

AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN
INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

Te Paepae Kaiwawao Motuhake o te Mahere Kotahitanga o Tāmaki Makaurau

**Report to Auckland Council
Hearing topic 002
ePlan and miscellaneous**

July 2016

Hearing Topic 002 ePlan and miscellaneous

Contents

1. Hearing topic overview	2
1.1. Topic description.....	2
1.2. Summary of the Panel's recommendations.....	2
1.3. Scope	2
1.4. Documents relied on.....	2
2. Panel Recommendations and reasons.....	3
3. Reference documents	9
3.1. General topic documents	9
3.2. Specific evidence.....	9

1. Hearing topic overview

1.1. Topic description

This topic relates to submissions:

- i. regarding the functionality of the ePlan presentation of the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan, and
- ii. that are outside the scope of the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan or beyond the jurisdiction of the Independent Hearings Panel.

The body of this report sets out the issues raised through the submission and hearing process, the Panel's response to these issues and the reasons for the response.

1.2. Summary of the Panel's recommendations

The Hearings Panel considers that evidence from Council on the technical improvements that can be made to the ePlan is helpful for determining relief sought on these submission points.

Evidence presented by a number of parties was sufficient to enable the reallocation of submission points to other topics. These submission points as contained in the Hearing Record are considered sufficiently within scope to be considered as part of other hearing topics.

The remaining submission points were related to either issues outside of the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan and the Resource Management Act 1991, or were beyond the jurisdiction of the Hearings Panel.

The Panel considers that none of its recommendations on these matters involve significant change to the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan and therefore an evaluation in terms of section 32AA of the Resource Management Act 1991 is not required.

1.3. Scope

The Panel considers that the recommendations in section 2 below are within scope of submissions.

For an explanation of the Panel's approach to scope see the Panel's Report to Auckland Council – Overview of recommendations July 2016.

1.4. Documents relied on

Documents relied on by the Panel in making its recommendations are listed in full below. Please see the reference documents listed under section 3.

Submission points coded to ePlan were referred to Auckland Council to report on prior to hearing. These submission points were the subject of the report entitled *Report for Independent Hearing Panel on submissions related to the ePlan* dated 17 September 2014. This report was presented in evidence to the hearing by Auckland Council.

2. Panel Recommendations and reasons

The following table summarises the Panel's response to the points raised in submissions and the reasons for the response.

Submissions	Panel recommended changes to proposed Auckland Unitary Plan	Reasons	Evidence relied upon	Significance	Scope
All submissions coded to the theme General and topic Miscellaneous.	None – all submission points recommended to be declined.	All submissions seek relief that is outside of the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan, the Resource Management Act 1991, Local Government (Auckland Transitional Provisions) Act 2010 or beyond the jurisdiction of the Hearings Panel.	Legal submission from Auckland Council dated 17 September 2014.	Declining of these submission points and therefore not recommending any changes to the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan is not considered to be significant in terms of section 32AA.	Yes
ePlan submissions seeking the GIS and hard copy maps are set to display only district or regional level rules.	None – all submission points recommended to be declined.	Separation of mapped rules into separate district and regional maps would be contrary to the integrated nature of the PAUP.	Auckland Council – Report for IHP on submissions related to ePlan dated 17 September 2014. See section 3.1.	Declining of these submission points and therefore not recommending any changes to the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan is not considered to be significant in terms of section 32AA.	Yes
ePlan submissions seeking integration	None – all submission points recommended to be declined.	The current level of detail against which the ePlan text	Auckland Council – Report for Independent Hearings	Declining of these submission points and	Yes

Submissions	Panel recommended changes to proposed Auckland Unitary Plan	Reasons	Evidence relied upon	Significance	Scope
within and between the ePlan and GIS Viewer.		and GIS maps are linked is considered appropriate. The time and cost associated with increasing the scope and detail of this linking is considered to be too great relative to benefits. It is also understood that aspects of this relief will be able to be addressed once the plan is operative through a 'phase two' project to improve the planning enquiry ePlan tool. The planning enquiry tool is considered to be the preferred intermediary step between the maps and the ePlan.	Panel on submissions related to ePlan dated 17 September 2014. Section 2.2 and 3.2 are considered relevant.	therefore not recommending any changes to the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan is not considered to be significant in terms of section 32AA.	
ePlan submissions on overlay groupings within the ePlan and GIS Viewer	Yes – ePlan text headings and GIS headings to be aligned once both agreed upon through respective hearing topics deliberations.	Headings of text and maps need to align for ease of navigation and accuracy of plan use.	Auckland Council – Report for Independent Hearings Panel on submissions related to ePlan dated 17 September 2014. Section 3.3 considered relevant.	The aligning of headings between the text and maps of the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan is not considered a significant shift as it will enhance Plan usability from its current state.	Yes

Submissions	Panel recommended changes to proposed Auckland Unitary Plan	Reasons	Evidence relied upon	Significance	Scope
ePlan submissions on new features / functionalities	None – all submission points recommended to be declined with the exception of submission points seeking that schedules contained within PDFs be brought into the text of the ePlan – these points are supported.	Functionality of ePlan considered sufficient for navigation and usability. The exception to this (being the schedules contained within PDFs) is supported to enable the planning enquiry function to identify information from these schedules.	Auckland Council – Report for Independent Hearings Panel on submissions related to ePlan dated 17 September 2014. Section 3.4 considered relevant.	The movement of the schedule information from PDF into the ePlan is not considered a significant shift as the information itself remains the same, only the access to this information changes.	Yes
ePlan submissions on legibility and cartographic issues	Yes - agree that the maps and legend should have colours that align exactly. Also recommend that zoning map colours and patterns used for other layers be presented so that layers can be easily visually differentiated from each other.	The differentiation of colours and patterns within the maps needs to be optimised to support the identification of what specific provisions affect land or water.	Auckland Council – Report for Independent Hearings Panel on submissions related to ePlan dated 17 September 2014. Section 3.5 considered relevant.	Amendments to the colours and patterns within the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan maps is not considered to be a significant shift.	Yes
ePlan submissions on labelling of scheduled items and identification of zones and overlays	None – all submission points recommended to be declined.	Functionality enhancements made that allow users to see in red the locations of features identified in the property summary box. This assists users to clearly identify these	Auckland Council – Report for Independent Hearings Panel on submissions related to ePlan dated 17 September 2014. Section	Declining of these submission points and therefore not recommending any changes to the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan is	Yes

Submissions	Panel recommended changes to proposed Auckland Unitary Plan	Reasons	Evidence relied upon	Significance	Scope
		features on their properties. To go beyond that and label features on the maps is not considered necessary and may lead to a cluttering of the maps (both hard and soft copy).	3.6 considered relevant.	not considered to be significant in terms of section 32AA.	
ePlan submissions on accuracy of location of scheduled items and appendices	Yes – accept that mapped information needs to be made as accurate as possible to determine compliance with controls. Accept however that this cannot be achieved for all mapped data and that an ongoing programme of map data correction through plan changes will be needed.	The ability of plan users to determine compliance for developments is dependent upon the mapped information being accurate.	Auckland Council – Report for Independent Hearings Panel on submissions related to ePlan dated 17 September 2014. Section 3.7 considered relevant.	Accepting in part these submission points and therefore not recommending any changes to the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan is not considered to be significant in terms of section 32AA.	Yes
ePlan submissions on printing at smaller scale of up to 1:25000	None – all submission points recommended to be declined.	Enabling the ePlan to produce maps for printing at scales beyond 1:15,000 will result in unwieldy delays in the downloading of these maps. 1:15,000 scale is also considered sufficient for hard copy maps to view wider areas	Auckland Council – Report for Independent Hearings Panel on submissions related to ePlan dated 17 September 2014. Section 3.8 considered relevant.	Declining of these submission points and therefore not recommending any changes to the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan is not considered to be significant in terms of	Yes

Submissions	Panel recommended changes to proposed Auckland Unitary Plan	Reasons	Evidence relied upon	Significance	Scope
		beyond even larger land holdings.		section 32AA.	
ePlan submissions on online pdf supply based on hard copy grid	None – all submission points recommended to be declined.	Enabling the ePlan to produce maps for printing at the scale of the hard copy proposed Auckland Unitary Plan maps will result in unwieldy delays in the downloading of these maps.	Auckland Council – Report for Independent Hearings Panel on submissions related to ePlan dated 17 September 2014. Section 3.9 considered relevant.	Declining of these submission points and therefore not recommending any changes to the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan is not considered to be significant in terms of section 32AA.	Yes
ePlan submissions on the use of non-statutory information in GIS viewer. Examples being park names, addresses, legal descriptions, site boundaries and extent of streams.	None – all submission points recommended to be declined.	Amending information owned or administered by departments outside of the Unitary Plan or Council is outside of the jurisdictional scope of the Hearings Panel.	Auckland Council – Report for Independent Hearings Panel on submissions related to ePlan dated 17 September 2014. Section 3.10 considered relevant.	Declining of these submission points and therefore not recommending any changes to the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan is not considered to be significant in terms of section 32AA.	Yes
ePlan submissions on use of LINZ CRS (property)	Yes – accept these submissions.	Aligning mapping layers with property boundaries correctly does support the consistent	Auckland Council – Report for IHP on submissions related to ePlan dated 17	Accepting these submission points is not considered to be	Yes

Submissions	Panel recommended changes to proposed Auckland Unitary Plan	Reasons	Evidence relied upon	Significance	Scope
database		implementation of controls.	September 2014. Section 3.11 considered relevant.	significant in terms of section 32AA	

3. Reference documents

The documents listed below, as well as the submissions and evidence presented to the Panel on this topic, have been relied upon by the Panel in making its recommendations.

The documents can be located on the Auckland Unitary Plan Independent Hearings Panel website (aupihp.govt.nz) on the Hearings page under the relevant hearing topic number and name.

You can use the links provided below to locate the documents, or you can go to the website and search for the document by name or date loaded.

(The date in brackets after the document link refers to the date the document was loaded onto the aupihp website. Note this may not be the same as the date of the document referred to in the report.)

3.1. General topic documents

[002 Parties and Issues Report - 6 Sept 2014](#) (15 October 2014)

[002-Submissions Points Pathway Report-15 Dec 2014](#) (23 December 2014)

[002-Hearing Record](#) (05 December 2014)

3.2. Specific evidence

[Hearing document](#) (29 October 2014)

[Hearing Evidence Legal Submission](#) (31 October 2014)