

AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN
INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

Te Paepae Kaiwawao Motuhake o te Mahere Kotahitanga o Tāmaki Makaurau

**Procedural Minute No. 7 by Chairperson of
Independent Hearings Panel**

**Amendment to Procedural Minute No. 6 in relation
to the categorisation of submissions on rezoning
and changes to precincts**

29 August 2014

Date: 29 August 2014
Signed: 

AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN
INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

Te Paepae Kaiwawao Motuhake o te Mahere Kotahitanga o Tāmaki Makaurau

Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan

Procedural Minute No. 7

**Amendment to Procedural Minute No. 6
in relation to the categorisation of submissions
on rezoning and changes to precincts**

1. By our Minute dated 5 August 2014 at paragraph 25 we directed the Auckland Council as follows:
 - 25 *We direct the Council to report to us by 10th September 2014 on changes to the RUB and by 1st October 2014 on its approach to and assessment of the categorisation of the submissions on rezoning and changes to precincts as set out above.*
2. The phrase “as set out above” referred back to paragraphs 17 – 19 of our Minute, which stated:

Re-Zonings, Precinct Changes and changes to the RUB

- 17 *The single largest group of submissions identified through the Summary of Decisions Requested is that containing all those submitters who seek a change to the zoning or precinct applicable to their property or seek to bring their property inside the RUB. We see these matters as a significant issue (both in terms of the time required to address them and in terms of their significance to submitters). We need to get a better idea of how many issues are raised to help determine the scale of this hearing topic, what issues may be able to be mediated and how many hearing days are likely to be required.*
- 18 *We understand that the Council is developing a spatial mapping tool to identify those properties where site specific changes are requested to the zoning or precinct which is proposed to be applied under the PAUP. We further understand that the Council is uncertain how robust this mapping tool may be in practical use in the near future and therefore has concerns about publicly releasing it. We have not had any access to the tool ourselves.*
- 19 *If such a mapping tool is of sufficient robustness for the Council at least to be able to do the work we envisage, then we think the following information is needed:*
 - i. *a summary of all re-zoning requests and their identification spatially, whether by list, table or map;*
 - ii. *a scheme for potential grouping of issues (whether spatially or by PAUP provision);*

AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN
INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

Te Paepae Kaiwawao Motuhake o te Mahere Kotahitanga o Tāmaki Makaurau

- iii. a preliminary assessment of the significance of the issue according to nominated criteria, which we envisage would include: areas of widespread concern; site-specific v street, neighbourhood or community changes; and addition of new zones or new zoning provisions;*
 - iv. the extent to which mediation is likely to be useful to progress the submission;*
 - v. an estimate of the total likely mediation and hearing time required; and*
 - vi. indicative responses by the Council as to its view of the merits of the requests.*
3. We are informed by the Auckland Council that this direction is not able to be complied with within the deadline set and that the amount of work it will involve will require significant resources to be devoted to it. It would appear from the Council's reaction that it reads our direction as requiring a full re-assessment of the sites that are the subject of these submissions.
4. For clarification we are not directing the Council to undertake a full re-assessment of each of the thousands of sites which are the subject of such submissions. We are asking whether the Council's mapping tool may be sufficiently powerful to enable a desktop analysis of the range of submissions which would produce an indicative summary of how this large group of submissions (of the order of 9,000 separate primary submissions) might best be marshalled so that the issues arising from them can be addressed in some logical and methodical way, rather than simply site-by-site. If, following on from that, the Council is able to indicate its views as to the best method for considering and potentially resolving such issues, including the non-exclusive options of mediation or direct discussion with submitters, then it would help us a great deal to know sooner rather than later what those views are.
5. We had set the deadline of 1st October 2014 for this report thinking that the Council might be doing this analysis for its own purposes in any event. Given its reaction, the need for this explanation and the fact that the Panel is presently scheduled to hear submissions on the Regional Policy Statement in relation to changes to the RUB (which are likely to involve at least some consideration of rezoning issues) in late January and early February 2015, we will extend this deadline to 28 November 2014 and the deadline in relation to rezoning and changes to precincts to 14 February 2015, so that our direction now reads:
 - 25 *We direct the Council to report to us by 28 November 2014 on changes to the RUB and by 14 February 2015 on its approach to and assessment of the categorisation of the submissions on rezoning and changes to precincts as set out above.*

AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN
INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

Te Paepae Kaiwawao Motuhake o te Mahere Kotahitanga o Tāmaki Makaurau

Date: 29 August 2014
Signed: 