
DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW

1. Purpose of report

This report seeks feedback and approval from the Strategy and Policy Committee (“SPC”) on a proposed two-stage review of the Wellington City District Plan (“district plan”). In doing so it explores the merits of continuing the current chapter by chapter review programme (“rolling review”), immediate full review, and a preferred two-stage option. It draws on detailed analysis of the district plan, the district plans and approaches of other territorial authorities, and feedback from targeted consultation.

2. Report summary

The report sets out that the district plan requires a comprehensive review in order to:

- address statutory review requirements under the Resource Management Act (“RMA”) – some forty percent of the plan is overdue for review,
- re-establish a clear role for the plan and effectively align it with Council’s key strategic documents including *Smart Green Wellington* and the *Urban Development Strategy*,
- build on the existing strengths of the plan whilst updating it to address current and emerging challenges and priorities (e.g. *Smart Green Wellington*),
- ensure it maintains the flexibility to manage change and adaptation as the City evolves over time,
- address significant drafting and structural complexities that have emerged as a result of the rolling review over eleven years,
- promote greater public accessibility to the plan and its content, and
- in doing all of the above maintain confidence in the plan and certainty to plan users and the community.

The existing “rolling review” programme is not capable of addressing these requirements in a timely fashion and is likely to create further complexity in the plan and its understanding. Rolling reviews deliver only incremental change, and a faster, more comprehensive approach is required.

APPENDIX 1

Two other options have been investigated – an immediate full review of the plan to be completed over six years and a two-stage review to be completed over eight years¹.

Both options represent a comprehensive review and would address the requirements set out above. The options have similar additional costs (approx. \$3m). However, the two-stage review is preferred because it aligns Council's actual district plan needs and responsibilities over time, achieves a greater overlap with running costs, and does not involve the significant duplication of recent plan review work associated with the full review.

3. Recommendations

Officers recommend that the committee:

1. *Receive the information.*
2. *Note that Council has a statutory obligation to review those parts of the district plan not yet reviewed.*
3. *Note that a continuation of the rolling review programme will not address the issues identified for the district plan.*
4. *Note that three options have been identified and that the recommended option is a two-stage review.*
5. *Agree to the two stage review for the Wellington City District Plan:*
 - *Stage 1 being in the period 2012-2015 and focused on review of those chapters of the plan not yet reviewed and other high priority issues, and*
 - *Stage 2 being in the period 2015-2018 and focused on review of all other chapters of the plan.*
6. *Note that the committee has recently resolved to notify the Thorndon Heritage Area and Johnsonville Design Guide plan changes.*
7. *Note that officers will report back through the Long-Term Plan process with:*
 - (a) *A detailed two-stage district plan work programme;*
 - (b) *A refined budget for the detailed work programme;*
 - (c) *A future approach and structure for the district plan; and*
 - (d) *A recommended approach to e-Plan opportunities.*

4. Why review the district plan?

The district plan is the primary regulatory tool for managing land use and development in the City. It is therefore an important public investment, and it is expected of territorial authorities that district plans are kept current.

¹ These timeframes are governed by RMA requirements

APPENDIX 1

Good district plans are easy to use, provide clarity and certainty, and deliver good quality development.

Specific to Wellington a number of significant issues have come together to make this an opportune and necessary time to consider the future of the district plan:

- Forty percent of the plan is overdue for review under the compulsory ten-year review cycle of the RMA².
- The majority of the plan predates key Council strategy documents including the *Urban Development Strategy* and *Smart Green Wellington*, and a review at this point can ensure a clear role for the plan and effective alignment with Council's strategic directions.
- The plan is an "effects based" document typical of first generation RMA plans – for this reason it is effective at managing development on individual sites but lacks the clarity and direction to deliver more prescriptive, strategic planning outcomes for the City.
- The plan has not been considered in its entirety since it was developed in the 1990s – it has been kept up to date by multiple individual plan changes via Council's ongoing rolling review³.
- The plan changes have not always been well integrated into the main document and as a result in part lacks coherence, is difficult to navigate, and is voluminous.
- For these reasons many regular plan users have lost confidence in the plan and it is adding significant transaction cost to resource consent processes.
- There is a significant set of external pressures on the plan, including RMA reform, national and regional planning initiatives, and the need to make the City more resilient to hazard and climate change – it is especially significant that central government has signalled RMA reform to improve planning outcomes in metropolitan urban centres.

Taking these issues together the future of the district plan requires urgent consideration and a deliberate programme to address the issues raised above. The district plan is a significant public document that will realise environmental and public benefit, and reduce costs to applicants, Council and ratepayers if developed in response to these issues⁴. In this regard there is room for improvement and the opportunity to build from the robust base established by previous Council plan change processes. Further, Council cannot avoid its statutory and governance responsibilities to keep the plan up to date. More details on key issues are set out in the sections below.

It is noted that "full reviews" of district plans are rare. This is because most territorial authorities have changed individual chapters in response to pressures over time and their plans have become "out of synch". From this position it is easier to continue a rolling review because it allows resourcing and flexibility advantages, and because it is all the RMA actually requires (i.e. that individual

² Those chapters still unreviewed are listed in **Appendix 2**

³ 76 plan changes have occurred in the period 2000-2011 – a full list is included as **Appendix 1**

⁴ The district plan generates an average of approximately 1000 resource consent applications per year

provisions are reviewed on a ten-yearly basis). Whangarei District represents a good recent example of a more comprehensive approach – they committed to a “managed rolling review” undertaking individual plan changes as part of an overall programme designed to arrive at a fully reviewed district plan in a specified timeframe.

5. The district plan today

The development of the current district plan commenced in the early 1990s and continued throughout that decade before becoming operative in 2000. The thinking at the time was strongly aligned to early RMA philosophy of light touch, site-by-site “effects based” planning (*“leave it to the market to sort out”*).

Since 2000 the plan has been kept up to date by individual “plan changes”. These have become more prescriptive over time, though they have generally retained the effects based tenet of the original district plan. In this context plan changes 48 (Central Area), 72 (Residential Areas) and 73 (Suburban Centres) are significant. These areas cover the majority of urban Wellington and generate approximately 90% of all resource consents. These plan changes have taken new approaches to land use control than the original plan, adopting firmer control over issues such as retail floorspace, urban design and residential infill.

Those chapters of the plan not yet reviewed⁵ are typical of the early district plan thinking and require updating to come up to a contemporary standard. They are not specific enough about what activities are and are not anticipated, and therefore lack the certainty of outcome and process expected by applicants and the community.

Considered in its entirety as a document the district plan is sophisticated and innovative by New Zealand standards. In particular, approaches to urban design, mixed-use, retail floorspace and residential infill have gained national attention. At least in part these approaches have been driven by the particular challenges of planning in Wellington, and a high level of community engagement in planning issues.

When first drafted the district plan was a coherent, easily navigable document, but this has been impacted on through the introduction of plan changes over eleven years. Particular challenges that have emerged include:

- integration of plan changes into the overall document, resulting in inconsistent and cumbersome structure,
- inconsistent and wordy drafting,
- extensive cross referencing of provisions requiring significant navigation throughout the entire document,
- significant volume and repetition across the plan.

These are significant issues for a document that gets so much use. Regular plan users report that these issues make using the plan difficult, time consuming and costly.

⁵ See **Appendix 2** for a full list of chapters yet to be reviewed

In addition the strong “effects based” approach of the plan does not provide certainty of process or outcome. In the purest sense an effects based approach essentially means “*make an application and assess it on its merits*”. This approach provides flexibility to land use and development and has been significant in the evolution of the City in the last 10 – 15 years. However, it also means that specific developments can catch people by surprise and applicants often enter into resource consent processes without knowing how much it will cost or what chance of success they have. For these reasons the prevalence of this philosophy in the district plan requires careful attention, particularly as district planning has gradually moved towards methods of planning that provide greater certainty.

Concerns raised with the current district plan are important. Given the volume of resource consents that Council processes it is important that the district plan functions efficiently and provides certainty to applicants and the community. For applicants and submitters the resource consent process can be very costly, and therefore reducing the cost of regulation (where possible and appropriate) should be a key priority.

6. Emerging issues

When we are considering the effectiveness of the district plan we need to consider the external pressures that act on it. At the current time these include:

- **Smart Green Wellington / Council’s future strategic direction** – the district plan can play an important regulatory role and also has potential to incentivise desired strategic outcomes for the City.
- **Central government RMA reform** – this is wide ranging but likely to promote a stronger role for territorial authorities in metropolitan areas in urban design and strategic land use planning.
- **Second generation Wellington regional policy statement** – this is also wide ranging and will place an immediate requirement on Council to review landscape and indigenous biodiversity controls in the district plan⁶.
- **Climate change and natural hazards** – the district plan can play a key role in Wellington becoming a more resilient city in response to these pressures.
- **Notification** – the use of non-notification clauses in the existing district plan has received attention and their future use will need to be carefully considered as part of Council’s overall approach to third party input on planning processes in the City.
- **e-Plan** - significant opportunities exist to improve the application and accessibility of the district plan through an intuitive on-line presence. This aligns with Council’s digital strategy and should be investigated as a matter of priority.
- **Customer focus**– the performance of the district plan is also influenced by how Council administers it. Continued best practice processes for engaging

⁶ A landscape plan change is anticipated to require technical investigation in the order of \$500,000

APPENDIX 1

with applicants and the community, in processing resource consents, and in educating the community on the district plan and processes will be needed.

Preliminary scoping of these issues has been undertaken, but further detailed investigation is required to address these issues in future district plan changes.

Some initial thought has been given to achieving greater consistency with other district plans in the Wellington region and / or other metropolitan centres. Possibilities include developing a “combined plan” or combined provisions with other metropolitan councils. Cross boundary issues (e.g. landscape protection) can lend themselves to co-operative approaches between Councils. Discussions have also been held with Iwi and there may be potential for more regionally consistent Maori cultural provisions in the plan.

Officers also note that SPC has recently resolved to notify plan changes for the Thorndon Heritage Area and the Johnsonville Medium Density Residential Area (a design guide) and it is important that these plan changes are developed with the future of the district plan in mind. This will ensure optimal alignment with work undertaken as part of a more comprehensive review and an overall rationalised district plan (should SPC agree to the recommendations).

7. What needs to happen?

In responding to the issues raised the following priorities have been identified:

- **A co-ordinated comprehensive review of the district plan is required in the short-term** to address current statutory requirements under the RMA, Council’s strategic requirements, and the external pressures identified.
- As part of a co-ordinated comprehensive review Council should clearly establish the role of the district plan in Council’s wider toolkit, and its alignment with *Smart Green Wellington* and the *Urban Development Strategy*.
- The approach of the plan also needs to be considered alongside Council’s strategic direction – in particular consideration needs to be given to more strategic, spatial planning approaches and how these might co-exist alongside effects based provisions. It is anticipated that a mix of the two approaches will be appropriate, with strategic / spatial planning approaches being utilised in parts of the City where Council is seeking to deliver predetermined outcomes.
- Ensure new chapters and provisions can adapt to new development pressures and have reasonable “shelf-life”. This will avoid the need to revisit work in the short-term and ensure Council gets a good return on its investment in the plan review.
- As a matter of priority future changes to the district plan should seek to restore consistency to structure and drafting across the overall document, and reduce complexity.
- Council should develop a strategy for engaging with the community and key stakeholders as part of plan change processes – the district plan is “their plan” and their input and buy in is essential to its success.

8. How do we do it?

Continuation of the rolling review will not address the needs outlined in Section 7. It would not achieve change quickly enough and would continue existing challenges. Notwithstanding, it should be noted that all plan reviews take time as they are governed the statutory requirements of the RMA involving public notice and submissions, hearings and appeal. A full plan review normally takes five or six years to complete.

In looking at options, officers have considered how best to balance existing resources and commitments with a change process. Two options have been developed and these are detailed below.

8.1 *Option 1: Immediate Full Review (2012-2018)*

This option is targeted to notifying and resolving a new plan in the shortest possible timeframe (estimated six years – 2012 to 2018). If there is support for full immediate review of the district plan then this is the best option to pursue. However, because of the pace of change there will be a cost – it will involve duplicating recent review work and significant short-term resourcing including a requirement for planning consultants or additional staff. A lower than usual proportion of plan review costs could be absorbed by normal running costs, and some unnecessary work would also be included in the work programme (i.e. work not required to be done in the short-term).

The duplication of significant recent work is an issue not just to Council, but to submitters and the community. Plan changes 72 and 73 (Residential and Suburban Centre reviews) were significant chapter reviews notified in 2009 and both are still ongoing through appeal processes. Immediate full review would mean reviewing and revisiting this recent work, imposing further costs on submitters and appellants who have invested time and money in PC72 and 73. Accordingly, it risks Council's relationship with these stakeholders, may create a negative perception in the community, and result in "consultation fatigue".

8.2 *Option 2: Two-stage Review (2012-2020)*

This option is recommended by officers, with the stages aligned to the 2012-2015 and 2015-2018 trienniums. Appeals would likely extend the process until 2020, meaning an estimated 8 year period. This is two years longer than Option 1, however it acknowledges existing workloads, takes account of current commitments and reduces reliance on external resources. Appendix 3 sets out an indicative draft work programme to demonstrate the intent of the two-stage review. The overall premise is to address all unreviewed and high priority chapters of the plan in the period 2012 – 2015, and all other chapters in the period 2015-2018. There would be flexibility within the two stages to notify individual chapters or groups of chapters, and to shift individual issues between stages if priorities shift over time. However, all work would be done in the context of an overall programme of work designed to update the district plan within a specified timeframe.

This approach would ensure Council's statutory responsibilities and strategic needs are addressed over time. Compared to the full review there would be

APPENDIX 1

some efficiency loss caused by splitting the review process in two, but there would be value gains from avoiding duplication of recent plan changes and greater overlap with day-to-day running costs.

The rolling review approach has meant that the component parts of the plan are at different stages. The two-stage review acknowledges this by proposing a managed transition from the plan in its current form to a fully reviewed plan within a managed timeframe.

8.3 Summary of costs and benefits of each option

Option	Benefits	Costs
Option 1: Full review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New plan addressing all existing needs resolved in shortest possible timeframe (6 years) • Efficiency and cost gains through reviewing the plan in one go and within a short timeframe • Short-term programme maximises likelihood of full review being achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duplicate recent plan review work reimposing recent costs on Council and submitters. • Duplication of recent work may also impact Council relations with key stakeholders, Council's image, and create consultation fatigue • Will involve review of work not required in the short-term • Low proportion of costs could be absorbed into day to day running costs due to rapid pace of change • Significant short term resourcing and financial costs due to rapid pace of change (including legal and consultant costs)
Option 2: Two-stage review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New plan addressing all existing needs resolved in slightly longer timeframe (8 years) • High priority needs addressed in short time frame as part of Stage 1 (5-6 years) • Managed transition from existing rolling review programme to a fully reviewed district plan – avoids duplication of recent plan review work • Best matches the work programme with actual district plan needs over time • Higher proportion of costs could be absorbed into day to day running costs due to slower pace of change • Lower short term resourcing and financial costs due to slower pace of change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slower pace of change (all needs addressed in 8 years) • Efficiency and cost losses through reviewing the plan in two-stages and over a longer timeframe • Longer-term programme may decrease possibility of full review being achieved • Significant resourcing and financial costs (including legal and consultant costs)

APPENDIX 1

9. Financial considerations

To further assist SPC in understanding the costs and benefits of each option some indicative costs / estimates have been developed and are presented in the table below. Some points to note:

- These refer to the additional and total costs of each option.
- Additional costs are those over and above usual running costs which are represented as “baseline cost” in the first row in the table below – these are estimated at \$1m per annum based on analysis of recent budgets (in 2011 dollar value).
- A status quo / rolling review option is also represented below for further context - given Council’s current responsibilities and needs for the district plan the figures shown below for the status quo / rolling review are regarded as the minimum that Council could reasonably invest in the district plan.
- Significant costs in undertaking district plan review work includes staff costs, legal costs, external consultants, hearings and meetings – all of these are incorporated into the ROCs below.
- Figures have been adjusted for inflation at a rate of 2.5% per annum.

Option	Annual Cost*	Projected Cost 2012-2016 (5 years)	Projected Cost 2012-21 (10 years)
BASELINE COST	\$1,000,000	\$5,255,000	\$11,205,000
Rolling Review (Added Cost)	\$100,000	\$525,000	\$1,120,000
Rolling Review (Total Cost)	\$1,100,000	\$5,780,000	\$12,325,000
Option 1: Full Review (Added Cost)	\$500,000	\$2,630,000	\$3,195,000
Option 1: Full Review (Total Cost)	\$1,500,000	\$7,885,000	\$14,400,000
Option 2: Two-stage Review (Added Cost)	\$375,000	\$1,970,000	\$3,275,000
Option 2: Two-stage Review (Total Cost)	\$1,375,000	\$7,225,000	\$14,480,000

* 2011 dollar value

It should be noted that how we review the district plan should not be a purely financial consideration. The district plan is the primary tool regulating land use and development in the City. It delivers benefits that cannot always be easily quantified; and if drafted effectively will realise significant savings to resource consent applicants and submitters. These factors should be considered alongside the financial implications for Council.

In addition, costs need to be considered as part of the ongoing requirement to keep the district plan up to date over the long term. The two-stage review acknowledges this requirement, and seeks to optimise alignment of the plan’s content, Council investment, and actual need / requirement over time. For this reason it is the recommended option despite having a slightly higher projected cost over a ten year horizon.

10. LTP implications

The proposed options have been developed to align with the 2012-2015 and 2015-2018 trienniums, to align with Council's 2012-22 and 2015-25 long term plans (LTPs). It is recommended that officers develop a work programme for the two-stage option to be included and costed as part of the upcoming Long-Term Plan process. A draft work programme for the two-stage review option is included as Appendix 3.

11. Next steps

This is the first step in a potential comprehensive work-programme to review the district plan. Drawing on the recommendations of this report the next steps would be for officers to report back to SPC with:

- a more detailed work programme for the preferred option,
- a recommended approach and structure for a new district plan,
- the outcomes of investigations into e-Plan opportunities.

Contact Officer: *Andrew Macleod, Principal Advisor (District Plan), Policy & Planning*

Supporting Information
<p>1) Strategic Fit / Strategic Outcome</p> <p><i>Consideration has been given to Council's strategic direction and subsequent changes to the district plan will need give effect to this, including Smart Green Wellington and the City Centre Framework.</i></p>
<p>2) LTCCP/Annual Plan reference and long term financial impact</p> <p><i>The option resolved by Council will inform the prioritisation of Council's future activities, as developed in the long-term plan and annual plan. Indicative figures have been provided to assist in understanding financial implications.</i></p>
<p>3) Treaty of Waitangi considerations</p> <p><i>Policy not yet under development. Future changes to the district plan will need to acknowledge the role of mana whenua and iwi in Wellington City.</i></p>
<p>4) Decision-Making</p> <p><i>This report does not seek a significant decision. The report identifies options and further work is required to develop any of these into detail. Councillors will be asked to make decisions on subsequent plan changes.</i></p>
<p>5) Consultation</p> <p><i>Targeted surveys and interviews have been undertaken. Full public consultation will be required under the Resource Management Act to implement changes to district plan policy. It is also anticipated that draft plan changes will be consulted on outside of the formal RMA consultation process.</i></p>
<p>6) Legal Implications</p> <p><i>There are no legal issues</i></p>
<p>7) Consistency with existing policy</p> <p><i>There are no immediate policy implications.</i></p>

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 1

Changes to the Wellington City District Plan

Plan Change	Description	Status
76.	Minor Amendments to District Plan Text & Maps	Summary of Submissions notified May 2011
75.	Centres Heritage Areas	Operative July 2011
74.	Telecommunications Structures	Under appeal
73.	Suburban Centre Review	Under appeal
72.	Residential Review	Under appeal
71.	General Minor Amendments to District Plan Text & Maps IV	Operative March 2010
70.	Earthworks	Operative September 2010
69.	Contaminated Land	Operative March 2010
68.	Ngauranga Forest Rezoning	Operative November 2009
67.	Rezoning of 43 Spenmoor Street, Newlands	Under appeal
66.	Amendments to Suburban Centre Provisions & Associated Definitions	Withdrawn , replaced by PC73
65.	Earthworks Provisions	Withdrawn , replaced by PC70
64.	Amendments to Kiwi Point Quarry Provisions	Operative July 2009
63.	General Minor Amendments to District Plan Text and Maps III	Operative July 2008
62.	Rezoning at Bellevue Residential Estate (Newlands) & Associated Policy Amendment	Operative May 2011
61.	Rezoning Land off Huntleigh Park Way, Heke Street, & Thatcher Crescent (Ngaio) from Rural Area to Residential (Outer)	Operative May 2011
60.	Churton Park Suburban Centre Rezoning	Operative November 2009
59.	Rezoning of 14 Westwood Road, Tawa	Operative July 2008
58.	Additions to Current Heritage Listings	Under appeal
57.	Provision for Non-Airport Activities within the Airport and Golf Course Recreation Precinct	Operative November 2009
56.	Managing Infill Housing Development	Operative July 2009
55.	Rezoning of Former Owhiro Bay Quarry Site	Operative May 2011
54.	Rezoning of 178 & 180 Owhiro Bay Parade	Operative May 2011
53.	Listed Heritage Buildings	Under appeal
52.	Suburban Centre Rule Amendments	Withdrawn , replaced by PC73
51.	Amendments to Financial Contributions	Operative July 2008
50.	Aro Valley Boundary Adjustments and Pre-1930s Demolition Rule	Operative July 2009
49.	Additions to Proposed District Plan Change 48 (Central Area Review) - Port Noise Provisions	Operative July 2008
48.	Central Area Review	Under appeal
47.	Takapu Island Rezoning	Operative July 2009

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 1

Plan Change	Description	Status
46.	Subdivision Design Guide Review	Decision notified March 2008
45.	Urban Development Area and Structure Plans	Under appeal
44.	General Minor Amendments to District Plan Maps and Text II	Operative July 2008
43.	Heritage Provisions	Under appeal
42.	Clarification of Airport Precinct Rules	Withdrawn , replaced by PC57
41.	Design and Wind Controls for the Operational Port Area	Withdrawn , replaced by PC48
40.	Amendments to Newtown Suburban Centre Character Area	Operative July 2008
39.	Controls on Residential Development in Newtown, Berhampore & Mt Cook	Operative July 2008
38.	Residential Character in Newtown, Berhampore & Mt Cook	Operative July 2008
37.	Chest Hospital Heritage Area	Operative July 2006
36.	Northern Growth Management Framework Reference	Decision notified September 2006
35.	Hazardous Substances	Operative July 2006
34.	General Minor Amendments to District Plan & Maps	Operative July 2006
33.	Ridgelines & Hilltops (Visual Amenity) & Rural Area	Operative November 2009
32.	Renewable Energy	Operative July 2009
31.	Woodman Drive & Bing Lucas Drive, Tawa	Operative July 2006
30.	Ohiro Road, Brooklyn - Zone Change	Appeal received
29.	Ladbroke Drive - Zone Change	Operative November 2004
28.	Non-notification Statements in the Operative District Plan	Operative July 2006
27.	Khouri Avenue/Makara Road - Zone Change	Operative July 2006
26.	Taylor Preston Area, Ngauranga Gorge - Rationalisation of Zone Boundaries	Operative July 2006
25.	Kiwi Point Quarry Extension, Ngauranga Gorge	Operative July 2006
24.	Downing Street & Silverstream Road, Crofton Downs - Zone Change	Operative November 2004
23.	Central Area Noise Insulation Rules	Operative June 2004
22.	Hazard (Fault Line) Area Realignment & Rules	Operative July 2004
21.	Wellington Stadium Coach Parking	Operative February 2004
20.	Moeller Street, Oriental Bay	Operative February 2004
19.	20A Oriental Terrace - Zone Change	Operative July 2006
18.	Oriental Bay Height Area	Operative July 2006
17.	Evans Bay Patent Slip Area - Zone Change	Operative February 2004
16.	Central Area Noise Rules	Withdrawn , replaced by PC23

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 1

Plan Change	Description	Status
15.	Airport Curfew Exemption Rules	Operative October 2003
14.	Utility Rules & Associated Definitions	Operative July 2006
13.	Futuna Chapel, Karori	Operative July 2006
12.	Hill Street - Zone Change	Operative September 2004
11.	Controlled & Discretionary Activities in Chapter 5 (Residential Area Rules) - Zone Change	Operative October 2003
10.	David Crescent - Zone Change	Operative March 2003
9.	Tapu Te Ranga Marae - Zone Change*	Operative July 2006
8.	Open Space & Rural Sites - Zone Change	Operative March 2003
7.	Aro Valley Character Controls*	Operative June 2004
6.	Residential Definitions & Rules*	Operative November 2004
5.	Amendment to the Victoria University Institutional Precinct	Operative July 2002
4.	Changes to Air Noise Boundary	Operative July 2002
3	Heritage notation for 6 Stowe Hill / 6A Frandi Street	Operative July 2002
2.	Commercial Sex Premises, Courtenay Place	Operative April 2004
1.	Tawa & Takapu Flood Hazard Areas	Operative July 2002

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 2

Chapters of the District Plan not yet reviewed

Chapter	Title	Notes
1	The District Plan	Includes introduction and strategic approach
2	Issues for Tangata Whenua	
3	General Provisions	Includes definitions and guide to using the plan
8	Institutional Precincts Objectives and Policies	
9	Institutional Precincts Rules	
10	Airport and Golf Course Precinct	
11	Airport and Golf Course Precinct Rules	
16	Open Space Objectives and Policies	
17	Open Space Rules	
18	Conservation Sites	
19	Conservation Site Rules	
24	Designations	

Draft work-programme: Two-stage district plan review

TWO STAGE DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW: INDICATIVE DRAFT WORK PROGRAMME 2011 – 2018

Remainder 2011		
Task Area	Specific Tasks	Drivers / Purpose
District plan “building blocks” exercise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm preferred structure for DP Confirm role and approach of DP Refine 2012 – 2018 DP work programme Investigate E-Plan opportunities 	Set the scene and establish key parameters for development of new DP
2012 – 2015		
Issue	Tasks	Drivers / Purpose
E-Plan	Developing architecture Uploading new DP text (ongoing)	Better presentation and usability of on-line District Plan
Chapter 1 – Introduction and Approach	Plan change to update the role and approach of the DP	Re-establish the role of the DP and set the scene for subsequent plan changes in 2012 – 2018 DP plan change programme
Chapter 3 – General Provisions	Plan change	Changes needed to reflect the new structure and direction
Chapters 18 & 19– Conservation Area*	Plan change	Out-dated, due for review under RMA, RPS
Chapter 2 – Tangata Whenua	Plan change	Out-dated, due for review under RMA
Chapters 16 & 17 – Open Space Areas*	Plan change	Out-dated, due for review under RMA, RPS
Chapters 14 & 15 – Rural Area*	Plan change	Out-dated, parts due for review under RMA, RPS
Chapters 8 & 9 – Institutional Precincts	Plan change	Out-dated, due for review under RMA
Chapters 10 & 11 – Airport & Golf Course Precincts	Plan change	Out-dated, due for review under RMA
Chapters 12 & 13 – Central Area [possible]	Plan change	<i>Smart Green Wellington, Central City Framework</i>
Natural hazards, earthquakes [possible]	Plan changes	Earthquake policy, city resilience policy (if any)
Already programmed plan changes	Plan changes	Thorndon Heritage Area, Johnsonville Design Guide, Kilbirnie Height variation
Miscellaneous plan changes	Plan changes	Plan changes to address emerging issues, errors and improve administrative functioning of the plan
Appeals	Resolving existing appeals	Statutory requirement
2015 – 2018		
Task Area	Tasks	Drivers / Purpose
E-Plan	Uploading new DP text (ongoing)	Better presentation and usability of on-line District Plan
All remaining sections of the DP – would include Centres, Business Areas, Residential Areas	Plan change	Have a completely new DP notified by 2016 and decided at Council level by 2018 [^] Focus on legibility and coherence
Miscellaneous plan changes	Plan changes	Plan changes to address emerging issues, errors and improve administrative functioning of the plan

* High priority reviews for landscape plan change (driven by RPS)

[^]Appeal processes will extend beyond 2018