

## SUPPLEMENTARY STAFF ASSESSMENT REPORT

**TO:** Environment & Planning Committee – TRMP

FROM: Rose Biss

**FILE NO.:** R430-6-2

SUBJECT: SUPPLEMENTARY SAR TRMP12/01/03 TO SAR 564.16 OF HEARING 62:

Report prepared for meeting of 8 February 2012

"In Committee"

### 1. BACKGROUND

The Committee at its 20 December meeting sought further staff advice on recommendation 564.16 regarding the Residential Closed Zone at Iwa St and Tahi St Mapua. Further advice was sought on a minimum lot size for further subdivision with prohibited status below the minimum lot size and second dwellings as a restricted discretionary activity.

The 15 lots in the Residential Closed Zone at Iwa St have an average lot size of 1260m2. Five lots have a lot size between 2000 and 3000m2 with the remainder below 2000m2. One submitter wants to keep the Residential Closed Zone on 6 and 8 Iwa Street. Three other submitters from Iwa Street want to retain the Residential Zone and the provision for second dwellings as a controlled activity.

The Residential Closed Zone (RCZ) at Tahi St has 50 lots. There are 9 large lots that have a lot size of between 2000 and 3000m2. None of the owners of these lots has opposed the Residential Closed Zone. There are 23 lots between 1000 and 2000m2. The Tahi St Residential Closed Zone has an average lot size 1200m2. There are three submitters from Tahi St who seek to be able to subdivide in accord with the previous Residential Zone rules. They have lot sizes 1394m2, 1351m2 and 1671m2.

The LiDAR levels for the Residential Closed Zones at Tahi St and Iwa St show the land is lowlying - below 3.5m above mean sea level.

## 1.1 Option 1 – change second dwellings back to controlled activities

The status of second dwellings was changed from controlled activity to restricted discretionary activity in the Residential Closed Zones in Plan Change 22. Some submissions sought to retain the controlled activity status. There were no submissions seeking a more restrictive status for second dwellings (such as non complying activity). To make second dwellings a non complying activity would require a variation. The reason for changing the status for second dwellings to restricted discretionary is to retain space on these low lying sites to allow for relocation of the first dwelling in the future if necessary. A secondary reason is that some services such as water supply are at capacity at present.

# **1.2** Option 2

This option would be to allow limited subdivision to the current average lot size 1200m2 and then make subdivision below that a prohibited activity. This would be less stringent than the notified provisions of Plan Change 22 which only permit boundary alterations but it would be less permissive than the previous Residential Zone which has a minimum lot size of 450m2.

At Iwa Street this option would allow the submitter properties at 16 and 18 Iwa Street to be subdivided into two additional lots and one further lot at 14 Iwa Street.

At Tahi Street this option would allow one large property at 15 Tahi Street to be subdivided into two more lots but not the three submitter properties which are close to the average lot size already. The large lot owner has not submitted.

# **1.3 Option 3**

Option 3 would be revert to the previous Residential Zone and controlled activity status for second dwellings as sought by some submitters. That zone would allow approximately 30 more lots at Tahi St and 10 more at Iwa Street. These areas are lowlying and at risk of future inundation and erosion.

## 1.4 **Option 4**

Option 4 would be to follow the original recommendation 564.16 that there be no further subdivision in the Residential Closed Zone in Iwa Street and Tahi Street other than boundary relocations.

#### •

## 2. SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATION

## 2.1 Recommendation 564.16

## **Submission Recommendations**

C22.3689.2	Atkins,Sue	Allow in Part
C22.3692.2	Bannister, Frederick & Annamarie	Allow in part
C22.3728.2	Robinson,Tim &Jill	Allow in Part
C22.3739.3	Waugh J & Armstrong A	Allow in part
C22.3729.1	Sampson Russell & Pam	Allow in part

#### **Plan Amendments**

**Topic:** 16.3.3.1

Add to Figure 16.3A new provision (xi)

(xi) Tahi St and Iwa St Residential (Coastal) Minimum net area 1200m2One new lot of at least 650m2 with a balance lot of at least 650m2 may be created from a certificate of title existing at 26 February 2011

**Topic**: 16.3.3.2 Restricted Discretionary Subdivision

Add new condition (d):

Tahi /Iwa Sts

(d) It is not in the Residential (Coastal) Zone at Tahi St or Iwa St

**Topic:** 16.3.3.3 Discretionary Subdivision

(d) It is not in the Residential (Coastal) Zone at Tahi St or Iwa St

**Topic:** 16.3.3.5 Non Complying Subdivision

Add after the words "Mapua Special Development Area"

Residential (Coastal ) Zone at Tahi St and Iwa St

# **Topic: 17.1.3.2 Controlled Activities (Building Construction)**

Amend in 17.1.3.2 (d) the words "the Residential Closed Zone at Mapua" to read:

"the Residential (Coastal) Zone at Mapua"

**Topic: 17.1.3.4 Restricted Discretionary Activities (Building Construction)** 

Add new condition (k) to 17.1.4.3:

Residential (Coastal)

Reserve building area

There is sufficient space for a reserve building area for the existing dwelling

Topic: 17.1.20

No plan amendments to statement about second dwellings in parts of Tahi and Iwa Streets.

Topic: ZM 87

Rename the Residential Closed Zone at Tahi St and part of Iwa St as Residential (Coastal)

### Reasons

- 1. It is considered prudent to allow only a very-limited amount of further subdivision in these low-lying areas in view of present and potential future flooding risk and increasing coastal hazard risk, particularly as a consequence of projected sea level rise and climate change.
- 2. Second dwellings are not considered to be appropriate as a controlled activity.
- 3. Intensive subdivision and second dwellings in the low-lying parts of Iwa and Tahi Streets is considered to be inappropriate, both presently and in-particularly the long term, in terms of the NZ Coastal Policy statement and the promotion of the sustainable management of resources under the Resource Management Act.
- 4. The Council policy is to accommodate residential growth at Mapua on the hillslopes above Mapua and Ruby Bay to avoid exacerbating the risks from coastal erosion and inundation on lowlying areas.