


Plan Change Document

Proposed Variation 1 to Plan Change 33

That Lot 1 DP 67858 be included in Appendix 6 to Rule 15.4.6

Appendix 6 - Western Slopes of Tawa
Area where Subdivision Rule 15.4.6 applies



0 50 100 200 300 400 500
 Meters



PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN VARIATION 1 – ADDITION TO PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN CHANGE 33 (RIDGELINES AND HILLTOPS (VISUAL AMENITY) AND RURAL AREA)

1. Introduction

Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act) stipulates a requirement to consider alternatives and assess the benefits and costs of adopting any objective, policy, rule, or method in the District Plan. This Plan Change proposes to make general minor amendments to the District Plan in order to ensure its smooth functioning. Due to the nature of the proposed amendments there are only limited options available and this report has been prepared to address the section 32 requirements.

2. Context

The purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act) is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The District Plan is the primary vehicle for achieving the purpose of the Act. It provides for the management of activities in the Wellington City District through objectives, policies and rules. To continue promoting the sustainable management of resources over time, it is necessary to amend the district plan and respond to changes in the environment and land ownership.

No alterations are proposed to the existing objectives and policies through this proposed Plan Change. This Plan Change relates primarily to amending the District Plan planning maps, including zone changes and corrections of errors, and the text of some rules of the District Plan.

3. Process & Consultation

Since the District Plan became operative a file has been maintained of issues or items that might be dealt with by way of a change to the Plan. At least once a year more minor items have been collected and put forward as a composite plan change.

Consultation by way of a letter in early April 2006 was undertaken with residents directly affected by two aspects of this proposed district plan change. These being the Karori zone change and the non-cadastral zone boundaries. Consultation was undertaken to clarify matters subject to this Plan Change and to identify potential concerns at an early stage.

Karori Rezoning

Eight out of fifteen affected parties responded to the letter. Most respondents requested more detailed information on the wider issue of the Karori Town Centre Redevelopment process, the suitability of the site, adverse effects from the future use of the site and current District Plan rules for a Suburban Centre zone. The vast majority of respondents were not in support of the proposed zone change as outlined in the officer's report. One Karori resident that was not directly consulted, emailed the Council in support of the zone change.

Non-cadastral Zone Boundary

There was only a limited response to the letters sent to those potentially affected by a non-cadastral zone boundary change or ratification. Of those that did respond, most were in support. One owner requested a slight change to the proposed boundary location and this was agreed to.

Consultation on the entire proposed district plan change was also undertaken with those parties identified in the 1st Schedule of the RMA. The Tenth's Trust commented that *"the Trust can support this change as it makes sense and we don't foresee any cultural issues for us"*

- Ministry for the Environment
- Tenth's Trust (Te Atiawa)
- Te Runanga O Toa Rangatira Inc
- Greater Wellington (Regional Council)
- Department of Conservation

4. Options

The following three tables provide an analysis of the costs and benefits of the proposed amendments to district plan zones (Table 1), District Plan maps (Table 2) and rules (Table 3) to assess the efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness of the proposed Plan Change.

Only two options have been considered for this assessment due to the nature of these proposed minor amendments: do nothing or to amend the District Plan as proposed.

Instead of assessing the selected cases individually, a cost/benefit and appropriateness assessment has been undertaken for each subject group: zone changes, map annotations and amendments of District Plan rules.

Table 1: Matrix of Options for the Proposed District Plan Change (Zone Changes)

	OPTION 1: Do Nothing – leave land use zoning as is	OPTION 2: Rezone land as proposed This is the RECOMMENDED option.
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs - if proposed zoning is not applied to sites with natural character or recreation values (Rural and Open Space) then these values may be lost. • Economic costs – if inappropriate zoning has to be changed at a later stage through a Private Plan Change (additional costs of compliance) or if inappropriate decisions are made when sites are not zoned appropriately • Inappropriate zoning may also result in a landowner requiring resource consent for an activity that would normally be permitted under the correct zoning • Social costs – if prospective Open Space sites become unavailable for active or passive recreational use due to inappropriate zoning and development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs - if Open Space zone is uplifted in order to allow development (applies only in Salford Street case because this property is in private ownership). • Economic costs – costs of processing the Plan Change • Social costs – potential for the community to be unsatisfied with future use of 66 Salford Street.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – no change • Economic benefits – none • Social benefits – none 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – future protection of Open Space and Rural zones • Economic benefits – land value is maximised with appropriate zoning, land can be fully utilised for development on Residential/Suburban Centre zones • Social benefits – reassurance is given to local community that recreation opportunities will remain available in the future (e.g. at playground and park sites)
Efficiency and Effectiveness of achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited. The Plan’s objectives cannot be efficiently nor effectively achieved in terms of land use planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High. Most efficient and effective in achieving the Plan’s objectives and policies in terms of land use planning • Guarantees the smooth functioning of the District Plan
Most appropriate for achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited. Not considered appropriate, because the zoning of selected sites does not reflect the current land use (and may lead to land use conflicts and greater costs of compliance) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High. Appropriate, because proposed zone changes reflect current land use

Table 2: Matrix of Options for the Proposed District Plan Change Non-Cadastral Zone boundaries (Maps)

	OPTION 1: Do Nothing – leave map errors in District Plan maps and do not annotate District Plan maps with additional information	OPTION 2: Correct and annotate District Plan maps as proposed This is the RECOMMENDED option.
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs – no change • Economic costs – if mapping errors or annotations to maps have to be changed at a later stage through a Private Plan Change or if inappropriate decisions are made when mapping errors remain in District Plan maps • Social costs – no change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs - unlikely • Economic costs – costs of processing the Plan Change • Social costs – unlikely
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – no change • Economic benefits – none • Social benefits – none 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – unlikely • Economic benefits – land value is maximised and land can be fully utilised for development without triggering specific District Plan rules • Social benefits – unlikely
Efficiency and Effectiveness of achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited. The Plan’s objectives cannot be efficiently or effectively achieved as long as District Plan maps contain zoning errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High. Most efficient and effective in achieving the Plan’s objectives • Improves the smooth functioning of the District Plan
Most appropriate for achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited. Not considered appropriate as long as District Plan maps contain mapping errors that may lead to confusion or ill-informed decisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High. Appropriate, because proposed amendments remove mapping errors in District Plan maps • Proposed amendments also clarify the extent of a particular zone where non-cadastral zone boundaries exist

Table 3: Matrix of Options for the Proposed District Plan Change (Rules)

	OPTION 1: Do Nothing – leave anomalies in District Plan rules	OPTION 2: Amend District Plan rules as proposed This is the RECOMMENDED option.
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs – if resource consent is obtained for inappropriate development due to District Plan anomalies and inconsistencies • Economic costs – if anomalies in rules have to be corrected at a later stage through a Private Plan Change or if inappropriate decisions are made when anomalies remain in District Plan rules • Social costs – potential for community to be unsatisfied with planning outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs - unlikely • Economic costs – costs of processing the Plan Change • Social costs – unlikely
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – no change • Economic benefits – none • Social benefits – none 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – unlikely • Economic benefits – reduced risk of misinterpretation of rules due to improved clarity • Social benefits – Yes, for example by clarifying and revising the non-notification statement for rule 7.3.10 and the definition of Antenna and Utility Structure, and generally increasing consistency throughout the District Plan
Efficiency and Effectiveness of achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited. The Plan’s objectives cannot be efficiently nor effectively achieved as long as District Plan rules are silent, inconsistent and/or contain anomalies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High. Most efficient and effective in achieving the Plan’s objectives • Improves the smooth functioning of the District Plan
Most appropriate for achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited. Not considered appropriate as long as District Plan rules are silent, inconsistent and/or contain anomalies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High. Appropriate, because proposed minor amendment improve consistency throughout the District Plan

Assessment of Lot 1 DP 67858 for inclusion in Appendix 6 to Rule 15.4.6

Clive Anstey February 2006.

Review

I have been asked to revisit the site and assess appropriate provisions for an area above the boundary of what was assessed in 2004. My understanding is that this additional area is part of the land owned by West Tawa Development Partnership, the area originally assessed in 2004. All of this additional area falls into the Ridges and hilltops overlay.

It is my view that this additional area should be treated in the same way as the remainder of West Tawa Development Partnership's property; included in Rule 15.4.6 Appendix 6. The majority of the land in question has a very similar character to the remainder of their property, with similar significance as a backdrop to Tawa. The upper boundary does however run immediately below a significant ridgeline so that there would need to be some sensitivity to this in the granting of any consent to subdivide.

I would support the requirement for a 'concept plan' for the property. I have in fact sighted such a plan, prepared by Spencer Homes prior to Plan Change 33, and this could be revisited and updated. I am not qualified to comment on how this might be incorporated into the planning process as a condition of inclusion in Appendix 6.

My earlier comments with regard to logging would apply to the additional area under discussion. The owners could be asked to build the requirements of logging into their 'concept plan'. I see little problem in extracting timber and carting material out from the top of the property; council plantations across the ridge to the west are only 1-2 years younger and logs will need to be carted from there via a similar route. It is my understanding following discussions with Barry Leonard, Forest Manager for GWRC who manages these council forests, that he has been approached by the West Tawa Development Partnership with a view to negotiating an access road. Mr Leonard tells me that he is favourably disposed towards such an arrangement. For the purposes of this report we can therefore safely say that the removal of logs from the back of the property, rather than down through residential Tawa, is possible. A suitable condition would not be unreasonable.