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National Policy Statement
Urban Development

December 2019
Key messages from the discussion document

Future Development Strategy (FDS)

Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessments (HBA)

Evidence for good decision making

Processes for engaging on planning

Making room for growth

Government Intervention Vs Local Decision-making
Key messages from the discussion document

Providing for further greenfield development

- Current planning system not responsive to changing opportunities
- Directs council to consider plan change requests out of sequence / outside Rural Urban Boundary
- Provide for growth ‘out’ and ‘up’
- Out of sequence
- Alignment (or perceived lack of it) with other national direction
Update on submissions and key feedback

259 submissions

One size fits all approach

Other key themes from submissions included:

- clarity of objectives and policies
- reverse sensitivity
- timeframe for implementation align with local authority planning
- effectiveness of NPS-UD = provision of infrastructure
- Focus should be on growing ‘up’, not ‘out.’
- Lack of Alignment with other NPS’s
Update on submissions and key feedback

Technical Advisory Panel (TAP)

Recommendations Report

March – recommendations report to Ministers

April onwards – preparing for Cabinet

June – NPS-UD is gazetted
Auckland Council’s submission on Action for Healthy Waterways

Dave Allen, Manager, Natural Environment Strategy
Coral Grant, Principal Freshwater Scientist, Research and Evaluation
Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department
Chief Planning Office

Presentation to Rural Advisory Panel 14 February 2020
Central government’s direction for freshwater – 2019

- Objectives (this round)
- Stop further degradation
- Reverse past damage

‘New’ NPS Freshwater Management, and new National Environmental Standards (NES) FW

- Council planning provisions must be in place by 2025
- Te Mana o Te Wai – integrated and holistic health and wellbeing, with status of water itself the priority
- New attributes (e.g., nutrients, sediment, aquatic life, river ecosystem metabolism)
- Reduce nitrogen loss in catchments with high levels within 5 years
- Urban and rural wetlands – no more draining, piping, filling, unless no other option
- Fish passage improvements to setting minimum water flows and reporting on water use
- Improving ecosystem health by improving farm practices
- Controls on intensification of land use until plans operative
- Stock exclusion regulations – fencing and setbacks
- Standards for intensive winter grazing, feedlots and stock-holding areas
Auckland Council submission response

- Support central govt objectives, although:
  - instruments not well integrated (NPS-FM & NES-FW)
  - actual council share of implementation work lacks clarity
- Need to balance prescriptive regulatory approach and flexible non-regulatory arrangements
- Ambitious implementation timeframes, considering capacity & capability limitations, including for Maori
- Impacts on existing risk-based catchment approaches and work programmes
- Need to capitalize on work undertaken to date
- Interaction of water reforms with NPS-UD, NPS-HPL, NPS-IB, NZCPS, NES-PF
- Support Te Mana o te wai as strategic framework, while allowing flexibility
Auckland Council submission response – rural focus

- Support inclusion of additional attributes, where robust
- Do not support proposed DIN and DRP attributes in current form
- Request that sediment attributes be further refined
- Support threatened indigenous species as compulsory national value
- Fish passage – support in principle, prioritise remediation
- Support improvements to setting minimum water flows and reporting on water use
- No further loss of streams – support, further clarity required around definitions
- Support including ‘effect management hierarchy’ for wetlands and streams
Auckland Council submission response – rural focus

- Support improving farm practices, but significant implementation concerns
  - Capacity and capability across central government, industry and council sectors
  - Council role in regulatory aspects unclear
  - Use of particular tools to calculate N loss – clarity around additional work
  - Support flexibility and risk-based approach and interventions at correct scale
  - Potential consenting burden
- Support farm plans where targeted to address greatest risks
- Regulatory context for farm plans needs clarification
- Nitrogen reductions (next 5 years) – support farm plan-based reductions (option 3)
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Item 10

Auckland Council submission response – rural focus

- Stock exclusion – greater clarity and flexibility to ensure practical solutions; use of slope identification tools, datasets to assist mapping; need national waterway restoration grant programme

- Promoting integration between national regulatory instruments

- NPS-UD – gear towards protecting and enhancing environment, future proofing, Te Mana o te wai expression, stream loss addressed up front

- NPS-HPL – Maintaining productive land potential while addressing sediment, nutrients, water allocation, recharge areas for aquifers etc

- NZCPS – overlap of proposed coastal wetlands provisions

- NES-PF – stream and wetland outcomes need to be compared

- RMA review – still unknown extent of change through this reform
Next steps…

- ~15,500 submissions received by end of October 2019
- Evaluation by central government underway, November 2019 onwards
- MFE workshops with council technical staff to refine proposals
- Regional Sector ‘Water sub-group’ input to inform govt dept workstreams
- Independent Advisory Panel to make recommendations to Minister Parker
- Advice to Minister Parker expected late February / early March
- Cabinet consideration ~April 2020
- Gazetral of regulatory measures ~June 2020
- On-going regional sector liaison with central government (MFE, MPI)
- Refining AC work programmes (eg, improved SOE monitoring, modelling etc)
- AC central govt response coordinated by Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research (APSR) department
Proposed National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land
Context

- Our Land (2018) highlighted key pressures on Highly Productive Land:
  - Urban expansion
  - Fragmentation (lifestyle blocks)
  - Reverse sensitivity
- Government has identified the loss of Highly Productive Land as a national issue
- Highly Productive Land not given enough weight in RMA decision making
Auckland’s LUC 1-3
126,000ha
(mapped)
NPS content

- The National Policy Statement would provide direction on Highly Productive Land for councils to:
  - recognise and provide for the full range of values and benefits associated with their use for primary production
  - maintain availability for primary production for future generations
  - protect from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.
**NPS content**

- Will **not** apply to land with existing zoning of:
  - Urban
  - Future Urban

- Will still allow flexibility for urban expansion on Highly Productive Land where other urban growth options considered first
**NPS content**

- Will initially apply to LUC1-3 soil as a ‘placeholder’
- Regional councils to undertake an exercise over next few years to determine what ‘Highly Productive Land’ is for their area (subject to NPS criteria)
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Council submission

1. General support for the National Policy Statement
2. Implications for Urban, Future Urban, and Countryside Living zoned land
3. Rural lifestyle development and fragmentation of Highly Productive Land
4. Urban expansion onto Highly Productive Land
5. Exercise to identify Highly Productive Land
6. Criteria to identify Highly Productive Land
7. Inappropriate use and development on Highly Productive Land
8. Reverse sensitivity
9. The value of rural land outside identified areas of Highly Productive Land
10. Application of the NPS to resource consents and private plan changes
11. Implementing the NPS into the Auckland Unitary Plan
12. Definitions
13. Integration with other national direction
- Support the exclusion of the Future Urban zone from definition of Highly Productive Land
  - No impacts on Auckland’s current housing capacity
  - Significant planning and investment already in these areas (Structure Planning, Supporting Growth Alliance, Watercare, Ministry of Education, etc)
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- Strengthen test for urban development on Highly Productive Land
Implications for the Council (Unitary Plan)

- Mapping exercise
- Plan Change(s) to remove current wording around ‘elite’ and ‘prime’ land and replace with ‘Highly Productive Land’
- Insert/replace objectives and policies to make them consistent with the NPS
- Insert rules to protect HLP (currently none)