

AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

Te Paepae Kaiwawao Motuhake o te Mahere Kotahitanga o Tāmaki Makaurau

Interim Guidance Text for RPS Topic 012

PAUP Section B3.2 – Significant Infrastructure and Energy

27 February 2015

Having read the submissions relating to this topic and having heard evidence and legal submissions from submitters (including the Auckland Council), the Panel issues this guidance in relation to RPS level provisions to assist submitters and the Council in preparing for mediation and subsequent hearings on regional and district plan provisions.

This interim guidance is not a recommendation within the meaning of section 144 of the Local Government (Auckland Transitional Provisions) Act 2010. It is not binding on submitters (including the Council) or on the Panel.

The Panel may revise its interim guidance after considering evidence presented on the regional and district plan provisions.

The Panel does not invite any further evidence in relation to this topic and will not enter into correspondence on this interim guidance.


Interim Guidance – Significant Infrastructure and Energy - PAUP Section B3.2

1. There should be a section in the RPS for infrastructure. A crucial element of any development is the infrastructure to support it, both to enable people and communities to use the development effectively and efficiently for their well-being and to assist in avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects of development.
2. Infrastructure should be defined by using the RMA definition of that term, supplemented to include some related facilities. The definition could be:

Infrastructure has the same meaning as in section 2 RMA and also means:
 - a. Bulk storage for wholesale or distribution purposes of natural or manufactured gas over 15 tonnes, or petroleum over 1 million litres;
 - b. Storage and treatment facilities for a water supply distribution system
 - c. Storage, treatment and discharge facilities for a drainage or sewerage system;
 - d. Class 1 solid waste landfills;
 - e. National defence facilities;
 - f. Facilities for air quality and meteorological services.
3. Such an approach means that there is no need to list various types of infrastructure or to name particular networks throughout the RPS, except as required by the RMA.
4. There does not appear to be any reason to limit the focus of the RPS to significant infrastructure, as in the RPS as notified. An essential characteristic of most infrastructure is its construction in the form of an inter-connected network. The

efficacy of a network almost always depends on every element of it. Distinguishing between, for example, parts of the roading system or the electricity system on the basis of whether they are significant or not does not serve any apparent resource management purpose.

5. Social facilities (for education, healthcare, social services, recreation and so on) should not be treated the same as infrastructure for resource management purposes. Social facilities are certainly important. They are activities in their own right, rather than structures and networks on which other activities are based (which are the purpose of infrastructure). Social facilities are addressed in their own section (B2.7) of the RPS.
6. It appears that the relevant infrastructure provisions of the plans in the PAUP (Sections C1 and H1) address infrastructure in a manner consistent with our approach, rather than the way indicated in the RPS as notified.
7. In order to enable infrastructure to be effective and efficient, especially in its network configurations, the Panel thinks that the RPS should recognise that infrastructure may be located in (including traversing) sensitive areas where there is a functional need for it to do so (that is, the function of the infrastructure requires such a location) or there is some technical or other operational need in the circumstances for such a location. Such location will still require full assessment of any adverse effects and whether there may be any reasonably practicable alternative to such a location.



David Kirkpatrick
Chairperson, Hearings Panel for
proposed Auckland Unitary Plan