

Meeting notes

SUBJECT **Regional approach to intensification under the NPS UD**

WHEN **Wednesday 24 February 2021 1:00-4:00pm**

WHERE **Greater Wellington Regional Council, 100 Cuba Street – Rūma Ako, 2.11**

ATTENDEES **s 9(2)(a)**

APOLOGIES

Agenda	Time	Lead
1. Welcome and introductions	1:00	All
2. Agree purpose – to determine where we can get regional consistency around key elements of Policy 3 of the NPS UD (and actually agree some of it?)	1:10	Fleur M
3. RLTP description of rapid transit	1:20	Amy H
4. Overview of planned public transport	1:30	Tim / Emmet
5. Break-out groups: What areas might we be able to establish regional consistency? What can we agree on now? What do we think we'll be able to agree on with some more work?	2:00	All
<i>Afternoon tea (2:30pm)</i>		
6. Report-back from groups	3:15	All
7. Next steps	3:45	Fleur M

Agenda item 2. Agreed purpose of workshop as proposed.

The issue of how we would achieve regional consistency was discussed, and the group agreed that, where appropriate, these matters would be included as part of the changes required to the Regional Policy Statement to give effect to the NPS UD. There was general support for that approach as it would reduce the need to argue the points multiple times across the region and potentially end up with different things in different districts.

Agenda item 3. RLTP description of rapid transit

Amy H provided an update on the description of rapid transit that is in the draft RLTP currently being consulted on, which includes the metro rail lines and the future mass rapid transit planned as part of Let's Get Wellington Moving. Amy H and Amy K talked through the draft One Network Framework Public Transport classifications, which describes indicative numbers for frequency and capacity of services to be classified as rapid transit at a national level. The draft determines that all metro rail corridors, and non-rail public transport on largely separated corridors with more than 12 services per hour that can carry more than 3000 people per day would meet the definition.

Agenda item 4. Overview of planned public transport

Grant gave an overview of the public transport plan in place of Emmett and Tim. Greater Wellington committed to providing a summary of the current levels of service for each of the metro rail lines and what changes are planned for those services.

ACTION: Greater Wellington to work with Waka Kotahi provide a summary of the current levels of service for each of the metro rail lines and the planned changes to levels of service.

Agenda item 5 & 6. Break-out groups on regional consistency

Two groups were formed to workshop two key areas in Policies 3 and 4 of the NPS UD: walkable catchment and qualifying matters. The outputs of those break-out groups is captured in Appendix 1.

The walkable catchment group identified two discrete areas where regional consistency would be useful:

- Whether we are going to define it as the distance that most people can walk in 10 minutes vs the average speed.
- How we would take into account barriers such as SH / rail corridors in defining walkability.

The qualifying matters group had a large range of topics to discuss, and made some good progress fleshing these out (see Appendix 1). Further group discussion of qualifying matters would be useful to narrow down the areas where regional consistency is needed.

ACTION: s 9(2) schedule another workshop to focus on qualifying matters [I don't remember if we discussed a timeframe but feel free to suggest one].

Agenda item 7. Next steps

The group discussed the need to communicate 'upwards' to ensure that our organisations are aware of the joint work we are doing, and how it relates to the WRGF and timelines for RPS and DP changes.

ACTION: s 9(2) to discuss with s 9(2)(a) and draft a suitable report to be used [if anyone else would like to draft something I would be eternally grateful!]

Appendix 1: Notes from break-out group sessions

Walkable catchments

Cities and metro centres should have larger walkable catchments noting that there are more reasons to walk

10 minutes around railway stations

Build on Kainga Ora and WCC walking work to develop a consistent approach for Wellington region

WCC model available next month.

Some matters discussed:

Average speed vs most people's speed – should demographics play a part?

Consistency with national approach – 500m, 600m, 800m?

Relevance of barriers such as SH corridor. What are the assumptions now and for the future? Would we build a bridge?

Useful areas for regional consistency:

- Whether we are going to define it as the distance that most people can walk in 10 minutes vs the average speed.
- How we would take into account barriers such as SH / rail corridors in defining walkability.

Qualifying matters

A. Matters of national importance

Natural hazards – high: avoid for NPS UD purposes; medium: consider for NPS UD purposes; low: enable for NPS UD purposes.

Historic heritage – regional consistency through RPS

- SASM – iwi identification
- Maori Reserve Land / Maori title
- Special character areas – site specific “burden of proof”

ONFLs / SNAs – give effect to RPS

Sites of cultural significance, silent file areas, waahi tapu (also recognising the iwi input of SNA criteria under Policy 23 of the RPS), possibly Maori land

Esplanade strips – reserve strips

B. Matters required to give effect to any other National Policy Statement

NPS FM, NZCPS, NES FW – setbacks coast / wetlands / streams

NPS IB – identification, mapping, protection.

- Presumption against intensification
- Urban allotments, notable trees

NPS HPL on its way

Waiwhetu aquifer – piling into the aquifer regulated through the PNRP (and NES Drinking Water?)

Forestry NES

Contaminated land – HAIL sites / SLUR – remedy not avoid.

C. Nationally significant infrastructure

Transmission line exclusion areas, buffer corridors

State highway and NIMT corridor – still enable but higher standard of mitigation, potentially lower yield.

Feasibility & realisability affected

Avoid in some instances.

D Open space

Protect and mitigate shading effects (quality of space) – is this provided for? Includes private land where public access is permitted (eg golf courses)

E. Designations and heritage orders

- expectations around reverse sensitivity protection
- future demand

- expectations on intensification around transport nodes.

F. Iwi participation legislation

Mana whakahono a rohe

Post-settlement iwi – agreed roles and boundaries

G. Industrial and business land

- protect existing productive industrial land
- HBA established high demand for flexible industrial / business land – FUZ
- Encourage intensification / increased residential yield in mixed use areas

H. Any other matters

- infrastructure? Fine grained analysis to intensify site by site exclusion / justification of lower density – bespoke assessment
- existing plan enabled not a qualifying matter, but will be challenged.
- Hazards that do not meet the 'significant' criteria under s6, like: medium liquefaction risk; over-flow or overland-flow paths; coastal inundation; other forms of land instability.
- Identified Distinctive or Special Character areas identified as part of site or area-specific assessments, where effects on capacity can be quantified (likely argument that this is unlikely to see much of an uplift as capital value > land value and proportionally represents a small area).
 - 3.32(1)(h) notes that there may be means to restrict to an area (rather than just site), however 3.33(3)(b) requires a "site-specific analysis" identifying the "site to which the matter relates" requiring characteristics to be identified on a "site-specific basis" only.
 - A question therefore remains as to whether restrictions can be placed on adjacent site, eg, high recession plane from heritage feature to avoid dominance and detracting of feature.
- Identified outlooks, vistas, or viewshafts where sufficient reporting exists to warrant their protection.