
AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN

Report To: Unitary Plan Political Working Party

Report Name: Unitary Plan Structure

Executive Summary

This paper summarises the proposed structure for the Unitary Plan. Whilst this will continue to evolve as the Plan is developed, the structure will provide a framework to assist in drafting the plan and a model to guide the formatting of different chapters and sections.

The process to develop this model is based on:

- The core and supporting principles that were established by the Unitary Plan team and agreed to by the Council Working Party.
- Research – looking at best practice locally, nationally and internationally on how the Plan might be structured;
- A series of workshops with the Unitary Plan team and across council to brainstorm ideas on content and structure;
- Unitary Plan team meetings and discussion on various aspects of the structure and components of the Plan;
- Preparation of a draft/working model;
- Ongoing testing and refinement of the working model.

The proposed structure will enable the Unitary Plan to:

- Meet legislative requirements;
- Achieve the core and supporting principles established to prepare the Plan, especially the need to be innovative and ensure a simple structure that is easy to navigate and understand;
- Take account of the approaches recommended in the direction setting papers (where these are relevant to the structure);
- Facilitate the development of a web-based plan; and
- Take account of the different tiers of planning that will need to be reflected in the Unitary Plan (ranging from the high level planning derived from the Auckland Plan to local precinct plans at the district plan level)

The structure is based on combination of best practice examples in New Zealand and around the world. This includes

- A separate policy framework at the front of the Plan. (ie objectives and policies are separated from the methods/rules);
- A policy framework that contains three hierarchical levels:
 - regional (including strategic directions and objectives at the Auckland Plan/RPS level);
 - sub-regional (including objectives and policies from each of the 21 Area Plans, sub regional resource management areas and generic zones that will apply across the region); and
 - local (which reflects planning at a local precinct and site specific level);
- The policy framework is organised around the elements that comprise a city and its region;
- The Plan will contain sub-regional maps, zone (or outcome area) maps, and maps covering local variations (or overlays) that often cross zone boundaries
- A section containing all the rules (including cross region rules, zone rules and overlay rules)

Recommendation

- a) That the report be received.

1 Context

1.1 Background

The Royal Commission considered that an amalgamation of the Auckland councils would provide the following benefits.

- Remove complexity
- Allow the creation of a single district plan, including a standard palette of zones and zone standards, and a standard set of regional objectives, policies, methods and rules
- Create a consistent set of environmental standards, recognizing different environments such as coastal, forested, rural, suburban or urban areas
- Acknowledge that a fine grained approach to planning will always be required to meet the needs of Auckland's diverse communities and manage the wide range of natural and physical resources
- Acknowledge the importance of using simple language and controls as a central objective (especially in the residential zones)
- Recognise that several areas will still require a local response:
 - sites where a design-led response has resulted in a spot zone with specific set of standards and rules that are in effect a super resource consent
 - sites with sufficient uniqueness that a special zone or overlay of controls is required to allow or constrain development e.g. Glenbrook Steel Mill, Weiti Forrest Park, Eden Park
 - centres where there is a location specific set of standards to achieve specific design outcomes (for example town centres with developed urban design and heritage protection outcomes)
 - the extent and location of zones
 - heritage and/or urban design guidelines and standards that reflect the specifics of an area e.g. Devonport, Ponsonby, Remuera garden suburbs

1.2 Legislative Requirements

The Resource Management Act contemplates a hierarchy of planning instruments as follows:

- (a) Part 2 of the RMA;
- (b) National Policy Statements;
- (c) Regional Policy Statements;
- (d) Regional Plans;
- (e) District Plans.

Within each of those planning instruments there is also a hierarchy:

- i) objectives
- ii) policies;
- iii) rules(where applicable)

This approach has been described as a 'top down' approach by the High Court in *Beach Road Preservation Society v Whangarei District Council (2001) NZRMA 176*:

"The Act works from the most general to the most particular and each document along the way is required to reflect those above it in the hierarchy. It is a top-down approach".

Section 78A was introduced into the RMA by the 2003 Amendment Act and provides for combined plans:

78A Combined regional and district documents

(1) A local authority may prepare a document that meets the requirements of two or more of the following:

- (a) a regional policy statement

-
- (b) a regional plan:
 - (c) a district plan.

(2) Subsection (1) is subject to sections 60, 64, 65, and 73.

59 Purpose of regional policy statements

The purpose of a regional policy statement is to achieve the purpose of the Act by providing an overview of the resource management issues of the region and policies and methods to achieve integrated management of the natural and physical resources of the whole region.

62 Contents of regional policy statements

- (1) A regional policy statement must state -
- (a) the significant resource management issues for the region; and
 - (c) the objectives sought to be achieved by the statement; and
 - (d) the policies for those issues and objectives and an explanation of those policies; and
- 62 (1) a, c & d

The purpose of a regional plan is set out in section 63 which states:

- (1) *The purpose of the preparation, implementation, and administration of regional plans is to assist a regional council to carry out any of its functions in order to achieve the purpose of this Act.*

Compulsory components of regional plans include those specified in section 67(1):

67 Contents of regional plans

- (1) A regional plan must state –
- (a) the objectives for the region; and
 - (b) the policies to implement the objectives; and
 - (c) the rules (if any) to implement the policies.

72 Purpose of district plans

The purpose of the preparation, implementation, and administration of district plans is to assist territorial authorities to carry out their functions in order to achieve the purpose of this Act.

75 Contents of district plans

- (1) A district plan must state—
- (a) the objectives for the district; and
 - (b) the policies to implement the objectives; and
 - (c) the rules (if any) to implement the policies.
- (2) A district plan may state—
- (a) the significant resource management issues for the district; and
 - (b) the methods, other than rules, for implementing the policies for the district; and
 - (c) the principal reasons for adopting the policies and methods; and
 - (d) the environmental results expected from the policies and methods; and
 - (e) the procedures for monitoring the efficiency and effectiveness of the policies and methods; and
 - (f) the processes for dealing with issues that cross territorial authority boundaries; and
 - (g) the information to be included with an application for a resource consent; and
 - (h) any other information required for the purpose of the territorial authority's functions, powers, and duties under this Act.

- (3) A district plan must give effect to—

-
- (a) any national policy statement; and
 - (b) any New Zealand coastal policy statement; and
 - (c) any regional policy statement.

(4) A district plan must not be inconsistent with—

- (a) a water conservation order; or
- (b) a regional plan for any matter specified in section 30(1)

(5) A district plan may incorporate material by reference under Part 3 of Schedule 1.

1.3. Principles

The following core and supporting principles have been established to guide the development of the Unitary Plan:

Core Principles

- Bold
- Simple
- Fast
- Innovative

Supporting Principles

- Gives effect to the strategic direction of the Auckland Plan
- Outcome focussed
- User friendly
- Minimum repetition
- Transparent and collaborative/consultative
- Robust
- Reduced number of activity classes (e.g. permitted, discretionary, non-complying, prohibited, etc)
- Greater use of the plan to determine notification
- Minimum content required under the RMA (e.g. objectives, policies and rules)
- Extensive use of illustrations and diagrams
- Reduced number of site-specific provisions

1.4. Direction Setting Papers

A series of direction setting papers are being produced for the Unitary Plan. Those which will directly influence the structure of the document are:

1. Regional consistency v local variation
2. Outcomes v effects
3. Heritage v character
4. Tools and techniques (e.g. whether zoning as a tool is necessary and desirable)

As decisions are made on these papers, the draft structure may need to be amended to accommodate or provide for the specified direction.

1.5. Electronic and Hard Copy Versions of the Unitary Plan

The Unitary Plan will be a web based Plan. This offers the best format for presenting the plan and creates options that have not previously been available for interfacing with the RMA. A web based plan will also enable tools such as drop down lists and hyper links to be used to navigate around the plan.

Council's lawyers have advised that apart from one minor area of uncertainty (the requirement in the RMA that the Council seal be affixed to the plan), the legal requirements for the Unitary Plan can be satisfied electronically and the Unitary Plan may be in electronic format.

1.6. An Evolving Structure

The Structure of the Unitary Plan will continue to evolve as there are still some unknowns and important pieces of the puzzle missing. For example:

- The draft Auckland Plan has not been finalised;
- Area Spatial Plans have not been produced and the format and content of these plans is yet to be determined;
- Drafting of objectives, policies and methods commences may require refinements to the structure

In the meantime the structure will provide a framework to guide the drafting of the plan and a model that will guide the formatting of different chapters and sections.

2 Relevant Issues

A key issue in identifying the proposed structure is to ensure that the Unitary Plan can:

- Meet legislative requirements;
- Achieve the core and supporting principles established to prepare the Plan, especially the need to be innovative and ensure a simple structure that is easy to navigate and understand;
- Take account of the approaches recommended in the direction setting papers (where these are relevant to the structure);
- Facilitate the development of a web-based plan; and
- Take account of the different tiers of planning that will need to be reflected in the Unitary Plan (ranging from the high level planning derived from the Auckland Plan to local precinct plans at the district plan level)

The process to develop this model involved:

- The establishment of principles to guide the development of the Plan;
- Research – looking at best practice locally, nationally and internationally on how the Plan might be structured;
- A series of workshops with the Unitary Plan team and across council to brainstorm ideas on content and structure;
- Unitary Plan team meetings and discussion on various aspects of the structure and components of the Plan;
- Preparation of a draft/working model;
- Ongoing testing and refinement of the working model.

3. Options

The table below outlines a number of broad approaches for structuring the Unitary Plan taken from local, national and international examples). The majority of the plans assessed combine at least two of these approaches.

Broad Type of Approach	Description	Examples
1. Resource based	Focus is on managing natural and physical resources	Auckland Regional Policy Statement
2. Issue or effects based	Focus is on managing issues and/or effects	Waitakere District Plan, Tasman Unitary Plan
3a. Area/Outcome based	Focuses on outcomes (ie using objectives policies and rules to achieve regional, region wide, area wide, precinct wide or site	Wellington City Plan Brisbane City Plan (through the Neighbourhood Plans), Victorian Planning

3b Policy outcome based	specific outcomes). Same as above, but outcomes achieved through policies only (ie with no or minimal use of rules)	Provisions Auckland City (Central Area) – precincts, Auckland City (Hauraki Gulf Islands) English Plans
4. Land use or activity based	Focus is on land use activities e.g. residential, business	Auckland City (isthmus)
5. Design based	Generally applies to parts of a plan for specified activities or areas	Vic Code, Melbourne (residential development); Brisbane City Plan (see their codes), structure plans, master planning, Mairi 21 (award winning), Mangere Town Centre
6. Combination of approaches e.g. issues/area or resource/area or design/area	Uses features of all of the above to accommodate the different focuses required by a unitary plan	

4. Evaluation of options

Option 1: Resource Based Approach

Benefits/Advantages	Costs/Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is an important component of the RPS and regional plans Fits the RMA philosophy of management of natural and physical resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not provide for area or “place based” outcomes Does not encourage good urban outcomes

Option 2: Issue or Effects Based Approach

Benefits/Advantages	Costs/Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Useful for preventing adverse environmental effects and/or maintaining the status quo (in terms of the environment) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not fit with the outcome based approach (which is one of the Unitary Plan principles) Is not proactive (ie it prevents negative outcomes but does not encourage forward planning or achievement of desired outcomes) Navigation around the plan can be difficult as one issue may give rise to multiple objectives and policies e.g Waitakere Plan

Option 3: Area or Outcome Based Approach

Benefits/Advantages	Costs/Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enables area or “place based” outcomes to be prescribed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Region wide management of resources is not always area based

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fits the outcome based approach sought as one of the Unitary Plan principles 	
--	--

**Option 3a: Area or Outcome Based Approach – but controlled by Policies Only (no rules)
e.g The English Planning Approach**

Benefits/Advantages	Costs/Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as option 3 Can significantly reduce the length and complexity of the plan with no rules required Provides a lot of scope for innovation and innovative solutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not enable a threshold for permitted activities to be established so nearly every activity requires a resource consent – planning burden v planning gain issues

Option 4: Land Use/Activity/Zone Based Approach

Benefits/Advantages	Costs/Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easily understood by the public as each zone is relatively self-contained and navigation around the plan is easy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can result in a lot of repetition with controls repeated in several zones (unless controls sit outside the zone in a codified form) Does not address the management of natural resources which are more region wide

Option 5: Design Based Approach

Benefits/Advantages	Costs/Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enables greater emphasis on urban design issues and design outcomes Approach more readily enables innovation – design outcomes can be specified rather than the less flexible development controls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not address the management of region wide natural resources where environmental bottom lines may be required (e.g. water and air quality)

Option 6: Combination of Approaches

Benefits/Advantages	Costs/Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Able to utilise the best features of all the different plan approaches Acknowledges that the Unitary Plan structure is part RPS and part District Plan equivalent so that different approaches may be required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure of plan requires a clear and transparent hierarchical structure to accommodate the complexity of information in an easy to understand way.

Evaluation

The assessment of the advantages/disadvantages of each model against the needs of the Unitary Plan indicates that a combined approach (Option 6) is required. No one plan structure best suits

the Unitary Plan, particularly given that it must function as a combined Regional Policy Statement/Regional Plan/District Plan.

The section below outlines a structure that will combine the best features of the national and international examples that have been assessed.

5. A Model Structure for the Unitary Plan

5.1 Policy Framework

The policy framework is based on a hierarchy of provisions which cascades from general high order objectives and policies to particular lower order objectives and policies. This is illustrated graphically in Attachment 2.

Heirarchy	Description	Inputs
Regional	This tier establishes overarching strategic objectives and policies that give effect to the Auckland Plan/RPS and inform the sub-regional and local objectives and policies.	Auckland Plan Regional Policy Statement Regional Plans
Sub-regional	This tier includes three sets of objectives and policies: (i) A set which accommodates the 21 Area Plans; (ii) A set that establishes objectives and policies for resource management areas such as air quality coastal management areas; (iii) A set which establishes objectives and policies for the “generic” zones or outcome areas that will apply across the region.	Regional Plans Area Plans District Plans
Local	This tier includes the objectives and policies for all area, “place based” and site specific locations ranging from strategic areas such as the Auckland Central City through to local precincts and specific sites.	District Plans Precinct Plans Concept plans/schedules sites for site specific areas

The regional policy areas running across the page in Attachment 2 (ie Treaty of Waitangi, Heritage Community etc.) relate to the elements that make up a city and its rural hinterland. These are grouped under a number of topic headings (ie values, natural environment, regional growth and form, networks, land/water use and effects and buildings and structures) and will cascade down to lower tiers in the policy framework as required.

Operation of the Policy Framework

Tier 1

Tier 1 establishes the higher order strategic directions, objectives and policies at a regional level. These will be taken from the Auckland Plan, the Regional Policy Statement or the region wide objectives in the regional plans as appropriate.

Tier 2

Tier 2 makes provision for the objectives and policies from the Area Spatial Plans (which will align with the 21 local board areas). The format of these plans is still evolving, and only a small number may be produced by the time the Unitary Plan is publicly notified

Tier 2 will contain the objectives and policies associated with the broad natural resource management areas. Examples include air quality management areas (rural, urban) contained in the regional Air, Land & Water Plan, and coastal management areas that cross zone boundaries.

Tier 2 will also contain the objectives and policies for ‘generic’ zones or outcome areas. The spatial allocation of these will be influenced by Tier 1 and the local Area Plans in Tier 2. In the absence of an Area Plan, the zone objectives and policies will be influenced by the Auckland Plan and/or zone provisions contained in the current operative district plans.

Tier 3

Tier 3 contains all the spatial or local “placed based” and site specific objectives and policies. These are grouped in three areas.

The first group of “places” includes key strategic areas of the region for example the Central City, Auckland Port and Waterfront, Auckland Airport. It also includes major greenfield or brownfield areas known as ‘strategic transformation areas’. These are major development areas most of which are the subject of existing plan changes. When these areas are fully developed they may be subsumed into the generic zones. Conversely, additional areas may be added in the future as new strategic transformation areas are identified.

The second group of “places” includes local precincts or structure plans. For example the Matakana Structure Plan may have its own set of objectives and policies that will provide a strategic justification for varying the rules in the generic zones relating residential and commercial development.

The third group of “places” includes site specific objectives and policies. These could be sites (such as the Chelsea Sugar Refinery) or they could “scheduled sites” (as labelled in existing district plans) that deal with non comply activities (although at this stage the treatment of scheduled sites has yet to be determined).

The Tier 3 objectives and policies provide a basis or strategic justification for varying the generic zones and any other cross region provisions in the Plan. As an example a generic residential zone could limit the height of buildings to two storey, but a Tier 3 objectives and policies for a specific residential precinct adjacent to a shopping centre could vary this height to allow for a 3 to 5 storey apartment development.

5.2 Mapping

Attachment 2 makes provision for a set of maps which corresponds with rule framework. This maps will include

- Sub-regional maps showing resource management areas
- Zone (or outcome area) maps that apply to all land across the region, much in the same way as existing land use zones.
- Overlay maps that facilitate local variations (ie different or more restrictive controls that have been justified in the Policy Framework). These overlays could be physical overlays such as

a flood overlay, or they could be subject or topic based overlays such as a design and built form overlay that changes lot sizes and development controls to give effect to specific urban design objectives.

5.3. Methods – Rule Framework

Cross –Region Rules

These rules apply across the region or to significant parts of it. Examples could include rules for car parking, utilities or advertising signs. This provides the scope for greater regional consistency and an amalgamation of the different approaches of the former Auckland councils. .

Zone or Outcome Area Rules

These rules apply to spatially defined areas in the form of zones or outcome areas. For example, rules relating to the residential zone(s). The amalgamation of all the district plans provides an opportunity to significantly rationalise the number of zones.

Overlay Rules

These rules relate to areas that require different controls to the generic zones. For example there might be a ‘significant landscape overlay’ that adds to or varies the generic zone controls in order to protect an identified landscape. This overlay could apply to a range of significant landscapes across the region, with each unique landscape having its own set of controls in a schedule to the overlay.

The Plan allows for multiple overlays to be applied to the same land if required. For example there could be a flood overlay which varies the zone controls on earthworks; there could be an ‘environmental significance’ overlay which modifies a boundary setback control to protect water quality in an adjoining creek; and there could be a heritage overlay which requires a resource consent to demolish the building.

Assessment Criteria

It is proposed that “assessment criteria” will only be used for locationally specific circumstances, for example where an overlay schedule relates to a particular site. Otherwise the objectives and policies will be used to assess applications. This will avoid the current practice in district plans where assessment criteria are almost a repeat of the objectives and policies.

5.4 Other Provisions

General Provisions

These include general application requirements, administrative requirements and interpretative provisions (excluding definitions).

Definitions

A common set of region-wide definitions will be contained in this section.

List of Incorporated Documents

Section 75(5) of the RMA enables District Plans to incorporate material by reference under Part 3 of Schedule 1.

Section 30 of Part 3 states:

30 Incorporation of documents by reference in plans and proposed plans

- (1) *The following written material may be incorporated by reference in a plan or proposed plan:*
 - (a) *standards, requirements, or recommended practices of international or national organisations:*
 - (b) *standards, requirements, or recommended practices prescribed in any country or jurisdiction:*
 - (c) *any other written material that deals with technical matters and is too large or impractical to include in, or print as part of, the plan or proposed plan.*
- (2) *Material may be incorporated by reference in a plan or proposed plan—*
 - (a) *in whole or in part; and*
 - (b) *with modifications, additions, or variations specified in the plan or proposed plan.*
- (3) *Material incorporated by reference in a plan or proposed plan has legal effect as part of the plan or proposed plan.*

List of Plan Changes/Variations

It is proposed to include a link to proposed changes and variations to the Plan. This section will summarise all proposed changes/variations.

Implementation Issues

The key implementation issues relating to the structure of the Unitary Plan are:

- There is a need to identify the Auckland Plan/RPS component of the plan (ie the regional objectives and policies Tier 1)
- There may also be a need to include some region-wide objectives and policies in Tier 1.. This would include those region-wide objectives and policies that are not Auckland Plan/RPS equivalent will apply across the region;
- The sub-regional objectives and policies relating to the 21 local board areas will need to be gradually phased in as not all will be completed by December 2012;
- The local planning component will also need to be phased in local precinct plans are prepared. Where time permits it may be possible to include existing legacy plans.
- Navigation around the plan will be critical as will the linking of objectives and policies to methods and vice versa;
- Software that was not available for the first generation plans now enables a web-based plan to be prepared – this will assist with navigation and the linking of provisions.

Attachments

Attachment 1 – Unitary Plan Structure: General Findings/Conclusions from Analysis of Plans

Attachment 2 – Model Structure of the Unitary Plan

Signatories

Authors	Tony Reidy – Team Leader – Unitary Plan, Raewyn Catlow - Team Leader – Unitary Plan
Authorisers	John Duguid – Manager Plan Development

Attachment 1 - Unitary Plan Structure: General Findings/Conclusions from Analysis of Plans

- 18 plans were assessed against the second order principals that established by the Unitary Plan Team. The structure of these plans was summarised on an excel spreadsheet. Examples were selected from New Zealand, Australia, UK, Canada and USA plans. Those plans selected were seen as innovative or best practices examples of planning practice.
- There was no one example that stood out as providing everything the Unitary Plan would need. This is due to the fact that many of these plans have been prepared under different planning regimes or deal with planning at a different scale. However, many ideas and techniques have been taken from the plans assessed, and have been combined to provide a best fit for the Unitary Plan in Auckland.
- The British plans have a strong, clear policy framework (e.g. Liverpool, London, Westminster, Peak District);
- The North American plans focus is on zoning and development controls with no apparent linkage to strategic or local area policies (e.g. Vancouver, Chicago, Miami);
- The Australian plans are strong on local area planning (e.g. Adelaide, Brisbane, Sydney, Victoria) and a number of ideas have been taken from the Victoria Planning Provisions which provides for a separate policy framework at the front of each council plan.
- The New Zealand Plans have a variety of approaches to how objectives & policies and rules are structured. Some are issue based (e.g. Waitakere), others are zone and activity based (e.g. Tauranga, Thames Coromandel) and some are natural and physical resource based (e.g. Tasman). The majority include a combination of issues, natural and physical resource management and zones (e.g. Wellington);
- In terms Treaty of Waitangi issues, the most common approach is to have a section at the front of the Plan. This reflects the fact that Maori values influence many/all policy areas.
- The issue of “planning scale” or the hierarchical levels in the plan was regarded as particularly important. Some of the plans assessed have policies at two or more levels including regional/state, and/or sub-regional, local area/precinct/neighbourhood. As an example, Victoria’s Plan has two levels: State and Local, with the local level split into an “area plan” level and a precinct/site specific level.
- Plans that are strongly outcome focused clearly describe the outcomes to be sought in particular areas or precincts (e.g. Victoria, Adelaide and Sydney);
- The use of standard or generic zones was seen as a key tool to reduce the amount of repetition. Local variations can be added to generic zones through the use of overlays (e.g. Chicago) or schedules to zones and overlays (e.g. Victoria).
- Where overlays are used, these can either add to the controls in the underlying “base” zone or can override them. Generally, the more detailed planning overrides the more general;
- There are a number of web-based techniques which enable easier navigation around a plan e.g. hyper-links, drop down lists which did not exist 10 years ago when first generation plans were developed;
- Links from policies and rules to planning maps and vice-versa are very useful in finding the relevant policies or rules quickly (e.g. Adelaide);

-
- Planning maps can be used in conjunction with rules to vary the development controls for particular areas without the need for a large number sub zones (for example where the difference between them is only one or two controls e.g. Sydney - density, height);
 - The use of diagrams and illustrations break up the text and/or assists in interpreting controls (e.g. Waitakere, Adelaide);
 - Many of the plans assessed have been designed to avoid repetition and this has been a key consideration in the structure proposed for the Unitary Plan.
 - New Zealand plans tend to have a lot more clutter as a result of issue statements (and discussion), explanation and reasons, and expected environmental results. These parts of a district plan are not mandatory under the RMA and it is proposed to exclude them from the Unitary Plan and include relevant non statutory explanatory material in the Section 32 report. At this stage the only second generation plan in New Zealand to remove this clutter is Tauranga.
 - There is a greater tendency for urban design codes to form part of district plans (rather than sit outside). Wellington is probably the best example of this approach. Where design codes sit outside plans, they have often been used to draft the assessment criteria;

Discussion/Testing Model for Unitary Plan Structure

Version 8: (July 18 2011)

Policy Framework

Policy Sections	1.1 Values			1.2 Natural Environment			1.3 Regional Growth and Form			1.4 Networks		1.5 Land/Water Use and Effects						1.6 Buildings and Structures		
Planning Scale	Treaty of Waitangi	Heritage	Community	Natural Resources	Hazards and Climate Change	Energy	Coastal	Rural	Urban	Public Open Space	Infrastructure	Rural	Housing	Business	Recreation	Special Uses	Effects of Land/Water Use	Built Form	Design	
Tier 1	Regional																			
Tier 2	Sub-Regional			Sub-regional areas (aligned to local board areas 1-21)			Natural Resource Management Areas			Zone or Outcome Areas										
		Albert-Eden	Devonport Takapuna	etc	Urban Air Quality	Rural Air Quality	etc		Open Space	Rural	Res	Mixed Use	Business	Industrial	Special Purpose	etc				
Tier 3	Local			Strategic Areas				Precincts (or Local Areas)				Site Specific Areas								
		Central City	Port	Airport	Flatbush	Hobsonville	Long Bay	etc	Bethells Beach	Titirangi	Anzac St	etc		Eden Park	etc					

Maps

Management Areas	Entire Region (not actually shown as a map)								
	Sub-regional: sub-sets of the entire region e.g air quality management areas								
	Zones or Outcome Areas								
	Overlays (includes precincts, local areas and site specific areas)								
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Flooding</td> <td>Signif. Landsc</td> <td>Signif. Vegetatio</td> <td>Design/Built F</td> <td>Character</td> <td>Heriatge</td> <td>Designations</td> <td>Dev.Cont</td> </tr> </table>	Flooding	Signif. Landsc	Signif. Vegetatio	Design/Built F	Character	Heriatge	Designations	Dev.Cont
Flooding	Signif. Landsc	Signif. Vegetatio	Design/Built F	Character	Heriatge	Designations	Dev.Cont		

Discussion/Testing Model for Unitary Plan Structure

Version 8: (July 18 2011)

Policy Framework

Methods

Tier 4	Rule Framework	Cross-Region Rules									
		Water discharges	Air quality	Carparking	Residential Code/s	Subdivision	Home occupations	Signage	etc		
Tier 5		Zone Rules									
	e.g.	Public Open Space	Rural	Residential	Mixed Use	Business	Industrial	Special Purpose	etc		
		Assessment criteria - only for specific locations, otherwise proposals are assessed against objectives and policies									
Tier 6		Overlay Rules									
	e.g.	Flooding	Coastal. Managemt	Signif. Landscapes	Signif. Vegetation	Design and Built Form	Character	Heriatge	Designations	Development contributions	etc
	Local variations to zone rules	Schedules to overlay	Schedules to overlay	Schedules to overlay	Schedules to overlay	Schedules to overlay	Schedules to overlay	Schedules to overlay	Schedules to overlay	Schedules to overlay	etc
		Assessment criteria - only for specific locations, otherwise proposals are assessed against objectives and policies									

Other Provisions

Tier 7	General Provisions (eg general application requirements, administrative/interpretive provisions).
Tier 8	Definitions
Tier 9	List of incorporated documents
Tier 10	List of Plan Changes/Variations