

Draft first set of National Planning Standards

Submission Reference no: 29

The details of this submitter has been withheld from publication.

Submitter Type: Individual

Source: Web Form

Overall Position: Oppose

Clause

Overarching comment

Notes

I strongly oppose this because there cannot be a one-size fits all approach to stipulating a set number and types of zones for all districts across the country. There are not enough zones to match what exists, so it is best to avoid interfering with this at a national level. It may work for some districts but would undermine the provisions Auckland now has. Use of new Purpose statements will not overcome that. Particularly in the case of Auckland, where they have just been through the arduous Unitary Plan process and done the long-term planning for neighbourhood change or preservation. By trying to adapt to what is proposed in the S-ASM, it could effectively up-zone areas and lead to a hugely litigious and costly process for everyone. Zoning of land does not just have implications for surface-use but also underground municipal infrastructure so the suggested standardising would create enormous problems in this regard too. Or, by default, if it meant down-zoning (to a lower intensity/more restrictive type of land use) this could be the safer option where two existing zones had to share one standard zone. This whole aspect of the planning standards is a "square-peg, round-hole" situation and must be abandoned.

Clause

Overarching comment

Notes

I strongly oppose this because there cannot be a one-size fits all approach to stipulating a set number and types of zones for all districts across the country. There are not enough zones to match what exists, so it is best to avoid interfering with this at a national level. It may work for some districts but would undermine the provisions Auckland now has. Use of new Purpose statements will not overcome that. Particularly in the case of Auckland, where they have just been through the arduous Unitary Plan process and done the long-term planning for neighbourhood change or preservation. By trying to adapt to what is proposed in the S-ASM, it could effectively up-zone areas and lead to a hugely litigious and costly process for everyone. Zoning of land does not just have implications for surface-use but also underground municipal infrastructure so the suggested standardising would create enormous problems in this regard too. Or, by default, if it meant down-zoning (to a lower intensity/more restrictive type of land use) this could be the safer option where two existing zones had to share one standard zone. This whole aspect of the planning standards is a "square-peg, round-hole" situation and must be abandoned.

Clause

Timing

Notes

Where a Council has recently completed a plan review, they should not have to adopt the National Planning Standards in their plan until a review is due again. e.g. Auckland should be exempt for 10 yrs.

Clause

Do you have any further comments you wish to make about the Government's proposal?

Notes

Where a Council has recently completed a plan review, they should not have to adopt the National Planning Standards in their plan until a review is due again. e.g. Auckland should be exempt for 10 yrs. In relation to this submission, please note I do not consent to the publicizing of my name and details with it.

The submitter have elected to withhold their personal details from publication.