

Important information

As a result of updating the Proposed City Plan to reflect decisions on submissions, a new numbering system has been devised.

This system enables the separation of Chapters where there are sub-chapters within a Chapter.

All Hearings Recommendation Reports utilise the numbering system as notified (and where relevant identify the new Objective, Policy or Rule number under the new numbering system.

The Section 32 Reports have been updated to reflect the new numbering system.

However, the following documents utilise and discuss the numbering system of the Plan as notified:

- City Plan Hearings Recommendation;**
- Schedule of Recommendations and Reasons;**
- Meeting Minutes.**

Any appeal against a decision of the Council should appeal and utilise the new numbering system as per the decisions version of the Proposed City Plan (i.e. the new numbering system).

Where any discrepancy exists between wording or numbering in any Appendix, it is a result of a drafting anomaly and that which is notified as 'Clear Copy' within the Proposed City Plan shall prevail.

1.0 CHAPTER 2 – ISSUES OVERVIEW

2.0 LEGISLATION AND CROSS BOUNDARY ISSUES

2.1 This section deals with parts 2.1 'Context of the Plan' and 2.2 'Other Relevant Legislation and Cross-Boundary Issues'. The purpose of this section is to detail the 'fit' of the Plan in the hierarchy of policy, rules, strategy and guidelines that cover the subdivision, use and development of land.

Submissions Received

Submitter (Submission points)	Summary of relief sought
167.1.	Generally supports the approach taken in section 2.2, but requests amendment to specifically address reverse sensitivity at District boundaries by adding: ' <i>...including managing the effects of activities that transcend or adjoin the boundaries...</i> '
357.1, FS1145.1.	Support the acknowledgement of SmartGrowth and the RPS as providing the overarching strategic direction.
519.91, 520.88, 521.88.	Submit that Figure 2C should be amended to identify the coastal marine area, which is referred to in the Plan.
760.2, FS1099.2, FS1190.4, FS1191.4, FS1192.4, FS1193.4.	Suggest that plan users need to understand the dynamic nature of Mean High Water Springs and the following explanatory note should be added to section 2.2: ' <i>The City shares a land border with Western Bay of Plenty District Council and a sea border with the Bay of Plenty Regional Council at mean high water springs. Although MHWS has been illustrated on the Plan Maps, it should be noted that this is not a fixed and surveyed line but rather one which provides an indicative representation of the Council's jurisdictional boundary based on an accepted height above sea level of 0.87m above Moturiki Datum.</i> '
782.2, 782.3, 782.4, FS1145.2, FS1214.127, FS1214.128.	These submissions request amendments to Figure 2A of the Plan to recognise: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• That District Plans are not subservient to Regional Plans in the hierarchy of planning documents;• Implementation guidelines and codes in the hierarchy of planning documents; and• Iwi Management Plans in the hierarchy of planning documents.
383.105.	Supports the identification of the guidance to the Plan provided by National Policy Statements.

Recommendation

2.2 Include the following addition to section 2.2 of the Plan: '*...including managing the effects of activities that transcend or adjoin the boundaries...*'.

2.3 Identify the Coastal Marine Area in Figure 2C of the Plan.

2.4 Include the following statement in section 2.2 of the Plan to recognise the dynamic nature of MHWS: '*The City shares a land border with Western Bay of Plenty District Council and a sea border with the Bay of Plenty Regional Council at mean high water springs. Although MHWS has been illustrated on the Plan Maps, it should be noted that this is not a fixed and surveyed line but rather one which provides an indicative representation of the Council's jurisdictional boundary based on an accepted height above sea level of 0.87m above Moturiki Datum.*'

- 2.5 Amend Figure 2A to recognise that:
- District Plans are not subservient to Regional Plans in the hierarchy of planning documents;
 - The place of implementation guidelines and codes in the hierarchy of planning documents; and
 - The place of Iwi Management Plans in the hierarchy of planning documents.
- 2.6 That FS1145, FS1214, FS1099, FS1190, FS1191, FS1192 and FS1193 are accepted as further submitters under Clause 8 of the First Schedule to the RMA.

Reasons

- 2.7 The effects of activities can cross territorial boundaries and it is appropriate to recognise this in the description of cross boundary issues.
- 2.8 It is appropriate that further clarification be provided in this section of the Plan on the indicative nature of the identification of MHWS on the Plan Maps.
- 2.9 Other documents also influence the sustainable management of subdivision, use and development of land and it is appropriate to recognise these in Figure 2A.3
- 2.10 The Coastal Marine Area is an area of jurisdiction of the Bay of Plenty Regional Council referred to in the Plan and it is appropriate to recognise this in Figure 2C.
- 2.11 FS1145, FS1214, FS1099, FS1190, FS1191, FS1192 and FS1193 are submitters representing a relevant aspect of the public interest of have an interest greater than the public generally.

3.0 SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

3.1 This section provides a high level overview of the significant resource management issues facing the City. The purpose of this issue is to set the background against which the direction of the Plan is set.

Submissions Received

Submitter (Submission points)	Summary of relief sought
167.2	The aggregate and quarry association seek particular recognition of the importance of aggregate and quarry resources to the future development of the City, through the following addition to section 2.3.6: <i>'Aggregates and minerals within the City and surrounding district are an important natural resource and one which is finite and fixed in location. This resource needs to be protected and the efficient movement of the resource into and within the City needs to be provided for to ensure the long term infrastructure and development needs of the District are able to be met.'</i> Further, the aggregate and quarry association seeks that section 2.3.7 – Transportation, is amended to make reference not only to the movement of people but also goods within the District.
181.7	Submitter seeks inclusion of a statement of how changes in the High Density Residential Zone in Mt Maunganui north are to satisfy forecast growth demand, especially from 1 and 2 person households and people over 80 years.
377.17	Considers that section 2.3.5 is lacking in coverage of issues and should include all significant resource management issues on responding to population growth, and changes in household structure, including the challenges for communities where intensification is proposed. Seeks inclusion of the acceptability of intensification to existing communities as a significant issue. Also seeks a range of other additions that are: problems in forecasting growth trends; practical issues with matching incoming family housing preference with the type of development promoted in infill, greenfield and intensification areas; environmental sustainability; the scale and impact of visitor accommodation; and similar relief to that sought by in submission 181.7 above.
609.4, FS1143.4, FS1162.2.	Supports reference to SmartGrowth and cross-boundary issues but seeks addition to emphasise the importance of achieving a target of 15 dwellings per hectare in new growth areas. Further submitters all support this submission.
616.2	Seeks amendment to this section to state that the Plan seeks to address population growth through the use of age friendly guidelines to provide opportunities for a range of types of community infrastructure and residential development.
621.5, 699.1 FS1162.3.	Submitters and further submitter supports this section and seeks retention as notified.
763.10, 864.34, 868.34	Seeks amendment to highlight the importance of urban consolidation and intensification.
783.37, 834.18, FS1190.5, FS1191.5,	Seeks recognition of housing affordability as a key issue for the City.

FS1192.5, FS1193.5	
860.14	Seeks addition to highlight the importance of small-scale renewable energy sources in the future.

Recommendation

- 3.2 In submission 167.2 the Aggregate and Quarry Association seek recognition that the location of aggregates are fixed in location, finite and special recognition should be given to this resource. This is not considered necessary given that it is a similar issue for a number of resources. This section of the Plan is a high level overview and the efficiency of the use of resources is a key concept that underpins many of the significant resource management issues, but it is not necessary to state each resource in turn. The addition of the movement of goods to the transportation sections is relevant and considered appropriate.
- 3.3 The changes proposed for the High Density Residential Zone in Mt Maunganui are irrelevant to the capacity of this zone to accommodate population growth. The 'changes' relate to increasing the test for breaches of building height outside of the High Rise area. Consequently, there is no need to include a statement about how these changes are intended to accommodate population growth.
- 3.4 The issue of constraints to future greenfield development, such as the cost of infrastructure and availability of land in reasonable proximity to the City are issues that warrant discussion in this section and additional discussion could be included on these matters.
- 3.5 The acceptability of intensification in terms of lack of open space, privacy, building design and parking are genuine resource management issues. It could reasonably be said that these are not 'significant resource management issues' but at a more detailed level of consideration that follows from the more high level description of issues which is the intent of this chapter. The Plan doesn't include a detailed description of issues, which is optional content under s75(2) of the RMA. Despite this, it is reasonable to include some discussion of the changing nature of the physical land resource and built environment in the City over the term of the Plan of which these issues are a component.
- 3.6 The inherent problem in forecasting population growth is a practice/procedural issue and not a resource management issue. The issue relevant to this practice is that growth will occur, at a rate that can only be estimated, and that provision needs to be made for that growth.
- 3.7 Environmental sustainability is an issue but is also a broader concept underpinning the RMA under which all decisions must be made. It is not relevant to repeat the underlying principles of the RMA in this section of the Plan.
- 3.8 Urban consolidation is a key component of the future growth management strategy for the City, supported by the direction of SmartGrowth and the Regional Policy Statement. Further addition to the issues overview as requested by submitters 763, 864 and 868 can be added to support the direction for intensification and consolidation of commercial development in commercial centres.
- 3.9 The support for the existing content of Chapter 2 is noted and requires no further discussion. The matter of achieving 15 dwellings per hectare in growth areas is a specific response to a high level issue that is discussed elsewhere in the Plan, however, as noted above, the constraints to future greenfield development can

reasonably be considered a significant resource management issue and provided for in the discussion of significant resource management issues.

- 3.10 The Plan does not provide guidelines to create an age-friendly City, but objectives, policies and rules for the subdivision, use and development of land. No further addition is required in this respect.
- 3.11 Urban consolidation and intensification are two key elements of the strategy to accommodate population growth in the City. The addition of phrases suggested in submissions 763.10, 864.34 and 868.34 support this intent and could reasonably be added to the description of the response of the plan to significant resource management issues. Where the relief sought in these submissions requests that particular emphasis is on new growth areas this is not considered appropriate, as the Plan seeks a balance between the provision of different living environments both within the existing footprint of the City and in new growth areas.
- 3.12 The issue of housing affordability is a significant resource management issue for the City. The issue has broadly, the following factors:
 - A declining stock of land in a price range which that the majority of entrants to the housing market can afford to finance and limited provision of the stock in growth areas;
 - Existing housing supply not reflective of a changing demographic profile;
 - Housing supply and section size not reflective of an affordable profile in the City; and
 - A recent significant increase in underlying land value.
- 3.13 The efficient use of energy is a significant resource management issue, but the component of small scale renewable energy generation is a subsidiary component of this issue better considered in the relevant section of the Plan.
- 3.14 Include mention of the movement of goods as a component of the discussion on transportation as a significant resource management issue.
- 3.15 Include discussion of the effects of changing built form in the City that may arise from more intensive living as a significant resource management issue.
- 3.16 Include discussion of the constraints to greenfield development (infrastructure cost, land availability) in the discussion of significant resource management issues.
- 3.17 Include discussion of housing affordability as a significant resource management issue.
- 3.18 Include discussion on urban consolidation and intensification, and the preference for business development to occur near these residential environments.
- 3.19 No specific mention of the numbers of dwellings required in urban growth areas, issues with forecasting population growth, environmental sustainability, specific discussion of the effects of certain activities (such as intensification); or the contribution of small scale renewable energy generation as significant resource management issues in the Plan.
- 3.20 FS1190, FS1191, FS1192, FS1193, FS1162, and FS1143 are all accepted as further submitters under Clause 8 of the First Schedule to the RMA.

Reasons

- 3.21 The purpose of this section is to discuss high level significant resource management issues and does not warrant a detailed description of the importance of each resource that the City relies upon for future growth.
- 3.22 The efficient use of energy is a significant resource management issue, but the component of small scale renewable energy generation is a subsidiary component of this issue better considered in the relevant section of the Plan.
- 3.23 The changes proposed in the Plan for the High Density Residential Zone at Mount Maunganui north are not relevant to the overall issue of accommodating population growth as these changes do not directly affect the capacity of the zone. They only provide clarity over the Plan's intent in relation to height.
- 3.24 The Plan does not provide 'guidelines for an age-friendly city' and it would be inappropriate to mention that it does.
- 3.25 Minor wording amendments to the issue in terms of urban consolidation and intensification, and the location of commercial development, will clarify the policy direction of the Plan. It also recognises that urban consolidation is a key component of the future growth management strategy for the City, supported by the direction of SmartGrowth and the operative Regional Policy Statement. The matter of achieving 15 dwellings per hectare in growth areas is a specific response to a high level issue that is discussed elsewhere in the Plan
- 3.26 The issues of the movement of goods, the impacts of changing built form in the City resulting from more intensive living, the constraints to greenfield development (infrastructure cost, land availability), and housing affordability are all significant resource management issues that could be further elaborated in section 2.3 of the Plan.
- 3.27 FS1190, FS1191, FS1192, FS1193, FS1162, and FS1143 are submitters representing a relevant aspect of the public interest of have an interest greater than the public generally.

