

Local board feedback on the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021

23 June 2022



Contents

Albert-Eden Local Board	X
Devonport-Takapuna Local Board	X
Franklin Local Board	X
Henderson-Massey Local Board	X
Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	X
Howick Local Board	X
Kaipātiki Local Board	X
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board	X
Manurewa Local Board	X
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board	X
Ōrākei Local Board	X
Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board	X
Papakura Local Board	X
Puketāpapa Local Board	X
Rodney Local Board	X
Upper Harbour Local Board	X
Waitākere Ranges Local Board	X
Waitematā Local Board	X
What Local Board	V

Albert-Eden Local Board

Meeting date: 21 June 2022 Resolution number AE/2022/1

That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

- a) note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022.
- c) provide the following general comments:
 - i) note the following excerpts from Albert-Eden Local Board Plan 2020:
 - I) Infrastructure, planning and development: ... advocate for urban growth and regeneration that supports Auckland's climate goals.
 - II) Our heritage is broad and includes historic heritage, special character and amenity.
 - III) We will... advocate for protection of relevant sites through heritage provision through town planning and development activity.
 - IV) We aim for resilient, connected and empowered communities.
 - V) We note the challenges related to the high cost of housing, low quality homes, the high number of renters and increasing homelessness means people don't feel safe with stable places to live and our community is more transient than it used to be.
 - ii) note there is a significant area of Albert-Eden affected by the possible location of Auckland Light Rail stations, that a future plan change process will be required once those station locations are confirmed and that this area overlaps with proposed special character areas or high quality
 - iii) note there were 925 submissions through the Auckland Council engagement process from Albert-Eden and 113 through the Kantar survey.
- d) provide feedback outlined in points d) o) on Auckland Council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.
- e) support the proposed walkable catchment of 1200 metres from the edge of the city centre.
- f) support the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres from the edge of metropolitan centres.
- g) support the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres around rapid transit stops.
- h) request that in addition providing the walkable catchment zones that Auckland Council and Auckland Transport also invest in making the areas more walkable, including; improving footpaths, increasing shade by planting street trees, improving and increasing pedestrian crossing points, installing drinking fountains, providing incentives to provide through-site links to allow for greater permeability and short-cuts.
- i) support the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone to residential areas up to around 400 metres from large town centres with high accessibility.

- j) support the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone to residential areas up to around 200 metres from small town centres or large local centres with high accessibility.
- k) support the proposal to include special character areas of high quality as a qualifying matter but retain reservations about the effect of including a large proportion of the land around rapid transit stations and town centres in Albert-Eden as Special Character Areas (SCAs), as this severely limits the potential for new dwellings with implications for emissions reductions and Auckland becoming a compact city.
- l) acknowledge the staff's identification and assessment of residential special character in accordance with the proposed definition.
- m) acknowledge the staff's identification and assessment of business special character in accordance with the proposed definition.
- n) support significant infrastructure constraints should be a qualifying matter with specific inclusion of sites with stormwater disposal issues as identified by staff in Mt Eden, Epsom and Balmoral.
- o) support the Regional Significant Viewshafts and Height Sensitive Areas Overlay being a qualifying matter, to provide continued protection of viewshafts to maunga.
- p) request Auckland Council provide information on the precinct areas under investigation and seek local board feedback prior to notification of any plan changes with provisions affecting those areas, noting the following are in the Albert-Eden area:
 - i) University of Auckland Campus, Epsom
 - ii) Wairaka Precinct (Unitec), Mt Albert
 - iii) Auckland Institute of Studies, Mt Albert
 - iv) St Lukes Mall, Mt Albert.
- q) support public notification of the plan change in August 2022 and encourage Aucklanders to have their say on the proposed plan change and use creative consultation processes in addition to standard processes.
- r) request that the Chair, or their delegate, present the local board's views to the Planning Committee.
- s) thank Bruce Young Senior Policy Planner, Noel Reardon Manager Heritage, Rebecca Freeman Senior Specialist Historic Heritage, Megan Patrick Team Leader Heritage Policy, Fiona Sprott Team Leader, Planning, Ruth Andrews Senior Policy Planner, and Teuila Young Policy Planner, for their attendance via Microsoft Teams.

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board

Meeting date: 21 June 2022

Resolution number DT/2022/94

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

- a) thanks the 7,880 individuals and organisations from around Auckland, including those from the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board area, who provided feedback through the Have Your Say consultation, and the 2,000 individuals who participated in a Kantar research survey, in relation to Auckland Council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) and Resource Management (Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act (the Act) Devonport-Takapuna Local Board 21 June 2022 Minutes Page 15
- b) provides the local board's views and comments in relation to the questions asked in the public consultation on the council's preliminary response in the document tabled at this meeting, to be **attached to the minutes of this meeting** subject to the following amendments:
 - i. Addition to question 9 clause iv: The board was particularly concerned by information shared with us by Watercare in a recent workshop, that they had significant concerns about their ability to accurately predict growth patterns and provide supporting infrastructure and that parts of the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board area were of particular concern to them.
- c) requests the opportunity to speak to this resolution and attached feedback at the relevant committee and Governing Body meetings
- d) appoints chairperson Ruth Jackson and member Trish Deans to speak on behalf of the board at the relevant committee and Governing Body, and authorises chair Ruth Jackson to appoint alternate/s if the nominated member/s are not able to attend. e) directs that this resolution and attached feedback be provided to the Mayor Phil Goff, Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore, and all Auckland Councillors, and all local board members.

Feedback and views of the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board on the Auckland Council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement – Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) and Resource Management (Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act.

The Devonport-Takapuna Local Board provides the following views and comments in relation to the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement – Urban Development 2020 ("NPS-UD") and Resource Management (Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act ("the Act"), noting the wide range of views received from individuals and organisations from within its local board area and across Auckland:

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

The board provides the following general comments and views, and notes that the responses provided in Section 2 below should be considered in the context of these introductory remarks.

- a) Feedback from individuals and organisations across Auckland and from within the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board area revealed a range of views on each topic. The board has considered these views in developing this feedback.
- b) The board notes that its members have taken up the opportunity to participate in a number of workshops and meetings that the general public were not able to attend and that the in-depth information gained at these have further informed the views and responses provided here.
- c) The board is concerned that the NPS-UD and the Act, and the council's preliminary response, rely on provisions which are standardised or, in other words, "one size fits all" and are not tailored to local needs and circumstances. This concern was a recurring theme in each of the 10 questions asked.
- d) The Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) already provides for 900,000 new homes. The AUP is the result of years of development by specialists and due process including exhaustive consultation and hearings prior to its adoption. The AUP already focused the greatest intensification around town centres and transport nodes following best practice and 'liveable city' aspirations.
- e) Town planning is a fundamental and core role of local government.
- f) The government's imposition of the NPS-UD and the Act is unnecessary as the AUP already met the goals they seek to achieve.
- g) The board expresses concern over the extremely tight timeframes required by the government which have meant a rushed process placing undue pressure on council, and allowing insufficient time for proper and meaningful involvement of local boards in accordance with Auckland's cogovernance model, and insufficient time for community education and public consultation.
- h) The board expresses concern that the Minimum Density Residential Standards (MDRS) mandated by the NPS-UD and Act are too permissive and focus on quantity at the expense of quality, with few, if any, protections for basics like sunlight and fresh air. The lack of minimum dwelling sizes, proximity to boundaries, increased heights, and smaller outdoor spaces are all causes for concern.
- i) The board supports the development and adoption of design standards, controls, and guidelines that would guide each typology of residential development

- j) The board proposes that all walkable catchments should be conditional on:
 - i. whether adequate infrastructure can be provided (which is discussed in more detail in our feedback on Question 9)
 - ii. the retention of existing levels of public spaces, parks, and reserves; and the provision of additional public spaces, parks and reserves commensurate with the expected increase in population
 - iii. the adoption of a 'sunlight admission control' which protects sunlight and daylight in public spaces including parks, reserves, lakes, foreshore, and beaches, and height controls to ensure the same are not dominated by the surrounding built environment.

SECTION 2:

a) Question 1: What do you think of the proposed walkable catchment of 1200 metres from the edge of the city centre?

- i. The board supports this in principle, noting the reservations and comments already outlined in Section 1.
- ii. The boards does not support a walkable catchment of more than 1200 metres around the city centre.
- iii. The board notes the views received from our board area: Individuals 31% support, 14% 1200m not far enough, 26% 1200m too far, 29% other/don't know. Organisations 25% support, 5% 1200m not far enough, 45% 1200m too far, 25% other/don't know.

b) Question 2: What do you think of the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres from the edge of the Metropolitan Centres?

- i. The board does not support a standardised 800m walkable catchment, and consider that Takapuna's unique constraints emphasise the need for the walkable catchment around each Metropolitan Centre to be tailored to local needs and circumstances.
- ii. The board does not support a walkable catchment of more than 800 metres around Metropolitan Centres.
- iii. The board notes the views received from our board area: Individuals 28% Support, 18% 800m not far enough, 24% 800m too far, 23% other/don't know; Organisations 29% support, 5% 800m not far enough, 33% 800m too far, 33% other and don't know.

Takapuna Metropolitan Centre

- iv. The Local Board considers that the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres from the edge of the Takapuna Metropolitan Centre should not include the section of Hurstmere Road between Killarney Street and Kitchener Road, or associated side streets (Earnoch Ave, Brett Ave, O'Neills Ave, and Minnehaha Ave)
- v. This section of Hurstmere Road and side streets is located on the narrowest part of the volcanic rim between Lake Pupuke (Auckland's largest natural freshwater lake), and a coastline designated as a Sensitive Ecological Area. The area is subject to multiple management layers which seek to protect the natural environment, and where winter sunlight hours on the public beach open space along the coastal frontage should be protected, and many properties are protected by overlays that include Significant Ecological Area, Outstanding Natural Feature, Notable Trees and Coastal Erosion Zone. This is a unique

- landscape, and the overlays seek to protect the area from up zoning. We do not support a walkable catchment that includes this area.
- vi. On the Lake Pupuke frontage, the protection of the Lake Pupuke management overlay should be extended to include properties between and inclusive of 2 The Promenade to 276 Hurstmere Road. The Lake Management Overlay exists for the protection of the natural environment, and the board notes that the environmental health of the lake has been in decline for some time and would be at particular risk from intensive development around its catchment.
- vii. The board considers that Takapuna's unique geography, which is severely constrained by Lake Pupuke, Shoal Bay, and the Waitemata Harbour, sets it apart from other Metropolitan Centre and therefore requires sensitive management and tailored solutions.
- viii. The board requests that the current Takapuna Metropolitan Centre zoning and height controls contained in the AUP (H9.6.1 Building Heights) be retained, and does not support exceeding these. These height controls manage the dominance of buildings and the effects of shadowing on Takapuna Beach and Takapuna Beach Reserve through a series of stepped building heights.
- ix. The board notes concerns expressed by the Milford Residents Association and Castor Bay Residents and Ratepayers Association about the difficulties that an 800-metre walkable catchment might create for vulnerable elderly and disabled residents and the effect of dominant heights on streetscapes and public open space
- x. The board expresses concern that the online Preliminary Response Map Viewer identifies the Takapuna Metropolitan Centre as being 'under investigation' but the details and proposed changes have been not been discussed with our Local Board and community.

c) Question 3: What do you think of the proposed walkable catchments of 800 metres around rapid transit stops?

- i. The board does not support a standardised 800m walking catchment around rapid transit stations and considers that catchments around each rapid transit station should be tailored to local needs and circumstances.
- ii. The board considers that a catchment of 400-600 metres around the Akoranga, Smales, and Sunnynook stations with our local board area would be more appropriate, while still achieving the desired outcome.
- xi. The board does not support a walkable catchment of more than 800 metres around rapid transit stops.
- xii. The board notes the views received from our board area: Individuals 37% Support, 15% 800m not far enough, 22% 800m too far, 27% other/don't know. Organisations 33% support, 5% 800m not far enough, 33% 800m too far, 25% other don't know.
- iii. The board expresses concern that NPS-UD Policy (3c), which allows 'building heights of at least six storeys' in a walkable catchment around rapid transit stops allows for a Terrace Housing and Apartment Building (THAB) zone to dominate and have poor planning and community outcomes
- iv. The board is concerned that the increased heights in a dominant THAB zone will create the unintended adverse effects of a visual uniformity and sameness, a decrease of the local character of a suburban area, and result in a poorly developed streetscape and urban area.

- v. The local walkable catchments areas around a transit stops include Akoranga, Smales Farm, and Sunnynook bus stations. These sites are situated on the edge of the Northern Motorway and intersect with arterial routes, and these physical barriers will create a division between residents that live in THAB apartments and those in residential streets. In the THAB zone in these areas there is limited access to open space areas for outdoor recreation
- vi. The proposed changes do not allow for the inclusion of the natural features and topography characteristics of suburban areas to be factored into planning outcomes
- vii. The board urges Auckland Council to develop and adopt design standards and guidelines to prevent the effects of undesired and unintended outcomes
- viii. The planning outcomes do not factor in the constraints and limitations imposed by the existing suburban street network for better access and connections to rapid transit stops.

d) Question 4: What do you think of the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings (THAB) zone to residential areas up to 400 metres from large town centres with high accessibility?

- i. The board supports the proposal for a THAB zone of up to, but no more than, 400m from large town centres with high accessibility
- ii. We note that there are no areas defined as 'large town centres with high accessibility' in our local board area, and the nearest to our residents is the Albany town centre.
- iii. The board notes a range of views received from our board area: Individuals 28% Support, 18% 400m not far enough, 20% 400m too far, 34% other/don't know. Organisations 29% support, 5% 400m not far enough, 24% 400m too far, 43% other and don't know.

e) Question 5: What do you think of the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings (THAB) zone to residential areas up to 200 metres from small town centres or large local centres?

- i. The board supports a THAB zone of up to, but no more than, 200 metres from small town centres or large local centres, but considers that the distance of the THAB zone should be individually tailored to local needs and circumstances rather than standardised
- ii. We note that this applies to the Devonport, Milford, and Sunnynook centres within the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board area and may also include the Belmont and Hauraki centres.
- iii. The board notes the views received from our board area: Individuals 23% Support, 20% 200m not far enough, 17% 200m too far, 40% other/don't know. Organisations, 20% support, 15% 200m not far enough, 30% 200m too far, 35% other/don't know.
- iv. The board notes that the Sunnynook shopping centre already falls withing the proposed walkable catchment of the Sunnynook bus station, and refers to our comments related to Question 3 on walkable catchments around rapid transport stations.
- v. The board is concerned that the Belmont and Hauraki centres are already under pressure, as they are located along the already hugely congested Lake Road the sole road in and out of the Devonport Peninsula and that intensification on the peninsula must be constrained because of that currently insurmountable infrastructure limitation.

Devonport Town Centre

- vi. The local board believes that the heritage overlays that protect the surrounding Devonport town centre must remain and be adopted as 'qualifying matters'.
- vii. The board supports retaining the Auckland Unitary Plan Regional Significant Volcanic Viewshafts and Height Sensitive Overlay, Special Character Overlay, Historic Extent of Place Overlay and Height Variation Control for the Devonport Business and Residential Areas and for these management layers to be recognised as Qualifying Matters in the NPS-UD.
- viii. All of these management layers have cumulatively protected Devonport's business and residential areas from inappropriate subdivision and development, and over time, led to the suburb being recognised as a distinctive historic seaside village with high architectural integrity, sensitive scale and special character.
- ix. The Local Board requests that the preliminary upzoning overlay around Devonport Town Centre, in response to NPS-UD Policy 3d, be removed from the draft planning maps.
- x. The Local Board believes that Policy 3(d) will be redundant, firstly as a consequence of the continued protection provided by all of the above management layers; and secondly, by Council's confirmation that the majority of properties within the proposed upzoning area have achieved a character rating of 5 or 6 by Council's heritage experts.
- xi. These qualifying matters that apply to Devonport's town centre area, that are identified in the NPS-UD and MDRS maps, contradict and negate the application of the proposed THAB zone.
- xii. The Local Board supports Auckland Council's proposed residential zoning around the Devonport Business Area as a 'Two-Storey Single Dwelling Residential Area'.

Milford Town Centre

- xiii. The Local Board partially supports the proposal to apply the THAB zone of up to, but no more than, 200 metres around the Milford small town centre.
- xiv. The Local Board's does not support THAB zoning adjacent to the Wairau Creek or Estuary, which are an ecologically sensitive area which is already under pressure and affected by pollution. We not that this waterway and estuary are named recipients of funding from the Environmental Targeted Rate, and over-intensification would appear to be contrary to the key aspirations of the council, local board, and community to return it to full environmental health.

f) Question 6: What do you think of the proposal to include special character areas of high quality as a qualifying matter?

- i. The local board strongly supports this proposal, and notes overwhelming public support for the retention of Special Character Areas (SCAs) as a qualifying matter.
- ii. The local board notes that respondents who selected the option "Do not support all existing special character areas should be a qualifying matter" are in fact indicating support not only for the somewhat reduced SCAs proposed in the council's preliminary response, but support increasing them back to the existing SCA boundaries.
- iii. The public feedback was clear-cut, with 74% of submitters explicitly supporting SCAs as a qualifying matter.
- iv. The board notes the views received from our board area: Individuals 38% support, 40% do not support as all existing SCA's should be a qualifying matter, 13% do not support SCAs as

a qualifying matter, 9% other/don't know. Organisations – 20% support, 45% do not support as all existing SCA's should be a qualifying matter, 5% do not support SCAs as a qualifying matter, 30% other/don't know.

g) Question 7: What do you think of the proposed residential special character area (SCA) of high quality that have been identified?

- i. The board strongly supports the proposed residential SCAs of high quality that have been identified
- ii. The board also strongly advocates that the areas recognised as SCAs in the current AUP Chapter D18 Special Character Overlay continue to be recognised
- iii. Note that respondents who chose 'Do not support there are areas of high quality not identified that should be' in fact support the residential SCAs identified in the preliminary response and wish to see them increased.
- iv. The board asks council to accept residential and business properties with a Special Character Assessment score of 4 as being of high quality and include those in Special Character Area assessments.
- v. The board notes the views received from our board area: Individuals 17% support, 57% do not support as there are more areas that should be identified as a qualifying matter, 6% do not support as there are areas that should not be identified as a qualifying matter, 6% do not support special character areas as a qualifying matter, 15% other/don't know. Organisations 17% support, 35% do not support as there are more areas that should be identified as a qualifying matter, 13% do not support as there are areas that should not be identified as a qualifying matter, 13% do not support special character areas as a qualifying matter, 22% other/don't know.
- vi. The SCA residential areas of Devonport are uniquely intact and form a comprehensive built landscape where the majority of villas and bungalows remain unscathed from either neglect or modernisation.
- vii. It is the Local Board's belief that the proposed removal of a small number of houses from inclusion in the SCA will have an adverse effect on its heritage streetscapes. Devonport's heritage character stretches across the entire suburb, and there are an overwhelming number of buildings that retain their architectural integrity and historic value. Council's preliminary response to the NPS-UD and MDRS identifies that the vast residential area of Devonport meets the threshold of the SCA qualifying matter.
- viii. Council's mapping exercise identifies small pockets of housing that are modern and fall outside of the classification of a heritage building. The proposed Medium Density Residential Standards regulation will remove the current SCA protection from these homes and introduce zoning that will allow subdivision and three storey development on these sites. The effect of greater heights and density in these pocket-sized areas will have adverse impacts on their surrounding area.
- ix. This approach will create a 'pepper potting' effect in Devonport's streets and result in a streetscape that disrupts and undermines the integrity of Devonport's SCA.
- x. We believe the benefits from the small number of potential dwellings to be re-zoned are limited, and counterproductive in comparison to the heritage values affected.

- xi. These sites should be zoned 'Two Storey Single Dwelling Residential." Applying a two-storey single dwelling zone will prevent a conflict of higher density housing dominating the next door SCA sites.
- xii. The board provides the following comment on particular locations:

A. The Local Board opposes the deletion of parts of Vauxhall Road and Grove Road from the SCA

This area contains the nationally significant site of Fort Takapuna/ O Peretu (Historic place category 1 No 2909) and many surrounding high-quality houses. The effect of this pepper-pot approach will undermine the quality of amenity of the special character heritage area and impact negatively. This would result in an inconsistent set of building heights and designs.

B. Grove Road - proposed removal of 10 houses from the SCA

It is proposed to remove No's 2 – 20 Grove Road from SCA. In this group are two restored villas at 16 and 20 Grove Road which are of high quality and we believe should retain their current SCA protection. The houses proposed to be removed from the SCA are located on the elevated side of the narrow street, and the resulting dominance would be significant. The proposal to remove 10 houses on a section of Grove Road will not result in a high-quality outcome.

C. Vauxhall Road - proposed removal of 6 houses from the SCA

The removal of No. 103-115 Vauxhall Road from the SCA will also have a negative impact on the heritage values of this location. Both No's 111 Vauxhall Road, a restored bungalow, and 115 Vauxhall Road, a restored villa, are important to the streetscape. The villa at No 111 was relocated from Onehunga recently and fits with the tradition of the 1890's relocated houses from Thames.

The three sites on the seaward side of Vauxhall Road identified for removal from the SCA are also an example of a 'pepper potting' approach. These three sites are located amongst high quality heritage houses. The other houses on the seaward side remain two story single dwellings due to the application of a Significant Ecological Area, coastal erosion and general coastal marine zone. The overwhelming majority of homes on the seaward side of Vauxhall Road will remain as two storey single dwellings as their properties act as a barrier to identified natural coastal forces.

D. Morrison Ave and Wairoa Road - proposed removal of 5 houses from the SCA

Morrison Ave is a street in a high value heritage area. The removal of five houses from the SCA overlay will effectively alter the heritage landscape of this street. No 7 Morrison is a well-maintained bungalow which adds to the heritage qualities of the Avenue. One house which is identified as 60 Wairoa Road is the only house on that road to be taken off the SCA.

E. North Avenue, Turnbull Road and no's 177-183 Vauxhall Road

Two houses on North Avenue, No's 23 and 27, have been identified as having the SCA protection overlay removed. Both houses are situated on elevated sections that overlook Woodhall Park. All other houses in North Avenue remain as two-storey single dwellings. This is an example of a 'pepper pot' approach and needless intensification for limited dwelling gains.

F. Turnbull Road No's 6-10, Vauxhall Road No's 177- 183 – proposed removal from the SCA

The suggested changes to the SCA protection for the following houses are confusing.

One side of Turnbull Road remains as part of the SCA and three high quality villas on the opposite side are no longer identified as having SCA qualities. The three significant villas no. 4,8,10, which we believe have high heritage values, have been overlooked

The area that links a corner block of houses inclusive of 2-4 Turnbull Road and 177-183 Vauxhall Road are identified as being removed from the SCA. Yet No's 177, 181, 183 Vauxhall are also identified as being overlaid with a "regionally significant volcanic viewshaft", a proposed qualifying matter. 177 and 181 Vauxhall Road sites are also identified as a Historic Heritage Extent of Place.

The 'regionally significant volcanic viewshaft' also identifies no 82, 84 Wairoa Road and 22 North Ave. Removing the SCA layer from these sites will be confusing and disjointed, as there are varying qualifying matters being applied within this subset of sites.

G. Stanley Point Road - removal of 8 heritage homes from SCA

The proposal to delete No's 47, 49, 51, 53, 57, 59, 61A and 65 Stanley Point Road from the SCA will deplete this area of the predominant heritage values for which Stanley Point is recognised and well-known. This 'pepper pot' planning approach to delete some houses from the SCA and retain others is sporadic and undermines Stanley Bay's coherence and distinct character. We believe there has been an error in the assessment of these properties:

No 61A and 65 are intact transitional villas of high heritage quality.

No 55 retains its SCA and is a Coastal Erosion qualifying matter despite being grouped in the area for deletion of the SCA

No 74 located opposite these properties is the home built by Cyril Bassett. Cyril Bassett was the only NZ recipient of the Victoria Cross at Gallipoli WW1, and became first Manager of Auckland's Queen Street ASB. This house has outstanding social and historic value.

h) Question 8: What do you think of the proposed business special character areas of high quality that have been identified?

- i. The board strongly supports this proposal.
- ii. The board notes that respondents who chose 'Do not support there are areas of high quality not identified that should be' in fact support the business SCAs identified in the preliminary response and wish to see them increased.
- iii. The board notes the views received from our board area: Individuals 24% support, 26% do not support as there are more areas that should be identified as a qualifying matter, 5% do not support as there are areas that should not be identified as a qualifying matter, 5% do not support special character areas as a qualifying matter, 41% other/don't know. Organisations 15% support, 30% do not support as there are more areas that should be identified as a qualifying matter, 0% do not support as there are areas that should not be identified as a qualifying matter, 0% do not support special character areas as a qualifying matter, 55% other/don't know.

- iv. The Local Board reiterates its support of retaining the Auckland Unitary Plan Regional Significant Volcanic Viewshafts and Height Sensitive Overlay, Special Character Overlay, Historic Extent of Place Overlay and Height Variation Control for the Devonport Business and Residential Areas and for these management layers to be recognised as Qualifying Matters in the NPS-UD.
- v. The local board supports the proposal by Devonport Heritage Inc for Devonport's Victoria Road Business Area to be recognised as a Historic Heritage Area.

The plan change provides an opportunity for Auckland Council to add new Historic Heritage Areas to the list of existing historic areas. The proposed Devonport Historic Heritage Area focuses on the Town Centre.

The Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter D17 Overlay provides a definition of a Historic Heritage Area (HHA):

Historic Heritage Areas: groupings of interrelated, but not necessarily contiguous, places or features that collectively meet the Category A or B criteria. Historic Heritage Areas may include both contributing and non-contributing sites or features, places individually scheduled as Category A or B places, and notable trees.

The Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter B5.4 explains the principal reasons for recognition of historic heritage places or areas:

Historic heritage helps people to understand and appreciate their history, culture and identity. Historic heritage places contribute to Auckland's distinctiveness as a visitor destination and to its economic vitality. The recognition, protection, conservation and appropriate management of historic heritage places will help future generations appreciate what these places mean to the development of the region. Historic heritage places are a finite resource that cannot be duplicated or replaced.

Auckland has a total of 16 HHA's which are identified in Schedule 14.2 of the Unitary Plan. These sites include Princes Street Historic Precinct and Karangahape Road, Point Chevalier Shops and Upland Village Business Areas.

Devonport Town Centre stands out as an exemplary historic area that is renowned and comparable to the southern townships of Arrowtown, Akaroa and Oamaru. Its landscape setting, as well as the percentage and concentration of scheduled historic heritage buildings along Victoria Road, are unparalleled locally and regionally. This is an area of high historic architectural integrity and coherence, whose value should be recognised as an HHA.

- i) Question 9: What do you think of the proposal to include areas in urban Auckland with longterm significant infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter?
 - i. The board strongly supports this proposal.
 - ii. The board notes the views received from our board area: Individuals 75% support, 14% do not support, 11% other/don't know. Organisations, 58% support, 11% do not support, 31% other/don't know.
 - iii. Adequate infrastructure must be provided to support the projected population growth. The board notes that infrastructure limitations were among concerns raised by council in respect of an application under the government's Fast Track legislation for an extensive hotel and apartment development in central Takapuna (which was subsequently declined and referred back to normal council consenting processes).

- iv. The board expresses concern about the ability of either council or central government to predict and provide increased infrastructure to support the additional growth provided for under the NPS-UD and the Act including electricity, water, wastewater, stormwater, public transport, parking, roading, parks and open spaces, hospitals, schools and tertiary. The board was particularly concerned by information shared with us by Watercare in a recent workshop, that they had significant concerns about their ability to accurately predict growth patterns and provide supporting infrastructure and that parts of the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board area were of particular concern to them.
- v. Without these and other key infrastructures in place we cannot provide a liveable city or quality of life to our residents, or adequately support economic activity and prosperity.
- vi. In reality, there is insufficient infrastructure to support Auckland's growth in terms of providing for increased open space, reducing congested roads and upgrading storm water and sewerage outlets.
- vii. There is also no ability to finance and fund the infrastructure required to support the predicted population growth across Auckland.
- viii. These matters have serious implication for both the built and natural environment, and the UPS-UD zoning and intensification demands don't address these concerns. Where are the robust provisions to ensure the resources needed to plan and provide increased infrastructure capacity are available?
- ix. Auckland Council must ensure that with the intensification of the built environment there will be an upgrade of infrastructure. As yet, the areas across Auckland that are already constrained by limited infrastructure have not been identified, and Local Boards have not been informed or involved in the process of identification.
- x. The proposed changes fail to incorporate an assessment of infrastructure capacity. The city cannot be effectively managed without a city-wide analysis and prioritisation of infrastructure investments and planned maintenance programmes. The Local Board's concern is that the result will be ad-hoc, developer driven, developments that risk imposing unplanned additional demands on infrastructure where investment is not currently planned or prioritised.

Open space as a constraint on infrastructure

- xi. The provision for further open space reserves and the increase in area of some of the existing reserves must be incorporated and built into the objectives and policies for the proposed significant changes to Auckland's zoning regulations. Auckland Council has a duty of care to provide for Auckland's communities' well-being and meet their recreational needs. In these new proposals the drive to deliver intensification outcomes is not commensurate with Auckland Council's need to provide for future open space demands.
- xii. The Devonport-Takapuna Open Space Network Plan 2013 reported that there was significant pressure placed on the existing open space network and there were competing demands for land in growth areas (pp2).
- xiii. The Devonport-Takapuna Open space Network Plan focused on how to use the existing network to meet the demand for open space land and indoor activities. The Plan signaled the need for additional sports grounds and identified the pressure on existing facilities and the impact on the current space. The Plan did not address the challenge of how open space needs can be met to support a growth in population and the resulting increased density of intensification.

xiv. The Local Board considers that the UPS-UD intensification will place undue demand on already limited accessible public open space for parks, pedestrian and cycle activity pathways, community amenities and community facilities

Road Congestion as a constraint on infrastructure

- xv. The population increase on the Devonport Peninsula will increase significantly and without a clear commitment to fund the Lake Road project the congestion on this arterial route will markedly increase. The 'Mayoral Proposal' Annual Budget 2022/23 discusses the deferment of the Lake Road project. A possible deferment would not address the need for a dedicated rapid transit lane and result in the continuation of private vehicles and a limited public bus service. Deferring infrastructure is a recipe for disaster.
- xvi. The residents of living in the areas and dependent on the arterial routes of Beach Road, East Coast Road and Forrest Hill Road are already experiencing daily congestion, and the commitment to improved public transport services have not been realised.
- xvii. Auckland Council's commitment to climate change policies as a constraint on infrastructure
- xviii. Residents from our town centres and walkable catchments have raised the following concerns that they identify as environment concerns related to climate change which will place increasing constraints on infrastructure.
- xix. intensification policies which increase site coverage to 50% and reduce permeable surfaces will further burden the storm water network
- xx. there should be an objective to minimise future flooding risks and over capacity of the system.
- xxi. any Plan Change must require adequate stormwater retention tanks, with capacity to accommodate future peak rainfall projections resulting from climate change.
- xxii. there is a recognised increased risk of flooding and sea level rises which will further exacerbate an inadequate storm water system
- xxiii. the loss of mature trees from local areas as developer's clear sites exacerbates the loss of vegetation across local areas. Diminished front yards and increased site coverage on multi-unit sites do not support Council's Climate Change objectives.

j) Question 10: Do you have any feedback on other qualifying matters?

- i. The Devonport-Takapuna Local Board supports the inclusion of the listed qualifying matters:
 - A. Regional Significant Volcanic Viewshafts and Height Sensitive Overlay
 - B. Special Character Overlay
 - C. Historic Extent of Place
 - D. Height Variation Control
 - E. Ridgeline Protection Overlay
 - F. Local Public Views Overlay
 - G. Auckland War Memorial Museum Viewshaft
 - H. Stockade Hill Viewshaft
 - I. Character buildings in City Centre zone and Queen Street Valley Precinct
 - J. Some of the existing built form controls in City Centre (e.g. allowing sunlight into public places, Aotea Square height control).

ii. The board recommends that an additional qualifying matter be adopted to allow sunlight and daylight to be maintained in the Takapuna Metro Centre, Takapuna Beach Reserve and the shoreline of Lake Pupuke.

The Local Board recommends 'sunlight controls into public spaces' become a qualifying matter and that this be adopted to protect Takapuna's Metropolitan Centre, Takapuna Beach Reserve, public space along the coastline from Takapuna Beach to Thorne Bay and the shoreline of Lake Pupuke. These significant public areas must be protected by 'a sunlight admission control.

These significant public areas must be protected by a sunlight admission control. These sunlight controls already apply to Aotea Square which is further protected by an "Aotea Square Height Control'. The relevant sunlight controls H8.6.3 Admission of sunlight to public places and H8.6.4 Aotea height control plane set out the specific details. It is important to 'avoid adverse dominance, shading and/or visual amenity effects of building heights on streets and public open spaces' (AUP H8.6.2 point 17). The Auckland Council Planning Committee, on the 31 March CP2022/02945 in its response to NPS-UD Policy 3(a) approved the recommendation to retain sunlight and daylight to open spaces for Auckland's Aotea centre. The Devonport Takapuna Local Board recommend the adoption of these sunlight controls for the Takapuna Metropolitan Centre and Takapuna Beach Reserve, public space along the coastline from Takapuna Beach to Thorne Bay and the shoreline of Lake Pupuke.

Franklin Local Board

Meeting date: 21 June 2022

Resolution number FR/2022/87

That the Franklin Local Board:

- a) note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022
- c) provide feedback on the council's preliminary response, to be considered by the Planning Committee in preparation of the proposed intensification plan change for notification in August 2022 as outlined in the **attachment** Franklin Local Board feedback on the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.

Minutes Attachment A: Franklin Local Board feedback:

Auckland Council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021

A. Requirements for intensification

Intensification inside walkable catchments

1. What do you think of the proposed walkable catchment of 1200 metres from the edge of the city centre?

Support

Tell us why

City centres are best placed to accommodate high density living as these areas have existing transport infrastructure and options including footpaths and cycleways. The City centres has established social infrastructure that can accommodate large car-free populations. It makes sense that the city centre accommodates high density housing.

2. What do you think of the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres from the edge of the metropolitan centres?

Support

Tell us why

After the city centre, Metropolitan centres are next best placed to accommodate high density living and car-free living within the 800m catchment. These centres, including Papakura as the closest Metropolitan Centre for most of Franklin Local Board are, will benefit from increased housing density around transport nodes. Papakura has excellent existing footpath networks and operates as an important transport hub for franklin communities, particularly to communities in in the south-east. Intensification within 800m will benefit the Papakura Town Centre if housing design and quality is appropriate to the environment.

3. What do you think of the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres around rapid transit stops?

Support

Tell us why

Housing supply 800m from most rapid transport stops supports Auckland Council's climate change aspirations and enables the greatest number of Aucklanders to access public transport networks from their homes without having additional transport emissions.

Intensification around town and local centres

4. What do you think of the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone to residential areas up to around 400 metres from large town centres with high accessibility?

Support

Tell us why

Support enabling higher density housing around 400 metres from large town centres with high accessibility as these centres are able to accommodate larger population numbers and support economic, social and transport needs to some degree.

5. What do you think of the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone to residential areas up to around 200 metres from small town centres or large local centres with high accessibility?

Do not support -it should be further

Tell us why

Support enabling higher density housing around 400 metres from large town centres, not 200m. Although town centres are able to accommodate larger population numbers to some degree, intensification should be limited to reflect the availability of social and physical infrastructure.

B. Council-identified qualifying matters

Special Character Areas

6. What do you think of the proposal to include special character areas of high quality as a qualifying matter?

Support

Tell us why

Support the inclusion of special character as an overlay however suggest this could be more targeted i.e. specific character properties identified. In Pukekohe for example, properties to the east of the Pukekohe train station ("Dr's Hill") offer rare examples of built heritage in the area and should be protected. Likewise, the forest on this Hill also has environmental heritage value that should be recognised. The board acknowledges that this priority may need to shift in more central areas where the housing need and housing amenity is greater due to proximity

of these centres to existing employment centres, social amenity and transport options (the wider transport network).

What do you think of the proposed residential special character areas of high quality that have been identified?

Do not support - there are areas of high quality not identified that should be

Tell us why

proposed residential special character areas do not consider the local context. Assessment of these areas are not considered on balance with housing need and housing amenity is greater due to proximity of these centres to existing employment centres, social amenity and transport options (the wider transport network), nor the proximity of similar character examples in the area.

7. What do you think of the proposed business special character areas of high quality that have been identified?

Do not support - more areas or parts of areas should be identified

Tell us why

proposed business special character areas do not consider the local context. Assessment of these areas are not considered on balance with housing need and housing amenity is greater due to proximity of these centres to existing employment centres, social amenity and transport options (the wider transport network), nor the proximity of similar character examples in the area.

Infrastructure constraints

8. What do you think of the proposal to include areas in urban Auckland with long-term significant infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter?

Do not support

Tell us why

The Franklin Local Board considers that additional areas should be included as having long-term significant infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter including;

i. Beachlands-Maraetai, noting that this area does not have access to potable water, is poorly serviced by public transport network, cycling and walking paths network, has inadequate roading infrastructure, does not have important social infrastructure e.g. high school, medical services, community centre (including public library or arts centre) and does not have significant source of local employment.

ii. Waiuku, noting that Waiuku is poorly serviced by public transport network, does not feature as part of Auckland's planned cycling and walking paths (active transport) network and has constraints on potable and waste-water systems due to its distance from centrally based infrastructure.

Other qualifying matters

9. Do you have feedback on any other qualifying matters? (please be clear which proposal you are referring to)

The Franklin Local Board supports the additional qualifying matters discussed in the proposal and recommends the following additions;

- i. Pukekohe Hill viewshaft
- ii. Cape Hill viewshaft (also in Pukekohe)
- iii. built form controls in Pukekohe Town Centre (e.g. allowing sunlight into public places).
- iv. 'Doctors Hill' heritage area, Pukekohe

Henderson-Massey Local Board

Meeting date: 21 June 2022

Resolution number HM/2022/85

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

- a) note the Council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the Council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022.
- c) provide the following feedback on the Council's preliminary response, to be considered by the Planning Committee in preparation of the proposed intensification plan change for notification in August 2022:
 - a) well-functioning urban environments:
 - A) support prioritising access and walkable catchments
 - B) note that walkability is not only a function of distance but is also affected by other aspects of the street environment, such as lighting, safety, shade/shelter and footpath quality
 - C) request a focus on the wider aspects of healthy streets within the walkable catchments as defined by distance.
 - ii) request an increased focus on spatial planning with population/development triggers to ensure sufficient open space is provided for the growing population in denser neighbourhoods
 - iii) note that the removal of minimum parking requirements negatively affects large parts of West Auckland with limited access to public transport and where employment is difficult to access by public transport, so Auckland Transport must consider transport planning to alleviate these concerns
 - iv) request Council act to mitigate the resulting transport inequities and expand access to public transport
 - v) strongly support the aim of a well-functioning urban environment, particularly as it relates to affordable housing, improved access to transport, jobs, services and amenities, and lower carbon emissions
 - vi) note that although existing special character housing is valued by some Auckland residents, increasing housing availability in the areas closest to rapid transit and infrastructure is crucial to affordability, access, and climate mitigation so any housing intensification must be distributed across the region in areas that have better access to these
 - vii) advocate for qualifying matters to ensure adequate environmental and freshwater management protection, and to acknowledge long-term infrastructure constraints (such as transport, wastewater, stormwater)
 - viii) advocate for a stronger focus on protecting productive rural land

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

- ix) advocate for planning incentives for developments to protect existing trees (e.g. Christchurch's proposal for financial contributions which could be remitted or discounted for developments which retain existing trees)
- x) request that the Council revise mobility parking rules to ensure sufficient mobility parking is provided
- request that planning in response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) and Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) focus on ways to support and encourage good urban design, mixed use, papakāinga, and extended family housing models, social housing (including community providers) and accessibility/universal design
- xii) support retention of current provisions for ridgeline protection overlay areas of protection relating to treasured maunga including the museum view shaft protection
- xiii) support proposal to include phased transitioning of areas in Auckland with long-term infrastructure constraints.

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board

Meeting date: 16 June 2022

Resolution number HB/2022/75

That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board:

- a) note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 as set out in attachment A to the agenda report
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022 as set out in attachment B to the agenda report
- c) provide the following local board views to the Auckland Council's preliminary response, to be considered by the Planning Committee in preparation of the proposed intensification plan change for notification in August 2022
 - i) note that there was limited support for this proposal in the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area
 - ii) request that tools and education to inform the community of what is a "permitted activity" are provided with some urgency upon adoption of this plan change
- d) express concern that the removal of requirements for open space or minimum parking under the National Policy Statement Urban Development, and request options for developers to apply best practice for open space, and pedestrian access that meets universal design guidelines should be strongly encouraged
- e) express concern that the pressures of increased and unplanned development places on infrastructure are of serious concern to communities and are likely to result in future frustration without adequate consideration from central government of new sources of funding for Auckland Council and its Council Controlled Organisations to meet demand from new housing
- f) request the consideration of the principles of access to sunlight and shading on neighbouring properties in respect of any development application provisions.

Howick Local Board

Meeting date: 20 June 2022

Resolution number HW/2022/81

That the Howick Local Board:

- a) note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022
- c) endorse the following feedback as the local board's response to the council's preliminary response, to be considered by the Planning Committee in preparation of the proposed intensification plan change for notification in August 2022:
 - i) do not support the proposed walkable catchment of 1200 metres from the edge of the city centre, noting the following:
 - A) a 1200 metre walk is a considerable distance for a great many people to cope with. Taking into account the demographic and topographic elements of a good deal of Auckland, the board considers that a 1000 metre walkable catchment should be the maximum.
 - ii) do not support the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres from the edge of the metropolitan centres, noting the following:
 - A) for newer modern well designed and sited town centres this distance should be acceptable however for older centres we feel 500 metres may be more appropriate.
 - iii) do not support the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres around rapid transit stops, noting the following:
 - A) this distance may be too far for many considering the demographic make-up of many parts of Auckland coupled with the region's topography.
 - iv) support the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone to residential areas up to around 400 metres from large town centres with high accessibility, noting the following
 - A) the board supports the 400 metres around LARGE TOWN CENTRES terrace housing but note that 6 storey apartment blocks may not be desirable.
 - B) the two housing types covered here are very disparate and the board doesn't agree the same rules should apply to both as of right.
 - C) 6 storey should be considered as a discretionary activity rather than as 'as of right' and should also be of a limited notification for resource consent.
 - v) support the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone to residential areas up to around 200 metres from small town centres or large local centres with high accessibility

- vi) support the proposal to include special character areas of high quality as a qualifying matter, noting the following:
 - A) the history of Auckland and its associated architecture, plus areas of environmental significance, are important to the vast majority of Aucklanders so there should be enduring protection for these special character areas.
 - B) conditionally supports the proposed residential special character areas of high quality that have been identified. The board believes that there may be other areas that have not been considered so feel that this needs further investigation and consultation with Aucklanders, particularly those with wide knowledge of Auckland's rich history and built heritage.
- vii) conditionally supports the proposed business special character areas of high quality that have been identified, noting the following.
 - A) that Howick Town Centre is identified in the Auckland Unitary Plan as a Business Special Character area, but the board would like more information on other proposed areas outside the Howick Local Board area.
- viii) support the proposal to include areas in urban Auckland with long-term significant infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter, noting the following:
 - A) the board is aware of serious infrastructure deficiencies in the Howick local board area, notably storm and wastewater issues, which are causing hardship to some residents and making it difficult for further development. The board understands that this is symptomatic of many parts of Auckland and these shortcomings need to be addressed before intensification occurs in these places.
- ix) with regards to other qualifying matters, notes the following points for input:
 - A) the reference to the Stockade Hill viewshaft, which is in the local board area, and applaud the earlier decision to establish and gazette this viewshaft. The board consider this to be 'untouchable' and trust that this protection is now cemented in place for posterity.
 - B) the board also believes that the areas of Howick's northern slopes that previously enjoyed protection under the former RH7 and HH7 zoning should be considered 'qualifying matters' and if these zones are not currently protected by an overlay, then this should be put in place, or the same outcome effected by whatever are now considered the appropriate mechanisms.
- x) endorse the views that were provided by Howick local board residents.

Kaipātiki Local Board

Meeting date: 22 June 2022

Resolution number KT/2022/131

That the Kaipātiki Local Board:

- a) note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022.
- c) note that this pre-consultation period was immediately following Easter and contained Anzac Day and Mother's Day, being a total of thirteen working days and not an appropriate amount of time for such significant feedback to be provide by the community.
- d) express concern over the significant distress that this rushed process has caused the community, particularly for the residents of Northcote Point and Birkenhead Point.
- e) express concern regarding confusion created in the community on the phrasing of some questions and selectable answers, and request that future feedback forms adhere to the principles of Plain English.
- f) thank the 660 submitters from the Kaipātiki Local Board area, being 8% of the 7,886 submissions received.
- g) acknowledge the receipt of the petition of 1102 signatories (resolution number KT/2022/69) opposing the removal of the Special Character Areas from Northcote Point and Birkenhead Point that will allow for greater allowances in development, noting that the petition is ongoing and that numbers in support of the petition have risen to 1231 signatures.
- h) provide the following feedback as the local board's response to the council's preliminary response, to be considered by the Planning Committee in preparation of the proposed intensification plan change for notification in August 2022:
 - i) we support warm, dry, affordable homes for our community with high standards of design, especially in areas of frequent public transport, appropriate infrastructure, access to adequate outdoor recreation space, and developed in a planned way rather than an ad hoc basis, however;
 - ii) we do not support the changes to the AUP foisted upon Auckland Council by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) and Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021, without being subject to the same public, democratic scrutiny and process as per the AUP.
 - iii) we request that where possible, the Governing Body seriously consider judicial challenge as a valid response to the NPS-UD and other National Policy Statements instead of accepting them as "mandatory", as they are not parliamentary legislation and open to judicial review.
 - iv) we are extremely concerned about the radical impact that the new density and height-to-boundary rules will have on our community, which will allow far more intense and higher developments throughout Kaipātiki Local Board area, and overrides the considerable public consultation that was done to shape the AUP.
 - v) we note changes to most of the Kaipātiki Local Board area will likely include:

- A) the effective removal of the single-house zone,
- B) the effective conversion of all Mixed Housing Suburban zoning to Mixed Housing Urban zoning,
- allowance of three dwellings allowed per site without a resource consent, preventing Council from mitigating impacts on the surrounding area, including infrastructure, traffic, etc,
- D) reduction of the minimum site for a dwelling from 400-600m² to 300-400m².
- E) reduction of distance to boundary to 1m,
- F) removal of minimum on-site parking requirements,
- G) removal of overlays, including the Special Character Areas and Significant Ecological Areas, and removal of notable trees.
- H) introduction of "walkable catchments" around rapid transit stops (and the city centre and metropolitan centres not in Kaipātiki) where building heights are required to be six or more storeys.
- vi) we request the retention of the existing Special Character Areas and boundaries, as identified in the Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter D18 Special Character Areas Overlay (including Birkenhead Point and Northcote Point).
- vii) we request that Council accepts that Special Character Area properties assessed at a score of 4 in the Special Character Area threshold assessment are of sufficiently high enough quality, and that they be added to properties that scored 5 and 6.
- viii) we request that the Special Character assessment threshold is lowered to 60% in order to accurately reflect and preserve continuous areas of high quality special character and the amenity to the area that it provides.
- ix) we request the retention of the existing Significant Ecological Areas and boundaries, as identified in the Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter D9 Significant Ecological Areas Overlay, with particular priority given to the private land around Le Roys Bush Reserve. Should medium density progress in this area, the Little Shoal Bay catchment will be significantly impacted by deforestation, sediment and erosion.
- x) we request that long-term significant infrastructure constraints are included as a qualifying matter, noting that 75% of respondents in the Kaipātiki Local Board area supported this.
- xi) we request that all walkable catchments should be conditional on:
 - A) whether adequate infrastructure can be provided,
 - B) the retention of existing levels of public spaces, parks, and reserves, and the provision of additional public spaces, parks and reserves commensurate with the expected increase in population,
 - C) the adoption of a 'sunlight admission control' which protects sunlight and daylight in public spaces including parks, reserves, lakes, foreshore, and beaches, and height controls to ensure the same are not dominated by the surrounding built environment.
 - D) including pedestrian infrastructure, such as seating and mature trees.
 - E) include minimum parking spaces and appropriate spread of disabled parking and loading zones.
- xii) provide the following responses to the questions asked during public consultation:

- A) Q1. What do you think of our proposed walkable catchment of 1200 metres from the edge of the city centre?
 - The Kaipātiki Local Board does not support the proposal and believes the walkable catchment should be closer, noting that 40% of Kaipātiki respondents supported the proposal and 32% did not support the proposal wanting it closer.
- B) Q2. What do you think of our proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres from the edge of the metropolitan centres?

 The Kaipātiki Local Board does not support the proposal and believes the walkable catchment should be closer, noting that 37% of Kaipātiki respondents supported the proposal and 30% did not support the proposal wanting it closer.
- C) Q3. What do you think of our proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres around rapid transit stops?

 The Kaipātiki Local Board does not support the proposal and believes the walkable catchment should be closer, noting that 39% of Kaipātiki respondents supported the proposal and 32% did not support the proposal wanting it closer.
- Q4. What do you think of our proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone to residential areas up to around 400 metres from large town centres with high accessibility? The Kaipātiki Local Board does not support the proposal and believes the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone should be closer, noting that 26% of Kaipātiki respondents supported the proposal and 35% did not support the proposal - wanting it closer.
- E) Q5. What do you think of our proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone to residential areas up to around 200 metres from small town? The Kaipātiki Local Board does not support the proposal and believes the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone should be closer, noting that 30% of Kaipātiki respondents supported the proposal, 23% did not support the proposal wanting it further, and 29% did not support the proposal wanting it closer.
- F) Q6. What do you think of our proposal to include identified special character areas as a qualifying matter?

 The Kaipātiki Local Board does not support the proposal and believes all existing special character areas should be a qualifying matter, noting that 38% of Kaipātiki respondents supported the proposal, and 42% did not support the proposal wanting all existing special character areas to be a qualifying matter.
- Q7: What do you think of the proposed residential special character areas that we have identified? The Kaipātiki Local Board does not support the proposal and believes there are more areas that should be identified as a qualifying matter, noting that 13% of Kaipātiki respondents supported the proposal, and 63% did not support the proposal – there are more areas that should be identified as a qualifying matter.
- H) Q8. What do you think of the proposed business special character areas that we have identified? The Kaipātiki Local Board does not support the proposal and believes there are more areas or parts of areas that should be identified as a qualifying matter, noting that 20% of Kaipātiki respondents supported the proposal, and 40% did not support the proposal – there are more areas or parts of areas that should be identified as a qualifying matter.

- Q9. What do you think of our proposal to include areas in Auckland with long-term significant infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter? The Kaipātiki Local Board supports the proposal, noting that 75% of Kaipātiki respondents supported the proposal, and 13% did not support the proposal.
- xiii) note that the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) already delivers sufficient supply of housing for short, medium, and long term, including provisions for housing in centre and fringe areas, as noted in the GM Auckland Plan Strategy & Research presentation to Planning Committee, 26 May, and 2 June 2021 as follows:
 - A) Plan-enabled housing capacity (supply under current AUP settings) clearly meets the forecast demand of approximately 320,000 over the next 30 years, and could meet higher demand:
 - 1) At least 909k net redevelopment opportunities exist now,
 - 2) 840k ~ 1.4m redevelopments are considered commercially feasible,
 - 3) 300k ~ 320k are expected to be realised over the next 30 years.
 - 4) Projections allow for 15-20% greater demand possibilities: Projected short-term demand (2020-2023) 45,000 / projected medium demand (2024-2031) 98,000 / projected long-term demand (2032-2051) 239,000.
- xiv) note the following excerpts from Parliamentary Hansard that confirm that the understanding of members of parliament was that under the NPS-UD, Auckland Council would have the discretion to retain Special Character Areas:
 - A) Nicola Willis (National Party): We also listened intently to local authorities who said that they needed to maintain some discretion so that they could exclude areas from intense housing development that were not properly suited to it—areas, for example, that were subject to natural hazards, areas that had historic heritage, areas which would not be able to support the level of housing that this bill implies. So, we tidied up the qualifying matters section of this bill to ensure that local authorities were able to carry over assessments formed during previous planning processes.
 - B) Eugenie Sage (Green Party): But it is on those matters that there were changes to the bill to provide a little bit more flexibility for councils to ensure that medium density happens in more suitable—well, doesn't happen in unsuitable areas.
 - C) Simon Watts (National Party): An issue that was raised a lot in my electorate was around the exclusions around particularly heritage zoning. If any of you have been to the beautiful Devonport Peninsula on the North Shore, it is a stunning location. I'm slightly biased, but it is a lovely part of our city, and I'm glad to see that a number of the considerations around special character zones—that the council will be able to ensure that those protections remain. And that's really important, not only for heritage but also for environmental aspects and other risk considerations.
- xv) endorse the following feedback provided by the Birkenhead Village Association in regards to retaining Special Character in Birkenhead:
 - A) Birkenhead has played a key part in Auckland Council's Heritage Festival for a number of years. Our Village Centre reflects that with a number of restored heritage buildings. A Heritage Walk is offered, paved footpaths and heritage globe lights all add to the very special character of Birkenhead.

 In conjunction with Auckland Council, Birkenhead Village has invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in the Auckland Heritage Festival with key events to drive

- economic activity in the area, these events have been hosted for the last decade since 2010 and have included vintage car shows, Clydesdale horses, music of the art deco period, heritage walks and talks, and showcasing of entrepreneurs and leading professional personalities of Auckland City ie Henry Haywood Luna Park producer, WF Hammond North Shore Map Surveyor and Creator, William Thompson president of Fruit Growers Association and entrepreneur of Thompson and Hills brand which went on to become nationally sold Oak Jam , and Edward Leroy visionary of Auckland's only inner-city rainforest. Written about in The Story of Birkenhead by Margaret McClure.
- B) It might have been helpful if the Council had bothered to send their inspectors out to Birkenhead and Northcote, to see the very dwellings they are condemning should this mad proposal go through. There are irreplaceable dwellings en masse in these suburbs that need to be retained and protected. These are some of the oldest suburbs on the North Shore still part of Auckland and are part of Auckland's heritage. Many owners of these homes have lovingly restored them and retained their heritage features. To walk down Hinemoa Street in Birkenhead, is to feast upon special homes that have a place in Auckland's history. To allow a developer to bowl a house and then erect 3x3 rectangular monstrosity in a heritage area is an outrage. It would destroy the unique special character of these suburbs.
- xvi) endorse the following feedback provided by individual members of the public from the Kaipātiki Local Board area:
 - A) This legislation has been rushed through with insufficient analysis and planning.
 - B) Infrastructure constraints are already of major concern in Birkenhead Pt. Morning and evening traffic is already an issue, as is parking due to the ferry terminal at one end of the Point and the shopping centre at the other. Public transport is inadequate as are pedestrian crossings; there are no cycleways. Rubbish trucks have difficulty manoeuvring. Old wastewater and storm water pipes are problematic, run off is already an issue and drainage doesn't cope in heavy rain.
 - Council's scoring system [Special Character Area threshold assessment] is too restrictive. The proposal requires 66% of individual properties in an area to score 5/6 or 6/6 on a character assessment, before the area would qualify to keep its "special character area" status. The 66% threshold should be lower, (e.g. 50% still a majority of character houses). Also, properties scoring 4/6 (which Council accepts are still "character supporting") should be counted towards the percentage test as well, not just 5/6 or 6/6. Many other suburbs that are keeping their "special character area" status were surveyed in person by Council representatives doing site visits. Northcote and Birkenhead Points were just assessed using Google Street View, which means Council's scoring for those areas does not properly show their true character status.
 - D) Infrastructure is a fundamental requirement to support any intensification. It is simply negligent to not include it as a qualifying matter. Much of the water, stormwater and wastewater infrastructure in Birkenhead is already under stress and there are significant issues, e.g. with stormwater overflow and wastewater leaking in the bush. Birkenhead Point has a rich history (as does Northcote Point and other special character areas, hence the zoning!), it tells the story of pre-bridge Auckland when people would travel across from the city on the car ferry, land at the Wharf and drive up Hinemoa to go north (through the strawberry fields and orchards). People would stop at the top of Hinemoa near Maritime Tce to shop at the dairy and bakery (I think the former is corner Bridgeview and Hinemoa and the latter corner Hinemoa and

Maritime), get petrol, go to the post office, butchers etc.

There are a lot of houses in Hinemoa St, Maritime Terrace and the surrounding areas (Bridgeview, Wakanui) that are worthy of protection and still retain their unique and distinctive architecture.

Examples: Wakanui St (west side) there are historic homes whose character has been retained. In addition, on the opposite side of the road on the corners of Maritime and Hinemoa there are Historic Heritage homes, so it would make sense to retain a small area or cluster of homes which are protected. Likewise, in the same triangle 'block' (Wakanui, Maritime, Hinemoa) the house at the corner of Maritime and Hinemoa (81 Hinemoa St), referenced above.

There are other houses in both Hinemoa St and Maritime Terrace that have special and unique character that should be protected, eg 30 Maritime (the maps are not clear if it is the one with Historic Heritage protection), 42 & 46 Maritime, as well as the villas across the road from them at #29 and 35.

In Hinemoa St, the houses which I think should be considered further are # 9 -1 3 and 19 (one of which I think is Historic Heritage but not clear which).

I support the retention of Special Character protections on the properties identify further along Hinemoa St opposite Glade Place and le Roy Terrace, thank you. I also support the retention of the Special Character overlay in Awanui St. As an added point - most of the special character homes on the Point are NOT close to any form of rapid transport, and the transport options are limited in frequency. There is the ferry - but it's a steep hill to walk down/up for many people.

- E) Google street was used for 100% of the Birkenhead Point & Northcote Point survey. There are issues with Google Street for example a property down a slip road might show a neighbouring property.

 The Queen Street, Northcote Point properties from Bartley Street to Duke Street should not be classed as Medium Density. They should retain the Unitary Plan zoning. Most have well cared for villa houses, dating from the 1890s to around 1910. It is unlikely that the waste and water infrastructure would cope with 3 X 3 homes being built on the proposed Queen Street rezoned medium density property. There is almost no public transport infrastructure in Northcote Point. The ferry has been closed and / or not operated reliably for the past four years
- F) We support careful and considered development and intensification of our historic Highbury Precinct (Heart of commercial development of what is now Birkenhead Village) in line with council overseas expert Donovan Rypkema commissioned to speak by Auckland Council March 10, 2015 for the following reasons:
 - 1) Heritage is a public good,
 - 2) Heritage delivers economic benefits, we have created a tourism drawcard through our Highbury Heritage Walks,
 - 3) Heritage is good urbanism,
 - 4) Heritage provides environmental benefits in line with the green economy the cost to develop existing buildings is less than the cost to develop new buildings.
- i) request the opportunity for the Chairperson or delegate to address the Planning Committee and Independent Hearing Panel on our feedback.

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board

Meeting date: 15 June 2022

Resolution number MO/2022/92

That the Mangere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 provided as Attachment A of the agenda report
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022 provided as Attachment B of the agenda report
- c) adopt the Board feedback tabled at the meeting as **Attachment A**
- d) generally support intensification to improve housing choice and affordability, but is concerned that intensification is occurring in communities that are under-provided for in terms of public open spaces, facilities and amenities and further investment is needed to address this situation so access to quality public services is enhanced rather than reduced as a result of intensification.

Minutes Attachment A: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board feedback:

National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and RMA amendments 2021

Council's preliminary response April 2022 Local board feedback template June 2022 Introduction

A. Requirements for intensification

Intensification inside walkable catchments

1. What do you think of the proposed walkable catchment of 1200 metres from the edge of the city centre?

Support

Tell us why

It encourages walking, cycling and active lifestyles.

It allows for easier access to amenities and major transport hubs, reducing the dependency on vehicles; as a result, reducing traffic congestion and contribute to other key obligations and aspirations in relation to climate change actions and reducing transport emissions.

What do you think of the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres from the edge of the metropolitan centres?

Support

Further comment: The Local Board requests further clarification on whether the light rail infrastructure, e.g., pedestrian walkways, planting and bus stops will be considered as part of the investment as this area will definitely have to be considered as a metropolitan area.

Tell us why

This proposal will reduce the pressure on the city centres as the higher density housing will be spread across all metro centres and this could activate the areas closer to the metropolitan centres.

2. What do you think of the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres around rapid transit stops?

Support

Tell us why

It allows easier access to transport hubs, reducing the need for private vehicle use and promoting the use of public transport especially for students and city workers.

Intensification around town and local centres

3. What do you think of the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone to residential areas up to around 400 metres from large town centres with high accessibility?

Support

Further comments: Some of the big future projects coming to the Local Board area, e.g., Auckland Light Rail, will require high accessibility. Currently, e.g., the Māngere Town Centre might not be a large town centre compared to some other town centres across the region, however, the impact of the light rail project on that area will be significant and it will support higher density Terrace Housing and apartment buildings in the surrounding area with high accessibility to retail and commercial centres and community facilities.

4. What do you think of the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone to residential areas up to around 200 metres from small town centres or large local centres with high accessibility?

Support

Tell us why

Building terrace houses and apartment buildings will increase the density of the people in the areas around the small-town centres and will support the local economy and the businesses across the immediate area and across a wider zone.

Higher density of people in different areas means that more infrastructure investments around the area are needed.

B. Council-identified qualifying matters

Special Character Areas

5. What do you think of the proposal to include special character areas of high quality as a qualifying matter?

Support

Preserving appropriate elements of high-quality special character areas retains aspects of our heritage, allows our built environments to continue telling our stories, adds variety, interest and even beauty within our city.

6. What do you think of the proposed residential special character areas of high quality that have been identified?

Support

7. What do you think of the proposed business special character areas of high quality that have been identified?

Support

Infrastructure constraints

8. What do you think of the proposal to include areas in urban Auckland with long-term significant infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter?

Support

Further comments: Adequate infrastructure investigation and studies are needed before intensification takes place

Further comments: the Local Board requests that any consideration of development and increasing density must include analysis of other current housing projects in the area prior to permissions and new builds. Areas such as Māngere already are absorbing massive new housing development and it will be important to avoid over-exhausting or lowering wellbeing of the residents with the various builds and infrastructure development taking place plus it will be vital to ensure soft infrastructure, green spaces, and services available in each area are sufficient for the wellbeing of communities and neighbourhoods. The rush to build more housing cannot be allowed to take priority over developing sustainable, healthy, and well-equipped communities for the future.

Other qualifying matters

9. Do you have feedback on any other qualifying matters? (please be clear which proposal you are referring to)

The Local Board requests including the Maunga on the qualifying matters.

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board		

Manurewa Local Board

Meeting date: 16 June 2022

Resolution number MR/2022/89

That the Manurewa Local Board:

- a) note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022
- c) provide the following feedback as the local board's response to the council's preliminary response, to be considered by the Planning Committee in preparation of the proposed intensification plan change for notification in August 2022:
 - i) the board remains opposed to the increased intensification rules imposed by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. We do not agree with requiring intensive development across the city regardless of infrastructure provision, and without due consideration of the views of local communities. These changes will increase housing intensification in areas that were never planned for such high density, and which lack the infrastructure to cope with it. While we accept that Auckland Council is required to apply these new rules, our feedback below on how council proposes to apply these rules should not be taken as an endorsement of the rules themselves

Requirements for intensification

- ii) the board supports in principle the council's proposed walkable catchment definitions. Development of areas where zoning is to be increased due to this process should ideally follow a staged approach. This would mean that properties closest to the city / metropolitan / town centre or rapid transit stop are developed first, then as higher density is achieved, development is progressed further out within the walkable catchment
- iii) the board requests that Auckland Council considers rezoning the area of Light Industrial Zoning on Great South Road adjacent to Te Mahia train station to Mixed Use Zoning as part of this plan change. We believe that this would allow for developments that would be more compatible with the residential zoning in that area, particularly as the residential zoning will be becoming more intensive as part of this plan change

Council-identified qualifying matters

- iv) the board supports the proposal to include special character areas of high quality as a qualifying matter. Special character area rules will need to be written in a way that preserves the current Auckland Unitary Plan zoning rules for these areas. Otherwise, the special character of these areas will be eroded over time, and would also result in the removal of large numbers of non-protected trees from private property due to development
- v) the board supports the proposed residential special character areas of high quality that have been identified. The Hillpark Special Character Area was included in the Auckland Unitary Plan through a process that included consultation with the local community, and we are pleased to

see it is proposed to be retained

- vi) the board supports the proposed business special character areas of high quality that have been identified, noting that there are no business special character areas in Manurewa
- vii) reverse sensitivity effects at the interface of special character areas with more intensive zones will require careful management in the zone rules if the preservation of special character is to be meaningful. Proximity to a special character area should be included as a qualify matter to ensure there is a gradual increase in the height of developments as distance from the special character area increases
- viii) the board supports the proposal to include areas in urban Auckland with long-term infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter
- ix) provision of public open space will become increasingly important as intensification takes effect in our suburban areas. The board requests that this is reflected by including 'lack of public open space provision' as a qualifying matter
- x) the board requests that Significant Ecological Areas are included as a qualifying matter, as protection of our Urban Ngahere and bush remnants should be prioritised even as intensification increases.

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

Meeting date: 21 June 2022

Resolution number MT/2022/69

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

- a) note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021;
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022;
- c) provide the following feedback on the council's preliminary response, to be considered by the Planning Committee in preparation of the proposed intensification plan change for notification in August 2022:
 - i) support the proposed walkable catchment of 1200 metres from the edge of the city centre;
 - ii) support the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres from the edge of the metropolitan centres;
 - iii) support the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres around train or bus stations;
 - iv) support prioritising accessible and walkable catchments, noting that walkability is not only a function of distance but is also affected by other aspects of the street environment, such as lighting, safety, shade/shelter and footpath quality;
 - v) request a focus on the wider aspects of healthy streets within the walkable catchments as defined by distance;
 - vi) support the proposed 400 metre Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zones around large town centres;
 - vii) support the proposed 200 metre Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zones around small town centres or large local centres with high accessibility;
 - viii) note that proposed plan changes for large parts of Onehunga were not publicly consulted on due to Light Rail Corridor investigations and that communities in Onehunga may now be disengaged from this engagement process, not aware of potential impacts of this plan change on their neighbourhoods;
 - ix) note that Onehunga West and Onehunga East residential Special Character Areas are of highquality special character value with 77% and 86% of individual properties scoring either 5 or 6 respectively, and anticipate that these special character areas will be included as qualifying matters in the proposed plan change regardless of where future rapid-transit stops will be located;
 - x) note that Onehunga business Special Character Area has been identified as a qualifying matter and anticipate this Special Character Area being retained to a full extent in the proposed plan change;
 - xi) note that Eke Panuku's urban regeneration work in Onehunga intends to honour and highlight local heritage alongside regeneration and development of higher-intensity housing;
 - xii) request that additional resource be allocated to plan change consultation in Onehunga and areas under the Light Rail Corridor once proposed plan changes are finalised;

- xiii) request that public consultation feedback from the notification period is presented to local boards with an additional opportunity for local board feedback;
- xiv) support the proposal to include areas in urban Auckland with long-term significant infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter.
- d) delegate authority to Chair M Meredith or Deputy Chair C Makoare as an alternate to speak at the 30 June planning committee meeting.

Ōrākei Local Board

Meeting date: 23 June 2022

Resolution number OR/2022/83

That the Ōrākei Local Board:

- a) note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022
- c) provide the **tabled feedback** on the council's preliminary response, to be considered by the Planning Committee in preparation of the proposed intensification plan change for notification in August 2022
- d) delegate authority to Member T Churton and/or Chair S Milne to present the board's views at the Planning Committee meeting scheduled for 30 June 2022

Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board

Meeting date: 21 June 2022

Resolution number OP/2022/97

That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

- a) note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 provided as Attachment A of the agenda report
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022 provided as Attachment B of the agenda report
- c) endorse the **feedback** on the council's preliminary response, to be considered by the Planning Committee in preparation of the proposed intensification plan change for notification in August 2022, **tabled at the meeting**.

Minutes Attachment: Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board feedback:

National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and RMA amendments 2021 Council's preliminary response April 2022

Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board feedback, June 2022

A. Requirements for intensification

Intensification inside walkable catchments

1. What do you think of the proposed walkable catchment of 1200 metres from the edge of the city centre?

Support

Tell us why

- Generally supportive of the proposed walkable catchment. However, a 1200m radius is a
 simplistic tool to use as land is not linear, and some land use can be barriers and cause delay for
 pedestrians, such as severance by road crossings over major routes. Therefore, corresponding
 planning and investment must be made for these catchments, to make them more walkable or
 safer for pedestrians.
- We continue to be concerned that many of our communities are left out of the conversation, and normal public consultations do not reach into our communities with any significant penetration.
 We constantly hear our residents complaining about a multilevel structure being built next door and are unaware of the Unitary Plan enabling such a build. We are afraid the same is happening again. We urge the Auckland Council to thoroughly engage and inform our communities of the ramifications of these proposed changes.
- Specifically for the Metropolitan Centre of Manukau there are large areas which are currently zoned General Business and Mixed Use. There should be a removal of the General Business zone and change to Mixed Use and Metropolitan. By extending the Metropolitan Centre into the proposed Mixed Use zone will make it consistent with surrounding area.
- Strongly support the aim of a well-functioning urban environment, particularly as it relates to affordable housing, improved access to transport, jobs, services and amenities, and lower carbon emissions
- Propose including reliable, frequent bus routes within the definition of 'rapid transit'

2. What do you think of the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres from the edge of the metropolitan centres?

Support

Tell us why

- As with the above, we are generally supportive, but also note the same concerns also mentioned above
- 3. What do you think of the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres around rapid transit stops?

Support

Tell us why

- As with the above, we are generally supportive, but also note the same concerns also mentioned above.
- Specifically for Puhinui, there is an area of Single House off Puhinui Road, around Ranfurly Road, and Clendon and Plunket Avenues. To be consistent with other parts of the Local Board and city, this should be up zoned to Mixed Housing Suburban. It is in a great location next to employment, main route to airport (more employment), Puhinui Train Station, schools, parks and potential greenways, and very close to the Manukau Metropolitan area.
- Note that walkability is not only a function of distance but is also affected by other aspects of
 the street environment, such as lighting, safety, shade/shelter and footpath quality, and request
 a focus on the wider aspects of healthy streets within the walkable catchments as defined by
 distance.

Intensification around town and local centres

4. What do you think of the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone to residential areas up to around 400 metres from large town centres with high accessibility?

Support

Tell us why:

- As with the above, we are generally supportive, but also note the same concerns also mentioned above.
- The board support prioritising access and walkable catchments.
- 5. What do you think of the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone to residential areas up to around 200 metres from small town centres or large local centres with high accessibility?

Support

Tell us why

- As with the above, we are generally supportive, but also note the same concerns also mentioned above.
- Liveability, easy access to transport connections and work is of priority for the local board. "Connected area and easy to get around" is one of the six outcomes of the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Plan 2020 and terrace housing and apartment buildings close to small town centres / local centres enables accessibility for families and business.
- Specifically, the area around Dawson Road could be considered for further up-zoning.
- The board support prioritising access and walkable catchments.

Council-identified qualifying matters

Special Character Areas

6. What do you think of the proposal to include special character areas of high quality as a qualifying matter?

Support

Tell us why

- The rapid, intensive growth taking place in Auckland has been further accelerated with the NPS-UD. The board support including "special character areas" as a qualifying matter to help retain character and features in the built environment of Auckland. These reflect both history and journey of the city and the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board value built heritage.
- However, in instances where we must weigh way up the value of build heritage, and the need for up zoning around public transport hubs and town centres, then the board agrees with the latter, otherwise we create a donut shaped developed city and increase inequalities
- Note concern that SCA's seem to cover walkable catchments around public transport hubs on the isthmus. This will perpetuate inequalities across the cities as intensification around public transport hubs will occur in outer suburbs but not in affluent central suburbs

7. What do you think of the proposed residential special character areas of high quality that have been identified?

Support

Tell us why

- The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board also notes serious concern of the adverse effect within its local area boundaries, with no areas zoned as SCA, it is attractive for developers and builders and consequent congestion and associated challenges, little regard to good, high-quality urban design and poor built environment and added pressure on the land.
- The Board is also concerned that large parts of the SCA are kept intact around public transport hubs such as train stations, particularly on the isthmus. While SCAs are important, the board believes it should not trump the need for intensification around our Town Centres and public

transport hubs. By protecting large swathes of SCAs in the central isthmus, this will be pushing development and intensification out to the outer suburbs such as Otara-Papatoetoe, creating a donut city and worsening inequalities. It is unfair that Local Boards with less SCAs and are further away from the city centre with employment opportunities have to bear the brunt of intensification around our Town Centres and public transport hubs, yet some isthmus area are protected by SCAs.

• The Board is also concerned that the methodology used by Council to arbitrarily assign SCAs as worthy of protection, is flawed. By not including the condition of rear properties, the percentage of special character buildings in an area can go up. A gerrymandering of sub SCAs can also push up the percentage of special character buildings

8. What do you think of the proposed business special character areas of high quality that have been identified?

Support

Tell us why

• As above, we are generally supportive of SCAs, including in business areas, but also agree those near public transport hubs should be up-zoned.

Infrastructure constraints

9. What do you think of the proposal to include areas in urban Auckland with long-term significant infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter?

Support

• The Board generally supports the sentiments behind this possible qualifying matter, however, this needs to be applied consistently across the city, and not applied to areas where residents are most vocal with their advocacy

Other qualifying matters

10. Do you have feedback on any other qualifying matters? (please be clear which proposal you are referring to)

The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board

- advocate a stronger focus on environmental hazards and environmental protection in Auckland Council's qualifying matters
- advocate for a stronger focus on protecting productive rural land
- note that existing special character housing is valued by many Auckland residents, but that
 increasing housing availability in the areas closest to rapid transit is crucial to affordability,
 access and climate mitigation
- advocate for planning incentives for developments to protect existing trees (e.g. Christchurch's proposal for financial contributions which could be remitted or discounted for developments which retain existing trees).

11. Additional feedback points for consideration, that the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

- request that the removal of minimum parking requirements negatively affects areas of Auckland with limited access to public transport (such as rural areas) and where employment is difficult to access by public transport
- request Council advocate to central government to review the issue of minimum parking requirements and consider a phased approach based on differing levels of public transport access
- request Council act to mitigate the resulting transport inequities and expand access to public transport
- request Council revise mobility parking rules to ensure sufficient mobility parking is provided

- request an increased focus on spatial planning with population/development triggers to ensure sufficient open space is provided for the growing population in denser neighbourhoods
- request that planning in response to the NPRS-UD and MDRS focus on ways to support and encourage good urban design, mixed use, papakāinga and extended family housing models, social housing (including community providers) and accessibility/universal design.

Papakura Local Board

Meeting date: 22 June 2022

Resolution number PPK/2022/99

That the Papakura Local Board:

- a) note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022
- c) provide the following feedback on the council's preliminary response, to be considered by the Planning Committee in preparation of the proposed intensification plan change for notification in August 2022:

a)	Question	b)	Papakura Local Board feedback	
Α.	Requirements for intensification			
c)	Intensification inside walkable catchments			
1.	What do you think of the proposed walkable catchment of 1200 metres from the edge of the city centre?	d)	Support	
2.	What do you think of the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres from the edge of the metropolitan centres?	e)	Support	
3.	What do you think of the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres around rapid transit stops?	f)	Support	
g)	Intensification around town and local centres			
4.	What do you think of the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone to residential areas up to around 400 metres from large town centres with high accessibility?	alway there walk j) town	Do not support – should be closer The board felt it should be 200 – 300 metres use the town centres and local centres don't ys have good connectivity for public transport, efore it has to be closer to encourage people to the board also felt that the ambiance of the centres could become prime locations for sof deprivation.	
5.	What do you think of the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and	k)	Support	

	Apartment Buildings zone to residential areas up to around 200 metres from small town centres or large local centres with high accessibility?	As long as parking is provided at the centres and onsite parking provided for residential dwellings otherwise side streets become blocked by vehicles parking on the roads. The effect on the town centres is people won't come into shop as there won't be enough carparking available. l) Adequate public transport options are a must.		
В.	Council-identified qualifying matters			
m)	Special Character Areas			
6.	What do you think of the proposal to include special character areas of high quality as a qualifying matter?	n) Support o) The board is concerned that there is no provision for any special character overlay in the Papakura Local Board area. There are historic buildings that are not listed as such in the Auckland Unitary Plan, e.g. the Papakura Old Central School and the Papakura Farmers building.		
7.	What do you think of the proposed residential special character areas of high quality that have been identified?	p) Do not support – there are areas of high quality not identified that should be q) The Papakura Local Board supports in principle, however, whilst these areas have been identified in the central city, they have not been identified in the outer suburbs.		
8.	What do you think of the proposed business special character areas of high quality that have been identified?	r) Do not support – more areas or parts of areas should be identified. s) The Papakura Local Board supports in principle, however, whilst these areas have been identified in the central city, they have not been identified in the outer suburbs.		
t)	Infrastructure constraints	u)		
9.	What do you think of the proposal to include areas in urban Auckland with long-term significant infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter?	v) Support w) It is crucial that local issues are taken into account.		
x)	Other qualifying matters			
10.	Do you have feedback on any other qualifying matters?	The Papakura Local Board felt the above qualifying matters should be included. In particular, the board felt it was important to allow the sunlight into public areas.		

These qualifying matters need to be continually
monitored as changes occur to viewshafts with new
or unrecognised developments.

Puketāpapa Local Board

Meeting date: 16 June 2022

Resolution number PKTPP/2022/92

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

- a) note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022
- c) support the proposed walkable catchment of 1200 metres from the edge of the city centre, noting this proposal had had widespread public support
 - support the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres from the edge of the metropolitan centres, noting this proposal had had widespread public support
 - support the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres around rapid transit stops, noting this proposal had had widespread public support.
 - request further investigation into the inclusion of the Frequent Transport Network of buses into this proposal.
 - support the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone to residential areas up to around 400 metres from large town centres with high transport accessibility, noting this proposal had had widespread public support.
 - support the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone to residential areas up to around 200 metres from small town centres with high transport accessibility, noting this proposal had had widespread public support.
 - support the principle of inclusion of Special Character Areas as a qualifying matter, noting the general support for this from Local Board residents.
 - request further investigation into the Special Character Area overlay on Donald Crescent and Fearon Ave, noting its proximity to the town centre and public transport.
 - recommend that Special Character Areas within walkable distance of Rapid Transport Network and Frequent Transport Network stations be disestablished, noting the importance of intensifying these areas when building a compact city, providing housing equitably and taking climate action. Noting that ability to protect heritage buildings and sites using other planning and legal mechanisms is not impacted by disestablishing Special Character Areas.
 - support the principle of including long-term significant infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter, with the caveat that these need to be focused on natural barriers to infrastructure rather than potential costs to the Council, noting the ability to charge Developer Contributions to address these.
 - support the proposal to include a number of other overlays and controls, especially the maunga view shafts.

- request a reassessment of the effects of intensification on Special Ecological Areas that currently do not have a restrictive overlay, such as surrounding the Wairaki Stream Catchment. These areas are of high value and should be protected, including from the impact of an increase in impermeable surfaces nearby.
- thank Marc Dendale, Ross Moffatt and David Wong for their attendance via Microsoft Teams.

Rodney Local Board

Meeting date: 22 June 2022

Resolution number RD/2022/88

That the Rodney Local Board:

- a) note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022
- c) provide the following feedback on the council's preliminary response, to be considered by the Planning Committee in preparation of the proposed intensification plan change for notification in August 2022:
 - i) request that infrastructure (such as roads, public transport, water and wastewater) be included by the council as an additional Qualifying Matter in those areas affected by growth and further intensification
 - ii) note Milldale is under five thousand people and should be exempt from the Medium Density Residential Standards at this time
 - iii) seek that any Special Character Area not within areas impacted by Policy 3 of the National Policy Statement Urban Development or the application of the Medium Density Residential Standards are not changed through this plan change.

Upper Harbour Local Board

Meeting date: 16 June 2022

Resolution number UH/2022/65

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

- a) note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 as set out in Attachment A.
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022 as set out in Attachment B.
- c) support areas with significant infrastructure constraints be included as a qualifying matter including but not limited to areas prone to flooding, sediment mitigation measures, water supply and wastewater network capacity and integrated transport network constraints. We believe these constraints apply to Whenuapai, Herald Island, Paremoremo, Albany Heights, and the large lot zone of Greenhithe along Upper Harbour Drive.
- d) support the intent of council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 as set out in Attachment A, considering the context of the limited funding currently identified in the Long Term Plan 2021 2031 and the likely deferrals to the capital programme, we note particular concerns as a consequence of intensification regarding:
 - enablement of widespread intensification in areas that are not suitable due to distance from jobs and services, infrequent if any public transport and the lack of infrastructure readiness
 - ii) the provision of open space,
 - iii) the potential dilution of amenity levels for all residents,
 - iv) the impact of intensification on the transport network, particularly the removal of parking, and
 - v) the current inadequate level of development contributions being collected to provide satisfactory mitigation for the impacts of development particularly reserve contributions
 - vi) the increased potential for poor environmental planning and design outcomes.

Waitākere Ranges Local Board

Meeting date: 23 June 2022

That the Waitakere Ranges Local Board provides the following feedback on council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (RMA amendments):

General comments

- a) The Auckland Unitary Plan already provides sufficient capacity for housing intensification that has not yet been realised.
- b) The quality of new housing development in Auckland is a significant issue that needs to be addressed in the plan change. As a voluntary design guide, the Auckland Design Manual has not been effective and a new approach is needed to produce quality urban environments across Auckland.
- c) There is a lack of cohesion in the scale of development making it appear incongruent with the existing character of areas.
- d) There is a need for reform beyond housing to deliver the urban development change Auckland needs. Continuing with a development model that allows shopping malls and big-box stores at the end of the motorway is exacerbating Auckland's car dependency at a time when there is an urgent need to reduce transport emissions.
- e) We have concern that in our area urban development is being left to market forces alone.
- f) A significant shift is needed for the Unitary Plan to achieve the NPS's minimum expectations for a well-functioning urban environment that includes:
 - i. good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by way of public or active transport;
 - ii. and supports reductions in greenhouse gas emissions;
 - iii. and is resilient to the likely current and future effects of climate change.
- g) The preliminary urban development proposal is overly focused on enabling intensified housing development alone rather than integrated planning to ensure areas grow in a planned way.
- h) There need to be requirements for open space provision alongside intensification. We are otherwise condemning future generations to re-live past mistakes[1].
- The current practice of clear-felling development sites of mature trees and vegetation is removing ecological corridors across urban Auckland. This is counter to our Climate Plan and the Urban Ngahere Strategy.

Rapid Transit Network (RTN)

- j) Support intensified transit-oriented development around train services on the Western Line, subject to any qualifications made below.
- k) Note that the Western Train Line is the Waitakere Ranges' only designated Rapid Transit Network connecting west Auckland suburbs from the outer semi-rural village of Swanson through to Avondale and, paralleling New North Road into the city centre.
- l) We have concern that in our area development is being left to market forces alone without adequate planning and investment from Auckland Council and the wider council family.

^[1] In Victorian England the public parks movement arose out of a desire to improve health in overcrowded conditions of rapidly growing industrial towns.

- m) Council needs to plan for 'additional infrastructure matters' along the Western Line train stops to enable the proposed housing development capacity of six-storeys or more.
- n) This should include addressing open space provision, community infrastructure, walking and cycling networks and street upgrades.

Walkable catchments

- o) Support 10-minute walkable catchments around rapid transit stops.
- p) Recommend strengthening the objectives, policies and rules in the Unitary Plan relating to cycling and walking provision in the Terrace Housing and Apartment Zone around the Rapid Transit Network.
- q) Developments should be directed to actively consider opportunities for walking and cycling connections indicated in greenways and paths plans, including the Waitakere Ranges Greenways Plan.
- r) Consideration should be given to designating an indicative walking and cycling network within area's zoned for intensification to future proof connections to public transport, open space and centres.

Town and Local Centres

s) Note that the Western Line connects our town and local centres from Glen Eden to Swanson so the proposed planning changes are influenced by proximity to train stations rather than classification as centres. In places, this creates a mismatch with a risk of creating an intensified dormitory suburb with few shops and services, and poor access to jobs.

Glen Eden

- t) Glen Eden has the potential to be an exemplar compact urban centre with intensification around the town centre and train station.
- u) We support the walkable catchment being clearly defined in the plan change and is appropriate for the area.
- v) Our concern relates to the quality of development, open space provision, and the need for council investment and coordinated planning to accompany the development enabled in the Unitary Plan.
- w) The lack of walking and cycling infrastructure is a significant constraint to encouraging active modes, with roads often not safe for cycling.
- x) Development around the rapid transit stops, centres and open space should promote walking and cycling connections to create liveable, walkable and connected neighbourhoods.
- y) Completion of the Avondale to New Lynn shared path, leaves New Lynn to Sunnyvale as the missing link to connect intensifying areas along the Western Line. We would like to see a designated route.
- z) An action from Auckland's Climate Plan is to "develop masterplans that demonstrate and promote the opportunity for zero carbon, transit-oriented developments that build climate resilience." We would like to see a Precinct Plan developed for Glen Eden and incorporated into the Unitary Plan.

Infrastructure-constraints / additional infrastructure

- aa) As the decision-maker for parks and open space, we have concern that in areas zoned for housing intensification:
 - i. constraints on stormwater infrastructure combined with topography becomes a pressure on local parks and natural streams to provide for stormwater infrastructure and outflows, as an

- 'easy' option. There should be a strengthened requirement for water sensitive design and protection of open space from the impact of adjoining development.
- ii. the Unitary Plan does not adequately address the need for walking and cycling connections between open space, centers and rapid transit stops in areas zoned for housing intensification of six storeys or more.

Sunnyvale

- bb) Sunnyvale Train Station serves the surrounding area as a Rapid Transit stop, and council provides significant community services with Parrs Park and its facilities, however it is not a centre and there are few shops, services or jobs in the immediate area.
- cc) A walking-cycling connection from Sunnyvale to Glen Eden following the rail corridor would promote access to jobs and services, and complete a connection to Henderson.
- dd) The proposal includes THAB zone immediate alongside council sports fields that are used at night so it increases the risk of reverse sensitivity issues. However we recognize the benefit of intensifying around parks with open space providing a positive aspect and amenity in a more built-up environment.

Swanson

- ee) In Swanson village:
 - i. we recommend an intensity below six storeys, with a graduated step down in height to create a buffer as it nears the Rural Urban Boundary and Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area, which should be considered as qualifying matters and refer the planning committee to the Swanson Heritage Plan.

Qualifying matters

- ff) Support the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area being a qualified matter.
- gg) Support Significant Ecological Areas being considered as a qualifying matter.
- hh) Protecting and restoring the North West wildlife link between the Hauraki Gulf Islands such as Titiri Matangi and the Waitakere Ranges forest, Te Wao Nui o Tiriwa, should be a qualifying matter.

Special Character Areas

- ii) We have an interest in the question of special character areas in the Auckland isthmus, however we defer to the local boards in those areas on that question. We note that:
 - i. The character inner city suburbs were built with kauri from the Waitakere Ranges so there is a strong historical association between the timber milling and de-forestation that took place in the ranges and the growth of Auckland that is worth preserving. Letting such valuable resource go to waste would be a further indignity.
 - ii. Protecting lower density housing in one part of the city likely increases development pressures in other parts.

Light rail is predicated on intensification to get the most benefit from the investment.

Waitematā Local Board

Meeting date: 21 June 2022

Resolution number WTM/2022/2

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) note the council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022, and particularly that more submissions came from the Waitemata Local Board area than any other Board
- c) note the National Policy Statement on Urban Development's stated objectives are to improve wellbeing, address the climate crisis and the housing affordability crisis and its interpretation of a response based on meeting all these goals realistically and strategically
- d) note that Auckland has many rich, mature trees, quality homes and beautiful older and newer suburbs, the latter of which have often been masterplanned. In the future there is a need to provide more decent and affordable homes close to the city, town centres, and rapid transit while retaining green space, plantings, community, good design, architectural interest, a sense of place and diversity of living options
- e) note that focusing development where it can best be supported whether the city experiences growth or degrowth would reduce economic risk, cost less and improve environmental, social and cultural wellbeing, and economic outcomes
- f) note that low density sprawl into greenfield is highly problematic regarding food security, reducing emissions, and ensuring access to the city's amenities for youth and seniors, and while the NPS-UD enables the city to go out as well as up, there is an opportunity to meet the quality compact form desired in the Auckland Unitary Plan
- g) provide the following feedback as the local board's response to the council's preliminary response, to be considered by the Planning Committee in preparation of the proposed intensification plan change for notification in August 2022
- h) support with some qualifications the proposed walkable catchment of 1200 metres from the edge of the city centre (question one of the local board feedback template), with the following feedback:
 - i) note that:
 - A) 1200m is a far distance for some to walk (most walk around 800m)
 - B) there is some confusion over which point the 1200m is drawn from the city centre
 - adding more homes could mean more cars and this could negatively affect wellbeing, congestion, and safety and therefore parking maximums need to be part of the solution
 - D) it is likely that more people will mode shift if doing so is easy, enjoyable and convenient
 - E) research by Jeff Speck suggests a neighbourhood is 'walkable' when walking routes are safe, comfortable, enjoyable and useful
 - ii) recommend that:
 - A) the port is considered its own zone and not as the edge of the city

- B) development is focused closer to the city and around transport stations
- C) council enable more development where it is easy to mode shift
- D) council enable more apartments in an easy walk to transit stations for those without cars
- E) low-traffic 'walkable' neighbourhoods are created limiting through-routes and ensuring safe street crossings
- F) space is maintained for loading/unloading, deliveries, drop-offs and pickups (ideally kerbside)
- G) a holistic, human, and place-based approach to refining the rules is supported, based on what people are actually likely to do keeping in mind topography and safety
- H) considering parking maximums on private developments in walkable catchments where an RPZ is in place
- there is provision for consolidated parking on the edge of centres or walkable catchments
- J) reconsider walkable catchments based on topography and safety
- i) support the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres from the edge of the metropolitan centres (question two), with the following feedback:
 - i) note that:
 - A) 800m is a distance that people walk regularly and aligns with best practice planning
 - B) there are concerns over increasing congestion in an already overly congested setting
 - ii) recommend maintaining low traffic neighbourhoods that restrict through traffic, enable micro-mobility use on the road, and free up pavements for pedestrians
- j) support the proposed walkable catchment of 800 metres around rapid transit stops (question three), with the following feedback:
 - i) note that:
 - A) 800m is a walkable distance that evidence suggests people will walk
 - B) there is an opportunity to create more streets like Ponsonby Rd, Karangahape Rd, O'Connell St and High St that are attractive and function well
 - ii) recommend that:
 - A) Plans enable six-storey mixed use streets within an easy five-minute walk of bus stops on fast, frequent bus routes with bus lanes/clearways at peak times with journey times of up to 30 minutes from city or metropolitan centres (peak and off peak)
 - B) Planning rules enable the transition on these routes towards an unbroken urban fabric of mixed-use streets with activated ground floors which will in time realise the "15-minute" neighbourhood in which shops, services, cafes, medical centres, schools and transport are with a 15-minute walk. This is likely to turn arterial routes into great places in themselves
 - C) Enable these streets to be sustained at similar density along entire major bus routes, for example all the way along Great North Road, College Hill, and New North Road
 - D) Enabling perimeter blocks (with central garden area) on/behind arterial routes close to bus stops
 - E) Requirements for new developments to create lanes through cul-de-sacs as porous neighbourhoods increase walkability
 - F) Considering parking maximums on private developments in walkable catchments where a RPZ is in place and provision is made for consolidated parking on the edge of centres or walkable catchments

- k) support the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone to residential areas up to around 400 metres from large town centres with high accessibility (question four), with the following feedback:
 - i) recommend also extending this zone along all arterial routes with frequent, fast bus services
- l) support the proposal to apply the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone to residential areas up to around 200 metres from small town centres or large local centres with high accessibility (question five), with the following feedback:
 - i) note that:
 - A) 200m is a reasonable distance to walk
 - B) enabling higher storey and perimeter blocks down frequent bus routes would enable more housing in areas with high accessibility and over times create vibrant streets
 - C) such areas are readily accessible for travel for work, education, and recreation
 - ii) recommend:
 - A) extending this zone along all arterial routes with frequent, fast bus services
 - B) zoning these centres to have shops, amenities, and cafes to create a vibrant area
 - C) prohibiting/restricting or disincentivising and further significant urban development that is not in walkable catchments to centres or rapid, frequent transport (including bus routes

Resolution number WTM/2022/3

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- m) support with qualifications the proposal to include special character areas as a qualifying matter (question 6), with the following feedback:
 - i) note that:
 - A) this is a topic that has very much drawn mixed views from residents
 - B) loss of character housing is distressing to many Aucklanders who make the point that once their history is lost it can never be replaced
 - C) the views of future residents could not be expressed in this consultation, but they will be even more affected by climate change if urban sprawl continues, and therefore intensification is required
 - D) there is a need to enable housing close to transport, the city centre and metropolitan centres
 - E) the amount of special character areas currently identified effectively reduces the housing supply the area can create, which is a negative outcome given the proximity to the city
 - F) it is not likely in itself the NPS-UD will lead to the production of well-designed, quality housing suitable and affordable for New Zealand families with two working parents on average incomes in Waitematā. The market has not delivered on this in the last three decades and is unlikely to now without intervention from central government
 - G) Auckland's collection of wooden housing is unique in the world
 - H) by chance or design, the historic areas of St Mary's Bay, Freeman's Bay, Ponsonby, Grafton and Parnell all share many of the characteristics of Charles Montgomery's "happy cities". It is worth considering how to translate these biophilic and community-building qualities into new-developments
 - ii) recommend that:
 - A) there is a strong focus on well-designed quality housing that is suitable for living in permanently and working from home if necessary
 - B) green space and biodiversity corridors are protected and enhanced

- C) residential areas in Waitematā transition to become low-traffic neighbourhoods to avoid congestion, and reduce emissions and air pollution
- D) economic levers are adjusted to incentivise more new builds, and encourage more cohousing, non-profit community providers and papakāinga housing in which future residents have a say in what they want from their future homes
- n) support with qualifications the proposed residential special character areas of high quality that have been identified (question 7), with the following feedback:
 - i) note that:
 - A) a huge amount of evidence and work went into establishing the current special character overlay
 - B) the Waitematā Local Board received appreciably more submissions on this subject because many people care deeply about holding on to what is left of Auckland's historic areas, and we thank the submitters for this work and this care
 - C) many submissions contain strong and passionate views both for extending the proposed special character areas and also for reducing them
 - ii) recommend:
 - A) retaining exemplars of our highest-quality heritage areas that tell the story of Auckland's history through its earliest suburbs Parnell, Grafton, Freeman's Bay, St Mary's Bay, Ponsonby, and Grey Lynn for the benefit of present and future generations
 - B) enabling some areas closest to transport and centres to evolve over time but with a focus on creating positive urban design outcomes
 - C) including areas of mana whenua pre-colonial sites of significance with suitable signage
 - D) including areas of settler housing/industry (of different classes) and other migrant stories, including French/Irish Catholics, Chinese and Pasifika stories in Parnell, St Mary's Bay, Freeman's Bay, Ponsonby, Arch Hill, Grafton, and Grey Lynn
 - E) enabling more intensification on all fast frequent bus routes and considering some of the boundaries to ensure that there is more development in areas closer to transport and centres
 - F) current special character areas should be low traffic neighbourhoods whether intensified or not
 - G) considering parking maximums within 400m of fast, frequent transit stations and parking controls on arterial roads that are fast, frequent bus routes
 - H) consolidating parking on the edge of city centres, metropolitan centres, and town centres
 - I) ensuring green space and trees are not lost and that tall buildings incorporate trees into their designs
 - J) a masterplan approach opposed to a pepper potting approach
 - K) incentivising development of brownfield sites, including the City Works area and Great North Road area
 - L) supporting precinct form codes to enable perimeter blocks and other environment and age-friendly developments with density done well
 - M) balancing vibrancy, noise, and pollution with areas of calm and rest
 - N) considering the proposals of the residents' associations of the heritage suburbs to work out the areas of high value
 - O) reviewing the Unitary Plan to better ensure the wellbeing of residents in the city centre and mixed-use areas through planning rules, noise limits, walkability, ensuring a quality public realm etc.

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- o) support the proposed business special character areas of high quality that have been identified (question eight) and believe all appropriate business special character areas have been identified in the report
- p) support the proposal to include areas in urban Auckland with long term significant infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter (question nine), with the following feedback:
 - i) note that:
 - A) Auckland does not have sufficient water in the region to meet the needs of the current population
 - B) out of sequence infrastructure renewal is either done on top of existing plans which may be economically unsustainable or means existing areas that need infrastructure upgrades is deferred
 - C) water and water quality is important to mana whenua and all New Zealanders
 - D) resources and supplies of other materials required for construction and infrastructure is finite and should be used as strategically as possible
 - ii) recommend:
 - A) restricting development to within the existing city boundaries to allow pace of infrastructure to catch up with the outer limits from the city centre
 - B) within these existing urban boundaries, the application of infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter should only be applied if it would be impracticable or prohibitively costly to overcome the constraint
 - C) avoiding damage to the water network or allowing sewage into the harbour or damage to streams
 - D) considering having a qualifying matter retaining sufficient horticultural and farmland and wilderness as part of planning
 - E) protecting the blue network and biodiversity corridors as qualifying matters
- q) support the below being qualifying matters (question 10):
 - i) the Auckland War Memorial Museum viewshaft
 - ii) most of the existing Maunga viewshafts
 - iii) quality character buildings in the City Centre zone and Queen Street valley precinct
 - iv) many of the existing built form controls including ensuring sunlight into public spaces and height controls in Aotea Square and elsewhere
- r) request the addition now, or in the next review of the Auckland Unitary Plan, of additional requirements over issues like the proportion of public open space and limits on the level of noise, light and air and other pollution
- s) support controls to ensure sunlight in public spaces
- t) support for sunlight and air movements in new developments
- u) recommend the following:
 - i) creating liveable, attractive developments to encourage more people to stay and invest in the city
 - ii) enabling green roofs and walls, and shade trees
 - iii) planning green corridors with trees and raingardens that service wildlife and residents
- v) thank the submitters for their proposals and their care and passion for the future of Auckland.

Whau Local Board

Meeting date: 22 June 2022

Resolution number WH/2022/71

That the Whau Local Board:

- a) note the Council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.
- b) note the feedback received from Aucklanders on the Council's preliminary response during the three-week public consultation in April and May 2022.
- a) welcome the opportunity to give feedback on Auckland Council's preliminary response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.
- a) reiterate its previous feedback advocating for a dense, high-quality urban form, preparedness for climate change, the need to reduce carbon emissions particularly in the construction sector, the importance of access to green open space in the context of brownfields development and the critical importance of restoring the urban ngahere (canopy cover) across the region.
- b) express its concern that this conversation and decision-making process is severed from what should be closely related discussions around climate change, emissions reduction, urban ngahere and provision of green/open space, and request urgent advice from Community and Social Policy on these matters, noting the local board's particular focus is on brownfields development rather than open space acquisition in greenfields areas.
- c) note that the Whau local board area is relatively diverse and relatively deprived when compared to the region as a whole and, given the under-representation of Māori and Asian communities in the overall public feedback, it is important for the Governing Body to consider these matters through equity and diversity lenses.
- d) support the proposed provisions for intensification around the city centre, metropolitan, town and local centres, and transport hubs, noting:
 - that intensive development is already happening in the Whau, yet the majority of feedback supported further intensification, suggesting that communities can see the benefits of intensification once it is underway
 - ii) that the local board has long advocated for a decisive shift away from greenfields development in favour of high-quality, high-density brownfields development and welcomes this shift towards intensification in existing urban areas
 - iii) that intensification presents an opportunity to provide affordable housing for members of the community who would otherwise be unable to buy, or even rent, a home in many parts of the region.
- e) support the proposals around Special Character Areas (SCAs) noting:
 - i) its support for the one SCA proposed for the Whau Local Board area
 - ii) that it does not wish to propose any additional SCAs beyond what has been proposed regionwide noting that, on balance, the need for increased affordable housing to serve the region's growing population outweighs the value of protecting large swathes of low-density housing, except where there is a strong justification

- iii) that, while noting that SCAs and historic heritage are technically separate matters, they are in practice closely related and the Whau Local Board area has very little historic built heritage left, and that any loss of built heritage is painfully evident to the community
- iv) that the local board would appreciate advice on whether any additional mechanisms could be considered to protect the few remaining sites in the Whau with significant heritage values, and would urge Council staff to consider this question as part of future consideration of resource management reform, noting this is a high priority for a significant part of the community.
- f) support the proposal to include significant infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter noting:
 - i) that a strong majority of submitters indicated support for this proposal
 - ii) that residents of the Whau Local Board area have, in successive consultations, indicated their high level of concern about the health of the Whau River and the risk (compounded by the increasing impacts of climate change) associated with aging stormwater and wastewater pipes
 - iii) that the local board supports the inclusion of pressure on and protection of stormwater and wastewater infrastructure as a qualifying matter to protect the awa and maintain resilience against extreme weather events
 - iv) that the local board has previously advocated for Auckland Transport to take a proactive approach to the provision of public transport services in brownfields growth areas (in particular consideration of proactively increasing frequency or route extension for bus services serving rapidly intensifying urban areas to anticipate population growth rather than respond to it reactively)
 - v) that the local board would urge the governing body and/or central government to consider any mechanisms that would compel Auckland Transport to take a more proactive approach to future growth regionwide, rather confining its future growth activities exclusively to greenfields areas in the rural south, north and northwest of the region.