

Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Transportation Interventions

Options for the transportation provisions

Prepared in support of the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Plan Variation

20 September 2021

This overview identifies and evaluates the broad planning options available to address the concerns raised by Councillors at the July 2021 Council meeting regarding transport solutions for Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile and in particular the desire for transport interventions to be in place prior to development at Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile occurring.

The broad options considered are as follows:

- Option 1** Identifying the land as a Future Urban Zone.
- Option 2** Remodelling the existing draft provisions into a deferred zoning, by either identifying a future date at which the zoning will take effect, or by identifying an action or set of actions that must occur first before the zoning takes effect.
- Option 3** Modify and strengthen the existing draft provisions, by increasing the focus on ensuring that key transportation infrastructural works precedes development of the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile area [**preferred option**]
- Option 4** The status quo, being the existing draft provisions notified for public feedback in April 2021.

Table 1 outlines the benefits and costs for each of the options identified above.

Table 1: Assessment of costs and benefits of the shortlisted options

<i>Option 1: Identifying the land as a Future Urban Zone</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Restricts or prevents development</i> • <i>preserves the land for future urban use</i> • <i>Future development would require a further plan change</i> 	
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Sterilises the land and prevents development inconsistent with future urban outcomes. b. Ability to obtain resource consents would be limited c. Provides time to consider appropriate infrastructure solutions d. Responds to community concerns that development should not occur in advance in infrastructure
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does not generate urgency in resolving existing traffic congestion, removing the incentive for other parties to engage in transport infrastructure solutions. b. Significant delay in achieving the development of the land for urban purposes, and the flow-on effects that this would have for achieving additional housing supply to accommodate QLD's projected population growth. c. Would have implications across the entire Proposed District Plan (PDP) with changes to the higher order strategic objectives and policies in the PDP required, which may lead to some

	<p>undesirable consequences where the Council comes under pressure to use the strategic direction to support additional future urban zoned land in other areas. It also creates an opportunity for land that has already been reviewed in the PDP to seek this zoning if they were not successful in earlier re-zoning requests.</p> <p>d. Not in accordance with the Spatial Plan outcomes or the National Policy Statement - Urban Development obligations.</p> <p>e. Lack of certainty regarding the timeframe for achieving urban development and likely to be strongly opposed by landowners and other stakeholders including Ministry of Education</p> <p>f. Significant costs and inefficiencies involved in completing two plan changes (one for the Future Urban Zone and then the eventual Urban Zone)</p> <p>g. Given that the urban plan change work would be completed at a later point in the future, the work completed to date would likely be superseded and lost.</p> <p>h. The Te Pūtahi land area has a number of different landowners, this could result in a series of separate ad-hoc plan change applications, reducing the ability for Council to consider Te Pūtahi-Ladies Mile holistically including its relationship with the neighbouring communities</p> <p>i. In the time taken to prepare a Future Urban Zone and publicly notify it, the landowners could lodge either a private plan change(s), Resource Consent, or the Fast-Track consent process. This would both undermine the Future Urban Zone and potentially foreclose implementation of the masterplan as the land becomes more developed.</p>
<p>Option 2: Remodelling the existing draft provisions into a deferred zoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Land is zoned in accordance with the masterplan, but at a future date (either a specified date or when key infrastructural actions have been completed)</i> • <i>PDP zoning would remain in the interim</i> • <i>Would prevent development until certain matters are achieved</i> 	
<p>Benefits</p>	<p>a. If applying the zoning from a future date, this option would provide certainty by giving transport-related agencies a timeframe for which to prepare for urban development.</p> <p>b. If applying the zoning on the completion of particular infrastructural actions, this option would provide certainty by ensuring transport solutions are achieved prior to urban development occurring.</p> <p>c. This option would retain the existing work undertaken in master-planning the development.</p> <p>d. Minor costs involved in reworking the existing provisions to include deferred zoning mechanisms.</p> <p>e. Responds to community concerns that development should not occur in advance in infrastructure.</p>
<p>Costs</p>	<p>a. Does not generate urgency in resolving existing traffic congestion, removing the incentive for other parties to engage in solutions for transport infrastructure</p> <p>b. If the zoning is deferred to a specific future date, this would not necessarily provide certainty that solutions to transport issues would be found and implemented prior to this time.</p> <p>c. Where the zoning was deferred until completion of infrastructure that involved third party agencies (for example, new bus routes and increased bus frequencies), this would:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ create uncertainty about whether the rezoning would occur; and ○ place the control of the rezoning on outside agencies. <p>d. Landowners can still develop under the existing PDP provisions, allowing applications for resource consent being made that would undermine the intention of the deferred zoning and potentially foreclose the ability to implement the masterplan.</p> <p>e. Not in accordance with the Spatial Plan outcomes or the National Policy Statement - Urban Development obligations.</p> <p>f. Introduces a new type of zoning to the PDP that other landowners may seek to have apply to their land.</p>
<p>Option 3: Existing draft provisions are modified and strengthened</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Land is zoned in accordance with the masterplan</i> • <i>Development has physical infrastructure triggers alongside</i> • <i>This allows transport initiatives to occur prior to or alongside development</i> 	
<p>Benefits</p>	<p>a. Rezoning the land for urban development (using the current master-planning work to date) provides certainty that urban development will occur and creates urgency in responding to the transport issues including the need for physical transportation works and other non-regulatory actions.</p> <p>b. Ability to utilise elements of a deferred zoning by incorporating actions to be undertaken prior to development occurring while retaining the certainty and urgency that rezoning the land immediately provides.</p> <p>c. Development is staged by requiring that specific Sub-Areas are not developed until the physical transportation works necessary to serve development in those Sub-Areas is in place, thereby slowing down development but providing certainty of when it can occur.</p> <p>d. The development of a specific transport-related suite of provisions (objectives, policies and rules, including non-complying where necessary) to provide greater strength for the Council in being able to refuse applications for development that would precede completion of the physical transportation works, using the tests for non-complying activities under s104D of the Act.</p> <p><i>Note: A prohibited status was investigated, but was considered less appropriate as would be hard to justify under the RMA</i></p> <p>e. This option would retain the existing work undertaken in master-planning the development.</p> <p>f. Provides for additional housing options to accommodate our projected population growth.</p> <p>g. Is in accordance with both the Spatial Plan outcomes and the National Policy Statement - Urban Development obligations</p> <p>h. Provides certainty around the timeframe for achieving urban development and more likely to be supported by landowners and other stakeholders including Ministry of Education</p>
<p>Costs</p>	<p>a. Minor cost involved in reworking the existing provisions.</p> <p>b. Until finalised, there is a risk of applications for resource consent being made under the existing zoning regime that would undermine the intention of the masterplan and proposed zoning and potentially foreclose future urban development.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. May be perceived by the community as not responding to their concerns d. Urban development may occur earlier than third-party transport infrastructure and solutions being in place, such as new bus routes and increased bus frequencies
Option 4: The status quo, being the existing draft provisions notified for public feedback in April 2021.	
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. This option would retain the existing work undertaken in master-planning the development with no changes proposed. b. Moving forward with rezoning the land for urban development provides certainty that urban development will occur and creates the need for urgency in responding to the transport issues with any identified non-regulatory methods. c. Ability to utilise elements of a deferred zoning by the incorporation of provisions requiring actions to be undertaken prior to development occurring but retaining the certainty and urgency that rezoning the land immediately provides.
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lesser focus in the existing objectives and policies about the transport outcomes sought (when compared to Option 3), and less potential for the Council to use the tests under s104D to reject development proposals that precede completion of physical transportation works. b. Until the masterplan and proposed Te Pūtahi zoning is implemented, there is risk of applications for resource consent being made under the existing PDP zoning that would undermine the intention of the masterplan and proposed zoning and potentially foreclose the ability to implement the masterplan.

Overall, from the costs and benefits identified above, the options are ranked as follows:

- Rank 1:** Option 3: Continue with a rezoning in conjunction with the modification and strengthening of the existing draft provisions
- Rank 2:** Option 4: Retain the existing draft provisions;
- Rank 3:** Option 2: Remodel the existing provisions to be implemented by way of deferred zoning.
- Rank 4:** Option 1: Rezone the land to a Future Urban Zone.

The preferred option is therefore **Option 3**.