

## PWP Unitary Plan Direction setting December 2012

### Day One – 3<sup>rd</sup> Dec Workshop Decisions

	<b>Summary of decisions</b>	<b>By whom</b>	<b>Due</b>
1.	Confirmed a bold approach for the Unitary Plan but acknowledged that it not necessary to implement major new direction all at once.		
2.	Cr Quax's role confirmed as an observer.		
3.	Support to implement new regime but work should continue on area based planning. Staging not an option but understand issues raised – discuss staging and controls that will govern development with governing body and the community.  (Crs Coney and Walker dissent from this view and support a staged approach.)		
4.	Discuss further in the SEA discussion on Tuesday whether SEAs too extensive.		
	<b>Treaty of Waitangi</b>		
5.	Confirmed to proceed with partial integration of Maori values into the March draft (option 2). Draft list of priorities for option 2.		
6.	Confirmed IMSB secretariat to be involved in agreeing the values to be integrated into the draft plan		
7.	Agreed to consider inclusion of a statement in the UP acknowledging there will be commercial redress and that it will be taken into consideration. (see action point 4 below).		
	<b>Centres</b>		
8.	Otara – smallest of the large town centres so four storeys appropriate and reclassify as a small town centre		
9.	Support for customising approach to height based on local issues.		
10.	Support for a range of height options - 4, 5, and 6 storeys.		
11.	Confirmed that recent environment court decisions will override UP proposals.		
12.	Agreed if no board feedback on height then no change to the height proposed.		
13.	Agreed to roll over existing character overlays.		
14.	See individual heights agreed as recorded in the spreadsheet of directions. (Note that Cr Coney supports 4 storeys for Papatoetoe rather than the 6 storeys agreed by the working party.)		

	<b>Summary of decisions</b>	<b>By whom</b>	<b>Due</b>
15.	Concern at impact of 3 storeys vs 4 and need to revisit Hibiscus Bays area plan.		
16.	Confirmed the need to be consistent in approach to local centres and apply the four storey height limit.		
17.	Rodney resolution on hold until small regional centres reviewed on a regional basis.		
18.	Recategorise Greenhithe as a neighbourhood centre.		

## Day Two – 4<sup>th</sup> Dec Workshop Decisions

	<b>Summary of decisions</b>	<b>By whom</b>	<b>Due</b>
1.	Agreed further half day session would be arranged to address outstanding matters – remaining height issues, proposed wording on commercial redress, and any other matters that could not be resolved during the second day of the workshop		12 Dec
	<b>Infrastructure</b>		
2.	Supported option 3 for parking (Retain proposed approach (max in and around centres (on FTN) and in the mixed use zone; minimums elsewhere) with more permissive maximum for retail) with some reservations.		
3.	Confirmed long term direction for parking is maximums for entire region as soon as possible.		
4.	Confirmed discretionary activity status in the inner corridor and permitted in the outer corridor with four people in favour of non-complying.		
5.	Agreed to make new residential building a non-complying activity in the inner transmission line corridor.		
6.	Supported development of an agreed position on tree management protocols.		
7.	Agreed to report back to PWP on a way forward on airport noise.		12 Dec
	<b>Residential</b>		
8.	Confirmed where an alternative approach to zone location boundary has been proposed by a local board that does not have a significant impact on capacity for growth, adopt the changes proposed by the local board.		
9.	Agreed in respect of height that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General principle that townhouses should not be taller than apartments, i.e. outer ring of centre should not be higher.</li> <li>• Reduce to five around a 6 storey centre</li> <li>• Remain at four adjoining a 4 storey centre.</li> </ul>		
10.	Confirmed reduction of minimum lot size to 1200m <sup>2</sup> .		
11.	Confirmed option 1 (up to 4 dwellings on a site as a permitted activity). Crs Coney and Walker opposed.		
12.	Confirmed minimum site width control for 3-4 (15m) and 5+ dwellings (20m).  Note Crs Coney and Walker's dissenting view that infill should not be a permitted activity but restricted discretionary.		

13.	Minor dwellings deferred for further discussion at 12 December workshop continuation.		12 Dec
	<b>Historic Character</b>		
14.	UP to remain silent on notification for demolition of existing historic character. Officers to apply standard section 95 tests on a case by case basis to determine if notification should apply.		
15.	<p>Supported proposed interim approach to protection of historic character:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduce an overlay to the Draft Unitary Plan based on the Boffa Miskell settlement map as an interim protection measure.</li> <li>• Exclude existing historic character areas from this overlay.</li> <li>• Demolition or shifting of buildings constructed prior to 1944 within the new overlay would require a resource consent (non-notified).</li> <li>• Underlying zoning will continue to direct new additions and alterations.</li> <li>• Demolition proposals assessed against the following:  Step 1 – Historic heritage scheduling criteria – if criteria met consent should be declined and a plan change initiated.  Step 2 – Criteria based on the contribution the building makes to a group of buildings within close proximity that have a consistent architectural style. If criteria met, proposal assessed against further criteria that address the impact of the loss of the building on the character of the local area. The condition of the building would also need to be taken into account.</li> </ul>		
16.	Supported officer recommendation <b>not</b> to link new buildings with applications to demolish.		
	<b>Mangroves and SEAs</b>		
17.	Agreed to consider mangrove management further at a later date with more information provided. Roger Blakeley to convene a subgroup to develop a proposal: Cr Coney Cr Webster, Cr Raffills, Lindsay Waugh, Cr Walker, Andy Baker.		
18.	PWP to consider SEAs further on 12 December, in particular whether a different approach is required for Maori land.		12 Dec
19.	Rural subdivision deferred to 12 December.		12 Dec

## Day Three – 11<sup>th</sup> Dec Decisions

	Summary of decisions	By whom	Due
19.	Confirmed an 8 storey height limit for Manurewa.		
20.	Confirmed a 4 storey height limit for Ellerslie.		
21.	Agreed to leave the Milford height limit at 8 storeys for now, noting Cr Hartley's concerns.		
22.	Residential pocket to south of Puhinui Rd – agreed to rezone to light industrial and non-complying activity status for new dwellings. Existing use rights remain in place.		
23.	Discuss interim solution with the airport and encourage airport to land bank.		
24.	Noted the concerns and agreed unable to take this issue any further.		
25.	Confirmed that the approach to minor dwellings proceed on the basis of the development controls outlined in the presentation i.e. minimum floor area 40sqm; max floor area 75 sqm; max of one extra unit per site; outdoor living areas and privacy controls to apply. <i>Concerns of Cr Coney and Derek Battersby noted.</i>		
26.	Noted that subsequent subdivision of a converted dwelling will need to meet density controls.		
27.	Confirmed that the March draft of the UP remain silent on GMOs and if the APC agrees to inclusion of GMOs in the UP then the provisions will be consulted on as part of a targeted engagement programme with a view to possible inclusion in September.		

## Day Four – 12<sup>th</sup> Dec Decisions

	Summary of decisions	By whom	Due
28.	Confirmed that the working party is comfortable with the general approach of a different level of control between rural production and coastal areas. Further work required on the detail of the provisions (see action point 1 below).		
29.	Rural coastal zone to be retained. Activity statuses of activities need to be looked at more closely - some may be too stringent. PWP members and Mark T to get together to look at this.		
30.	Support for Countryside living zone with a density of 2ha and down to 1ha where there is a TDR receiving opportunity		
31.	TDRs supported. Detail of what locations can be a receiving area and opportunities for rezoning to countryside living need to be considered.		
32.	Confirmed that the recommended approach to TDR can be put out in the March draft for discussion with further work on the detail by the small group proposed above.		
33.	Confirmed the proposed approach to quarries and in next version of the plan need to link the cleanfill discussion with the quarry discussion.		
34.	Confirmed the recommended approach to discharge of sewerage from boats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain the current depth based exclusions;</li> <li>• Extend the distance from the coast to 2km.</li> </ul>		
35.	Agreed to identify locations where structures such as moorings can be located. Otherwise restrictive approach to new structures in other locations.  Interim approach is to hold status quo with view to the Marine Spatial Plan refining the approach and implement through a variation to the UP.		
36.	Advocate for pump out facilities on marinas and make it easy for people to do the right thing.		
37.	Confirmed the proposed objectives and policies on commercial redress for inclusion in the Unitary Plan.		
38.	Confirmed that work on SEAs is to continue for inclusion in the March draft as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Supported the recommended approach for the March draft.</li> <li>b. Supported that the UP stay silent on notification</li> <li>c. Confirmed that SEAs should apply equally across all</li> </ol>		

	<b>Summary of decisions</b>	<b>By whom</b>	<b>Due</b>
	<p>land tenures/ownership.</p> <p>d. Supported free consents for vegetation clearance.</p> <p>e. Supported controlled activity status for clearance for house site.</p> <p>f. Support objectives and policies to enable the occupation and use of Maori land with identified natural values</p> <p>g. Improve communication and support for land owners in this process.</p>		
39.	<p>Confirmed the proposed two step approach to mangrove management for inclusion in the Unitary Plan:</p> <p>Step 1 removal or mangroves back to 1996 levels using hand held motorised tools;</p> <p>Step 2 work with local boards to identify further areas for removal as a variation to the Unitary Plan.</p>		