email thread

From: [Richard Speirs](#)
To: "john.rosemary@xtra.co.nz"
Subject: RE: FW: Geraldine projections
Date: 4 April 2017 3:03:51 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#) [image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Hi John

I agree that the population estimate for 2016 appears to understate the population growth in Orari AU since 2013.

The population projections that have just been released take into account the population estimates but do make allowances if the building consents data indicate that population growth should be greater. As a result the medium variant projections have Orari AU's population growing from 4,860 in 2013 to 5,290 at 30 June 2018 – a growth of about 9 percent. I assume you are aware that the latest updated area unit population projections are available in NZ.Stat on the Stats NZ website.

When using population projections all 3 variants – low, medium and high – should be considered. It may well be that the high variant population projections perform the best for Orari AU in the period from 2013 to 2018.

Richard

From: John & Rosemary Shirtcliff [<mailto:john.rosemary@xtra.co.nz>]
Sent: Tuesday, 4 April 2017 2:44 PM
To: Richard Speirs <richard.speirs@stats.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: FW: Geraldine projections

Thanks Richard

I'll include your remarks in my discussion

I have attached a very simple spreadsheet which I think may highlight some problems with the area unit update

I may have it wrong but I think the update has not ascribed sufficient growth to Orari

Cheers

John

From: Richard Speirs [mailto:richard.speirs@stats.govt.nz]
Sent: 4 April 2017 11:56 AM
To: 'john.shirtcliff@xtra.co.nz' <john.shirtcliff@xtra.co.nz>
Subject: RE: FW: Geraldine projections

Hi John

Our latest population projections for Geraldine Area Unit indicate growth of 130 people between 2013 and 2018 (this being consistent with the number of building consents over the last 4 years). The population is then projected to grow by another 200 in the following 25 years through to 2043. These figures are based on the medium variant projections. By comparison the low variant projections have the population in 2043 the same as what it was in 2013.

The neighbouring area to Geraldine is Orari Area Unit. It has had considerable growth since 2001 and that trend is projected to continue to 2043. Some of that growth has been to the areas immediately north west and north east of Geraldine Area Unit.

Any analysis or planning to do with Geraldine that includes the use of Stats NZ population projections has to realise what the area boundaries are that existed at the time of the production of the projections. If the town of Geraldine is considered to be larger than the current Geraldine area unit then the projections for Orari area unit should also be taken into account.

Stats NZ is currently reviewing area unit boundaries with the plan that area units will no longer exist and new geographies will be in place for the 2018 Census. Given the amount of development taking place immediately outside the current Geraldine area unit boundaries it is very likely that the new geography that includes Geraldine will be for an expanded area.

Richard Speirs
Statistical Analyst
Population Statistics
Stats NZ Tatauranga Aotearoa
DDI +64 4 931 4085 | stats.govt.nz

Unleashing
the power of data to change lives



From: John Shirtcliff [mailto:john.shirtcliff@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 4 April 2017 9:04 AM

To: Richard Speirs <richard.speirs@stats.govt.nz> **Subject:**
FW: FW: Geraldine projections

Correspondence with Natalie herewith

John Shirtcliff

Principal
Insights Consultancy
021474334

From: John Shirtcliff [<mailto:john.shirtcliff@xtra.co.nz>]
Sent: 2 April 2017 3:55 PM
To: 'Natalie Jackson' <demographics@nataliejackson.net>
Subject: RE: FW: Geraldine projections

Hi Natalie

Thanks for taking the time to comment.

It is a difficult problem to unravel – the Council are locked into a heavy reliance upon the Statistics NZ area unit based upon Environment Court precedents in which Stats have been regarded as the sole reliable source of population data. Unfortunately, as I have discovered, the area unit is smaller than Geraldine urban and adjacent lifestyle areas

Geraldine has benefited from a number of sources of population growth which may help to explain a skew towards larger households:

- Dairying has resulted in more working age and families – a number of these workers live in Geraldine itself rather than on-farm. Also dairying has repopulated the farming areas.
- Clandeboye factory expansion
- Internal and external migration
- A large retirement village which has built some 50+ units (in the past 3 years) and is planned to grow to 150 in the near future (outside the Area unit but within the “town boundary”)
- The local school rolls are growing – this after an Education Ministry school closure programme based upon Stats predictions of negative growth in 2004!

So ageing population will certainly slow growth dramatically but I suspect that Geraldine is not going to be as adversely affected as many less fortunate small and more isolated towns with less commerce and tourism.

In summary I believe that Geraldine has grown more strongly than the statisticians (and therefore Council) give it credit for and the dodgy statistical base will only compound problems in the future. Not at all sure how to turn the lights on!

Cheers

John Shirtcliff

Principal
Insights Consultancy

021474334

From: natalie@nataliejackson.net [mailto:natalie@nataliejackson.net] **On Behalf Of** Natalie Jackson

Sent: 2 April 2017 12:18 PM

To: john.shirtcliff@xtra.co.nz

Subject: Re: FW: Geraldine projections

Hi John

I'm not really able to help much I'm afraid - my expertise is primarily in analysing/developing projections from a given base on given boundaries, not in determining what those boundaries should be, which is no help to you at all.. its pretty much the same as Stats NZ does. However I do empathise re the boundary issue - and if you can show that there are conflicting boundaries, council should take notice. Even Stats NZ state that their baseline populations are rough around the edges..eg they state that "In reality, there is no data source that perfectly measures the resident population of New Zealand or of subnational areas. Furthermore, there is no data source that perfectly measures changes in the resident population, or even movements of the resident population within New Zealand" (see attached, Stats NZ 2011, page 8).

http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/population/estimates_and_projections/estimatingpop-after-chch-quakes-paper.aspx

The only other way I can really assist is to suggest what I call 'forensic' analysis. For eg., the population of Geraldine Area Unit is relatively old (28 per cent aged 65+ years in 2013), so would have a relatively low average number of people per household - probably in the vicinity of 2.4-2.6 per household -- but it could be lower.

Looking at Geraldine's Area Unit population in 2013 (2,370 according to the latest Stats NZ data) that would be around 912-988 households. If I'm reading it correctly, your data indicate there were 1056 households in the Geraldine Area Unit (and as many as 1419 households in the broader area). At 1056 households for the Area Unit, that would be an average of 2.9 people per household, which would seem to me to be too high, for a population with 28% aged 65+ years, which would in turn indicate that there may be more people in the area unit than the Stats NZ data suggest. Its slight mental gymnastics, but I'm sure you will get the picture.

I note that the latest Area Unit projections released the other day (31st March) show Geraldine growing modestly, at a decelerating rate - which is commensurate with its older age structure (relatively few at reproductive age to have babies, plus increasing deaths = the end of natural increase). Projected growth for the period 2013-18 is 130 (people), compared with 2000 for total Timaru, so around 6.5% of Timaru's growth. For Geraldine all of the growth comes from the net migration assumptions; natural increase is zero by 2018, then modestly negative, which offsets some of the growth from migration. This ignores the boundary problem you are concerned about, but draws attention to another important issue for planners, and that is the negative impact of pop ageing on future growth.

Timaru's population is also relatively old - but not as old as Geraldine - so growth also slows, to zero by 2043. Natural increase is negative from 2028 - again reducing the assumed growth from natural increase.

Again, these points don't take into account potential leavers from Auckland or other large cities, or the main land use issues that concern you, but they do caution about 'open-ended growth'. Pop ageing will slow growth everywhere, as the numbers at older ages, and thus deaths, increase, and with low births we enter the situation of natural decrease - following older counterpart countries like Europe and Japan. Once experiencing natural decrease already the case for around 15% of NZ towns, the number of migrants has to increase just to keep the population constant in size, and this will be happening pretty much everywhere.

Not much else I can add to the mix I'm afraid, but you could try my colleague Etienne Nel at Otago (etienne.nel@otago.ac.nz) who is a geographer and he has a lot more local knowledge about boundaries.

warm wishes
Natalie

Dr Natalie Jackson
Director, Natalie Jackson Demographics Ltd. +64
2102537490

On 1 April 2017 at 10:50, John Shirtcliff <john.shirtcliff@xtra.co.nz> wrote:

Not sure which email address is the best to contact you on so have sent this to Massey and this

From: John Shirtcliff [mailto:john.shirtcliff@xtra.co.nz]

Sent: 31 March 2017 7:26 PM

To: 'natalie.jackson@waikato.ac.nz' <natalie.jackson@waikato.ac.nz> Subject: Geraldine projections

Hello Professor Jackson

I understand that you carried out a population and household projection to inform the Timaru district Council's plan review.

I have been involved in some debate with the planners at Timaru for several years now over what seems to be a consistent under-projection of growth for the locality. They challenged me to provide them with evidence to support my assertion based upon largely anecdotal evidence.

First of all I should declare that my background is in management consulting and economic development rather than town planning so my credentials in that area are rather slim. However, I am a keen observer of progress and the underlying reasons for lack of progress and a resident of the locality.

Anecdotally there is considerable comment from real estate agents that there is little land available for new residential building in particular (despite the Timaru planners claiming that they have not been advised to that effect by them), there is considerable evidence of flight from the cities (as people seek to cash up their Auckland home and seek a slower lifestyle) etc. I am personally aware of an appreciable number of people who have come to the area from other cities and countries.

The problem appears to be a structural one in the way statistics are collected:

- * The Geraldine area unit has been effectively full for the past almost 10 years

- * The bulk of new housing has been constructed in the mesh blocks immediately to the north and east contiguous with Geraldine

- * The maps being used to support the projections are inconsistent with each other and I am sure no-one has noticed the inconsistency let alone thought about the consequences of the confusion. o The Geraldine area unit (upon which the Geraldine population and its forecasts are predicated ref <https://www.citypopulation.de/php/newzealand-southisland.php?cityid=285>) is smaller than the area indicated as the Geraldine town boundary (pasted below from the Growth Strategy p. 15) which is shown in the Growth Strategy document

o You will see that the outlined areas are quite different with town boundary including areas of the adjacent meshblocks but not being counted as

Geraldine

- * My analysis based upon the intercensal period 2006 - 2013 indicates that Geraldine has grown by in excess of 10% in terms of housing units and accounts for more than 50% of the growth in the entire Timaru District when the growth in the neighbouring meshblocks is accounted for. I have attached my spreadsheet.
- * You will see that the 2 outlined areas are quite different.

I would be interested to hear your view

Kind regards

John Shirtcliff

Principal

Insights Consultancy 021474334

