

10 Development sequence & key infrastructure

10.1 Approaches to sequencing

In general there are two possible approaches to development sequencing.

The first is to maintain a tight and orderly approach which determines that no additional land will be released for development until at least 80% to 85% of existing land has been taken up. While this approach goes some way towards satisfying the requirements of Part II of the RMA 1991 in terms of the efficient use of resources, it has the following downsides:

- ➔ Available land may not be either in the form or location desired by the market
- ➔ As the land is increasingly developed shortages occur and prices increase
- ➔ Land shortages enable developers to insist on sales with tied land and building contracts
- ➔ Market choice becomes limited
- ➔ There is unnecessary pressure on infill development and a reduction of amenity in established areas

The second is to allow much greater market freedom for the location of development, provided that detailed structure planning occurs and arrangements are made for the provision of infrastructure before any land is released. This approach has a number of advantages:

- ➔ Future planning has the flexibility to cater for changes in market demand

- ➔ Land prices are less likely to be significantly affected by issues of supply
- ➔ The requirement for structure planning ensures that infrastructure services are planned and provided for in an efficient manner

10.2 Land development process

Not all of the locations identified for future growth are ready to be developed in the near future. This is largely due to infrastructure requirements and funding sources.

To ensure that growth takes place in an orderly fashion a two stage process for the release of land is proposed – refer to the growth area maps in the previous section.

Stage 1 - Yellow

The land shown as yellow on the location maps for the Northern, Southern, South Eastern and South Western growth areas indicates those areas that are considered suitable for future urban development. These areas have either been the subject of previous structure planning in the case of Taupo Town and Kinloch, or they have been considered as part of previous infrastructure planning.

The infrastructure to service these areas has been budgeted for in the 2006-16 Long Term Council Community Plan.

Before these areas can be developed there will still need to be alignment between Taupo District 2050 and the Proposed District Plan. It is



anticipated that Taupo District Council will make the necessary changes to the Proposed District Plan to facilitate growth in the chosen locations.

Stage 2 - Red

The areas shown on the location maps as red circles indicate those areas of future growth for which more specific planning must be undertaken such as the Mapara Valley. These areas have been shown as red circles to specifically avoid any determination in this strategy about exactly where future urban boundaries might be. Such determinations will be part of subsequent structure planning.

Structure Planning

It is anticipated that Council will take a leadership role by undertaking structure planning exercises for the identified growth areas. In parallel, the necessary changes to the Proposed District Plan will be prepared and both documents will be publicly notified simultaneously. This will ensure that the planning in the structure plan can be given statutory weight as soon as possible.

The structure planning process is important as it identifies the extent of a growth area, the range of different densities and resulting infrastructure requirements (without re-litigation of the general location and indicative lot yield as set out in this strategy). Without this structure planning approach, there is no basis for Council to strategically zone land in the Proposed District Plan. Once the Proposed District Plan has been changed to incorporate the structure plan, individual landowners will have the ability to apply for resource consents for specific developments in respect of their property holdings.

It is also recognised that there may be some situations where developers wish to proceed faster than the Council can complete structure planning

processes). In those situations developers will bear the cost of preparing the private equivalent of a structure plan; however they will still be expected to work closely with Council in preparing that plan.

Council's structure planning for the future growth areas is intricately linked to asset management planning for key infrastructure. This reflects the fact that Council is unable to provide the entire required infrastructure for all the growth areas at once. Where developers wish to proceed faster than Council anticipated (as identified in the Long Term Council Community Plan), the developer will need to pay the cost of bringing forward those infrastructure projects required to service the new growth area. That cost may also involve recognition of extra operational costs that Council might incur as a result of taking over the new infrastructure earlier than anticipated.

Once a structure plan has been prepared for a growth area that structure plan can be implemented by incorporating it into the Proposed District Plan or through a comprehensive resource consent application. While comprehensive resource consents have been used previously, such as the Brentwood balance lands, they do not provide the same opportunity as a change to the Proposed District Plan to consider the wider environmental effects of a proposal (including precedent effects on the integrity of the Proposed District Plan). In addition, the consultative requirements of a resource consent application are less onerous than the First Schedule process set out in the Act for a change to the Proposed District Plan.

The other key disadvantage of a comprehensive resource consent application is that it doesn't provide a mechanism for incorporating the key elements of a structure plan into the Proposed District Plan. Structure plans by their nature include roading patterns and infrastructure networks which cross boundaries. Although they may be identified in a structure plan, there is still the opportunity for individual resource



consents to undermine these cross boundary plans unless they are included in the Proposed District Plan.

As a result, all future structure plans must be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan to secure the strategic zoning identified in the structure plan. The Proposed District Plan will be amended to highlight this process.

Statutory process

Structure plans are non-statutory documents prepared under the Local Government Act 2002, however to have statutory effect, they must be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan through the First Schedule process under the Resource Management Act 1991.

The First Schedule process involves the following steps:

1. Notification
2. Submissions
3. Further submissions
4. Hearings
5. Deliberations and decisions
6. Appeals to the Environment Court

As noted above, when a structure plan is prepared, a variation or plan change to amend the Proposed District Plan will be prepared at the same time. This variation or plan change will outline the elements of the structure plan which will be taken into the Proposed District Plan. The structure plan and the variation/plan change will need to be notified together and both will go through the First Schedule process together.

The above process is exactly the same regardless of whether the structure plan is led by the Council, or a private developer.

Other Considerations

It should be noted that the private plan change approach does not provide the applicant with an unfettered right to obtain what is provided for in the plan change. The Council processes the plan change and still retains the right to submit on it.

A private plan change allows for the sharing of costs in respect of plan formulation. Traditionally all of these costs would have fallen on the Council. However, picking up on the theme of growth paying for growth, it places some of the cost burden on the developer promoting the plan change. These costs can be significant.

The experience in other local authorities is that the private plan change approach allows the developer to focus on preparation of the change without being side tracked or having competing priorities, provides the resources to undertake the work (in collaboration with the Council, potentially any substantive issues are resolved prior to notification) and then the Council focus is on the processing of the change and ensuring that matters such as infrastructure provision and associated funding mechanisms are in place.

The collaborative approach required by the Council and the developer may be formalised through a Memorandum of Understanding to clarify who will do what, that the developer will not withdraw the change or parts of it without the agreement of the Council and any other matters of relevance. It is about providing a framework for the formulation and processing of private plan change so both parties have clarity and understanding of what is to be achieved.





10.3 Impact on community facilities

Infrastructure costs

The Local Government Act (LGA) 2002 requires Council to anticipate the impact of development on infrastructure and to fund for this so that infrastructure is provided in a timely manner, and that development does not have a negative impact on existing infrastructure.

Much of the infrastructure required for the future has already been budgeted for within the 2006-16 Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP). A full list of all capital projects from the 2006-16 LTCCP is attached in Appendix 8.

The infrastructure elements which have not been budgeted for will need to be further investigated and decisions made on the best way to fund these elements. Subsequent amendments to the LTCCP will need to be made.

Funding will be provided from a variety of sources such as development contributions, rates, central government funding and specific development agreements.

The main infrastructural element for which there has not been future funding planned is a proposed Taupo to Kinloch western transport corridor known as the "West Kinloch Arterial" (WeKA). This corridor is necessary to:

- Efficiently link an expanded Taupo town and Kinloch in the future
- Provide the key access for an orderly and efficient development pattern in the Mapara Valley

- Avoid the situation where urban development in the Mapara Valley is reliant on the rural standard Mapara Road for its access links to Taupo
- Provide an efficient access from settlements at Kinloch and the Mapara Valley into a secondary commercial centre on the Rangatira E lands between Acacia Bay and Nukuhau
- Provide an opportunity for a more economic public transport system linking Taupo Town, Mapara and Kinloch
- Enable walking and cycling provisions within the corridor

Although the WeKA will result in reduced travel times, particularly for those residents in Kinloch, the primary reason for this link is to reinforce the established pattern of settlement. Ultimately the linkage of Kinloch and Taupo Town will result in a more sustainable urban form in the long term. This objective is consistent with the overall objectives of both the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Land Transport Management Act 2003.

In order to progress the implementation of the WeKA the route has to be identified and designated. Preliminary work has already been undertaken. This now needs to be aligned with Council's asset management planning and the WeKA needs to be incorporated into the Long Term Council Community Plan as a capital project.