AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

Te Paepae Kaiwawao Motuhake o te Mahere Kotahitanga o Tâmaki Makaurau

Interim Guidance Text for RPS Topic 013

PAUP Sections B2.1 - Providing for growth in a quality compact urban form and B2.3 - Development capacity and supply of land for urban development

23 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 - Urban Growth - PAUP Sections B2.1 and B2.3

- 1. The objective of a quality compact urban city is appropriate in the promotion of the purpose of the RMA in the context of the region given the significant growth which is occurring and is expected to continue to occur during the planning period.
- A Rural Urban Boundary (RUB) is the most appropriate method to achieve the
 objective of a quality compact urban city when compared to the principal alternatives of
 the operative Metropolitan Urban Limit and no boundary.
- 3. The purpose of a RUB is to set a threshold for change (probably a minimum of seven years of developable capacity) and to provide a high level spatial planning tool for structure planning, including planning for infrastructure, to respond to urban growth. The principal feature of a RUB is that urbanisation outside it is to be avoided.
- 4. The purpose of a RUB should not be to identify areas for development or where development should not occur. Areas where development should not occur ought to be specifically identified and assessed on their own merits and then listed and protected using specific controls in the appropriate plan.
- 5. The proposed provisions for the RUB in the PAUP as notified may be overly stringent and may not be the most appropriate provisions to achieve or promote all of the objectives of the RPS. A more flexible RUB which is defined but which can be changed would better promote the purpose of the RMA by providing for growth, relieving land supply and price pressures and allowing rezoning of rural land for urban activities ahead of it being required.

- 6. The basis for establishing or changing the RUB should be determined by criteria in the RPS which include at least the following:
 - a. A feasible developable area;
 - b. Infrastructure able to be provided efficiently (including on a timely basis) and resiliently; and
 - c. An appropriate time frame for development.
- 7. The method for rezoning land inside the RUB must be based on structure planning. The scale of the structure planning exercise will depend on the size and complexity of the proposed rezoning. The method set out in Appendix 1.1 to the RPS appears to be generally satisfactory for this purpose. Core principles of structure planning in the PAUP should be:
 - a. a quality compact urban form with a range of housing or employment choices needs to be provided; and
 - b. the promoters of the structure plan are responsible for ensuring infrastructure needed to serve the land is provided in a timely manner.

Structure planning must also identify how to avoid or mitigate natural hazards and avoid where practicable identified important resources and values.

- 8. The maps identifying the location of the RUB should be plan provisions and not included in the RPS. In order to provide appropriate flexibility so that timely responses to growth pressure can occur, opportunity for private plan changes to include areas within the RUB must be available.
- 9. There do not appear to be any plan methods which would achieve any objective or policy which seeks to allocate growth within and outside the current metropolitan area, other than using Future Urban Zones as a restriction on growth. The Panel is not satisfied that such restrictions would promote either the overall growth objective or the purpose of the RMA. The use of the words greenfield and brownfield in this context is accordingly not supported.
- 10. The Panel is not satisfied that a land release programme or strategy should form any part of the RPS or the rest of the PAUP. While there would obviously be value for strategic planning in considering future sub-regional development scenarios, it appears to us that formalising such a programme (in conjunction with a strict RUB and the application of a Future Urban Zone to undeveloped land inside the RUB) would be restrictive in nature rather than enabling. This approach would not promote the growth objective. We think it would be more likely to perpetuate current imbalances between land supply and demand with consequent adverse effects on social and economic well-being.
- 11. It is appropriate to enable higher residential densities in and around centres and corridors or close to public transport routes, social facilities or employment opportunities. A broad mix of activities should be enabled within centres. A wide range of housing types and densities should be enabled across the urban area.

Separate interim guidance will be issued for this topic in relation to Sections B2.2 and 2.4 – B2.7.

This interim guidance should also be read in conjunction with the interim guidance on RPS Topic 011 – Rural.

David Kirkpatrick

Chairperson, Hearings Panel for proposed Auckland Unitary Plan