



## Briofina

	olicy Statement		proposal to bri evelopment	ing forwar	- unu s	aongalon
Date: 27	August 2021		Security level:	In Confiden	е	1
Priority: Hig	h		Report number:	HUD track	ng #: BRF	21/22081079
				MfE trackir	g#: BRF	-355
Action sough	t					0
		Action s	ought		Deadlir	ne
Hon Dr Megan W		Agree to	the recommendation	ns.	2 Septe	mber 2020
Minister of Hous Hon David Parker						
Minister for the I				. (1)		
CC: Hon Nanaia I		Note the	contents of this brie	efing.		
Minister of Loca		_		111		
CC: Hon Phil Twy		ant		<b>)</b>		
Associate Minist	ter for the Environme	ent	<del></del>			
Contact for di	scussion		617			
Name	Position		0,	Telep	hone	1st contact
Lesley Baddon	Director, Minis	stry for the Env	vironment	021 738	357	
Rebecca Lloyd	Manager, Min	istry for the En	vironment	022 013	6139	✓
Brad Ward	Deputy Chief Urban Develo		istry of Housing and	s 9(2)(a)		
Jessica Ranger	Manager, Min Development	istry of Housin	g and Urban	s 9(2)(a)		<b>✓</b>
Other agencie	e consulted	<u> </u>				
[Names]	s consulted					
[Names]	<del></del>					
	e to complete					
□ Noted	7	Comments				
	)					
	11					
□ Approved	e II					
☐ Approved☐ Needs chang						
□ Approved □ Needs chang □ Not seen by N	Minister					
<ul><li>□ Approved</li><li>□ Needs chang</li><li>□ Not seen by I</li><li>□ Overtaken by</li></ul>	Minister					
□ Approved □ Needs chang □ Not seen by N □ Overtaken by □ Declined	Minister events					
☐ Approved☐ Needs chang☐ Not seen by N	Minister events					
□ Approved □ Needs chang □ Not seen by N □ Overtaken by □ Declined	Minister events					
□ Approved □ Needs chang □ Not seen by N □ Overtaken by □ Declined	Minister events					
□ Approved □ Needs chang □ Not seen by N □ Overtaken by □ Declined	Minister events specify)					

New Zealand Government





### **Briefing**

## Formation Act 1982 Further delegated policy decisions on the proposal to bring forward and strengthen the National Policy Statement on Urban Development

For: Hon Dr Megan Woods, Minister of Housing

Hon David Parker, Minister for the Environment

CC: Hon Nanaia Mahuta, Minister of Local Government

Hon Phil Twyford, Associate Minister for the Environment

In Confidence Date: 27 August 2021 Security level:

Report number: MfE tracking #: BRF-355 **Priority:** High

HUD tracking #: BRF21/22081079

#### **Purpose**

1. This briefing seeks agreement on further delegated policy decisions relating to the proposals to bring forward and strengthen the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD). These decisions will enable us to refine drafting of the Bill to amend the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) with the Parliamentary Counsel Office (PCO).

#### Background

- 2. On 31 May 2021, Cabinet agreed to the proposals in the Cabinet paper Bringing forward and strengthening the National Policy Statement on Urban Development [CAB-21-MIN-0188]. Cabinet delegated some decisions to the Minister of Housing and the Minister for the Environment and authorised them to clarify and develop policy and process matters relating to the proposals.
- 3. We have previously provided advice on a set of delegated policy decisions (HUD: BRF20/21060984, MfE: BRF-89 refers) relating to: the intensification streamlined planning process (ISPP); the content of the medium density residential standards (MDRS); legal effect of the MDRS; and criteria for applying the MDRS to tier 2 urban environments.
- 4. This paper seeks:
  - a. further policy decisions on matters within your delegation including on notification dates for tier 2 council plan changes, financial contributions for permitted activities, enabling councils to use the ISPP to change financial contributions policies and transitional provisions (Table 1)
  - b. to enable a change to the NPS-UD to correct a minor error in the definition of planning decision (Table 2)
  - c. a decision from the Minister for the Environment to amend the RMA to fix an error relating to a repealed clause on subdivision (Table 3)

New Zealand Government

Referred to in that advice as the 'medium density residential zone'.

5.	There may	be further drafting	improvements as	work on the	Bill continues.
Ο.	THOIC INA	, be fulliful diditing		WOIN OIL GIO	

#### **Recommended actions**

Information Act 1982 6. Recommendations and matters to note are set out in Annex 1: Tables of recommendations and matters to note.

Jessica Ranger

Manager, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga -

Hon Dr Megan Wood Minister of Housing

Ature, provisions of the provi

Hon David Parker

**Minister for the Environment** 

#### Annex 1 – Tables of recommendations and matters to note

#### Table 1: Recommendations on further delegated policy decisions

Policy decision	Rationale	Recommended actions	Ministers' decision
Clarifying notification dates for tier 2 council plan changes	Cabinet agreed [CAB-21-MIN-0188] that tier 2 councils could be required to use the Intensification Streamlined Planning Process (ISPP) to implement the intensification policies of the NPS-UD and the MDRS via an Order in Council (OIC) if certain criteria were met. Officials will provide you with advice and data in early September on which tier 2 councils are experiencing acute housing shortages and could be required to use the ISPP to implement their intensification plan changes and the MDRS. This will enable an OIC to be in place with sufficient time for the council to prepare plan changes to meet the NPS-UD notification date of August 2020. We consider that five months is the shortest amount of time in which councils could do this. Guidance and support will be provided to these councils.  There may be some circumstances where Ministers decide a housing shortage has become more acute and additional tier 2 councils need to implement the MDRS using the ISPP after August 2022. In these circumstances, we recommend having the OIC set the notification date and a direction set out a workable process including timeframes.	Agree that if a tier 2 council is required to use the intensification streamlined planning process to implement the MDRS and they do not have at least 5 months to meet the August 2022 notification date:  a. the OIC sets the notification date b. the direction sets out a workable process including timeframes.	Agree/disagree
Financial contributions for permitted activities and enabling councils to use the ISPP to change their financial contributions policies	To assist councils to fund infrastructure to support the implementation of the MDRS, we recommend amending the RMA to make it clear that councils can charge financial contributions for activities that do not require resource consent (permitted activities).  It is not common practice to charge financial contributions for permitted activities. However, case law² has clarified that financial contributions can be charged for permitted activities.  The MDRS will make a large number of additional activities permitted. We want councils to be clear they can charge financial contributions for the activities permitted by the MDRS and making this explicit in the Bill will achieve this.  We also recommend enabling councils to include amendments to their financial contributions polices within the ISPP. These changes would not be subject to appeal.	Agree that the Bill:     a. clarifies that financial contributions can be charged for permitted activities     b. enables councils to use the intensification streamlined planning process to change financial contributions polices.	Agree/disagree
Transitional provisions to provide clarify on when plan changes need to be withdrawn	Councils are currently working to prepare plan changes (and variations³) to implement the NPS-UD intensification provisions. Councils are likely to adjust this work once these policy proposals are announced. However, there is a minor risk that a council may notify a plan change to give effect to the NPS-UD intensification provisions or to make changes to a zone that would be subject to the MDRS before or after the policy proposals are announced.  The RMA allows councils to withdraw a plan change through clause 8D of Schedule 1. However, we recommend specifying that any such plan change be withdrawn to provide clarity and certainty.	Agree the Bill require notified plan changes (or variations) be withdrawn where the plan change (or variation):  a. intends to give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development intensification provisions b. proposes changes to a residential zone subject to the medium density residential standards c. creates a new residential zone.	Agree/disagree

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Carterton District Council v McCarron and Butler [2013] District Court Masterton

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> √ariations is a plan change prepared by a council to a proposed plan.

Table 2: Enabling a change to the NPS-UD to correct a minor error

Policy decision	Rationale	Recommended actions	Ministers' decision
Enabling a change to the NPS- UD definition of planning decision	On 15 June 2021, the Environment Court released an oral decision <sup>4</sup> on preliminary questions about the relevance of the NPS-UD to proposed private plan change 21 to the Auckland Unitary Plan. The private plan change was to enable expansion and intensification of development of a private hospital in Epsom.  This decision drew attention to an issue with the NPS-UD definition of 'planning decision'. The definition of planning decision includes one form of private plan change (adopted), but could be interpreted as excluding another form of private plan change (accepted).  Under the RMA if a council adopts a private plan change, it continues through the process as if it was a council-initiated plan change. With adopted plan changes, councils will generally bear the cost of managing the plan change from the date that it is adopted.  If the council accepts a private plan change (but does not adopt it) the council administers the legal process; and the costs are generally borne by the applicant.  Amending the definition of planning decision to make it clear that the NPS-UD applies to both forms of private plan change will better reflect the policy intent of the NPS-UD.	Agree that the Bill enables a change to the definition of planning decision in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development to make it clear that it applies to both private plan changes adopted and accepted by a council.	Agree/disagree

Table 3 – Recommended action for the Minister for the Environment to enable a change to the RMA

reference from one section of the Act (224 Pestrictions upon deposit of survey nan to another (11 Pestrictions		Agree/disagree
224 Restrictions upon deposit of survey plan on subdivision of land), which is incorrect.  Certification obtained under Section 224 of the RMA is the final step in certifying a subdivision, which enables plants	Agree that the Bill amends RMA section 224 Restrictions upon deposit of survey plan to correct a reference to section 1(1)(a)(i) or (iii).	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Eden-Epsom Residential Protection Society Incorporated v Auckland Council [2021] NZEnvC 082

# 100%

Table 4 - Update on where drafting has been improved to ensure the workability of the Bill

Policy decision	Rationale	Recommended actions
The MDRS will be the default minimum level of permitted development, including in areas that require further intensification	CAB-21-Min-0188 noted the MDRZ will apply to all existing and future residential zones unless the zones are already more enabling.  It is no longer necessary to include the wording 'unless the zones are already more enabling'. Additional analysis found there are no current residential zones that are more enabling than the MDRS. Furthermore, in areas that require further intensification under the NPS-UD, the MDRS will be the default minimum level of permitted development. This will ensure that zoning standards in these areas (in addition to height) are at least as enabling as the MDRS.	Note the medium density residential standards will be the default minimum level of permitted development, including in areas that require further intensification.
Allowing assessments against design guides in areas incorporating the MDRS	Following previous advice (HUD: BRF20/21060984, MfE: BRF-89 refers) Ministers agreed to the MDRS preventing the use of design guides. However, we now consider that design guides will be useful in certain circumstances, and there are limited downsides to allowing their use  This would be consistent with the other requirements in the MDRS. The Bill does not set out matters to which discretion is restricted when a consent exceeds the MDRS. This is because councils need flexibility, as a wide range of activities would be assessed as discretionary restricted activities in zones that incorporate the MDRS. These activities will range from four units at three storeys to much greater density at six storeys (and above). We believe design guides can play an important part in, for example, developing six storey buildings and consider we should not restrict their use.	Note the requirement in the medium density residential standards that prevents design guides from being a matter of discretion has been removed.
Empowering the Minister for the Environment to make consequential changes	Cabinet agreed [CAB-21-MIN-0188] to "empower the Minister of Housing and Minister for the Environment to make consequential changes to the NPS-UD, if necessary, to align with the intensification requirements of the MDRZ without using the usual process to amend nation policy statements".  Under the RMA, the Minister for the Environment is solely responsible for issuing national direction. For this reason, we recommend the Bill empowers the Minister for the Environment to make consequential amendments to the NPS-UD, but in consultation with the Minister of Housing. This will enable the housing and urban development portfolio perspective to be considered alongside that of the environment portfolio.	Note the Bill will empower the Minister for the Environment in consultation with the Minister of Housing to make changes to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.

In Confidence
HUD tracking #: BRF21/22081079, MfE: BRF-355