

## RESPONSE TO ADDITIONAL CLAUSE 23 FURTHER INFORMATION REQUEST TABLE

	Request	Response
1	Are there any sites in the plan change area that the reports provided do not cover?	Yes. All sites north of Park Estate Road are not covered by the reports provided as Appendices 9, 10, 11 and 12. However, the sites north of Park Estate Road are not subject to any changes in zoning and are only affected by the requested changes to the reformatting of the Hingaia 1 Precinct text, including the alignment with the Auckland-wide provisions following decisions on the PAUP – there is no significant change in policy direction for the land north of Park Estate Road.
2(a)	Can you please confirm the anticipated level of growth in dwelling numbers enabled from this plan change request;	Refer to the discussion above regarding the anticipated level of growth in dwelling numbers enabled from this plan change. This increase is across all of the land south of Park Estate Road, including land that is not subject to natural hazards and land which is being remediated to avoid natural hazards risks (e.g. land subject to fill earthworks so that it is no longer subject to coastal inundation).  It is reiterated that the provisions in E36 of the AUP, unaffected by the requested changes, will continue to direct development away from natural hazard areas (and Council can refuse resource consent if this is proposed) while also incentivising the remediation of land so that it is no longer subject to natural hazards – for example, the filling of significant parts of 144 and 152 Park Estate Road (under resource consent BUN60339982) – so that the land is no longer at risk of coastal inundation. Therefore, there should not be any increase in the number of people within natural hazard areas unless Council grants resource consent for this to occur.
2(b)	Can you confirm the coastal reporting for the resource consent adequately addresses the requirements under Schedule 1 of the RMA.	The coastal reporting provided as Appendix 13 to the first RFI response related to all sites along to the south of Park Estate Road that adjoin the coast (i.e. the coast line between the end of Park Estate Road and the Slippery Creek motorway bridge). Therefore, this report covers all of the land subject to the requested changes in zoning and is suitable to meet the applicable requirements under Schedule 1 for this plan change request.

	Request	Response
3	Can you please provide maps of the permanent and intermittent streams	<p>Figure 6 on page 12 of the ecology report attached as Appendix 12 to the first RFI response provides a map that delineates permanent and intermittent streams within the Hugh Green Limited landholdings south of Park Estate Road. This map was used as the basis for the streams shown on the operative Hingaia 1 Precinct plan for these properties.</p> <p>In addition, Figure 1 on page 10 of the ecological reports attached as Appendix 23 to the first RFI response provides a map that delineates permanent and intermittent streams within the Hugh Green Limited landholdings south of Park Estate Road. However, this includes streams that consent has since been obtained to reclaim.</p> <p>Furthermore, attached as Appendix 4 to this additional RFI response are draft stream classifications for the Hingaia South area that were prepared on behalf of Auckland Council in 2015, which have been provided to the applicant by Council's resource consent department.</p> <p>Differences between the maps are noted and reflect the subjective nature of stream classifications, as well as the evolving approaches to classification. The mapping in Appendix 23 to the first RFI response is the most up-to-date and can be considered to be the most suitable version to refer to.</p> <p>Given that the provisions that manage activities in, on and over streams in section E3 of the AUP and the National Environment Standards for Freshwater 2020 (which are not affected by the requested changes) do not rely on streams being mapped in planning documents, it is considered there to be no need for any further refined plan of stream classifications to be produced (and classifications be subsequently debated by ecological specialists). It is considered to be more appropriate for stream-specific classifications to occur when resource consents affecting streams are applied for, as has been occurring to date.</p>

	Request	Response
4	Please ensure agreements have been included in this plan change request and are referenced in the section 32 report.	<p>It is accepted that only written agreements will be considered for any plan change that is accepted for processing. Where agreement has only been verbal, it is anticipated that the same opinion will be held by Council and that this position can be confirmed (and reconsidered if necessary) as part of the plan change process.</p> <p>Where written agreement or other proof of agreement of Council's prior agreement to requested change is available, this has been listed in section 2.3.2 of the evaluation report. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The acceptance that on-site retention is not required for coastal catchments has been confirmed through Healthy Waters' approval of the Stormwater Management Plan for 144-252 Park Estate Road and the approval of blanket land uses consents to contravene the Hingaia 1 Precinct provision;</li> <li>▪ Minor changes to the roading pattern from that shown on the precinct plan have been confirmed through approval of various resource consents, although it is accepted that changes to local roads outside of these approved resource consent areas have not been similarly confirmed (although the effects of such changes are not considered to be significant, plus the local road positions continue to only be indicative);</li> <li>▪ Bus route changes have been confirmed by AT as evidenced in Appendix 18 to the first RFI response; and</li> <li>▪ Agreement to changes to roading cross-sections have been confirmed through the approval of various resource consents and engineering approval (although this could be limited only to the roads approved, a number of stub roads that will be extended to cover the remaining parts of the precinct were included in these approvals).</li> </ul> <p>Having reviewed previous written correspondence with Council, no further evidence of agreements with Council in relation to changes requested have been discovered.</p>
5.	Is this analysis of the section 32 report? if not, please update the report to include.	The response to item 33 of the first clause 23 request has now been inserted into section 5.2.2-1 of the evaluation report.
6.	[Urban Design queries]	See below.
7.	[Note regarding items 46 and 47 of the initial response]	Noted.

	Request	Response
8(a)	To further understand the traffic effects along the Hingaia Road / Beach Road corridor as a whole, including the motorway interchange intersections with Beach Road / Hingaia Road, which were not included in the Intersection Performance analysis section in Flow's Transport Modelling Update Report. Please provide this assessment alongside the neighbouring intersections with Hinau Road / Harbour Side Drive and Chichester Drive / Eliot Street respectively, in order to understand any knock-on traffic effects between these intersections and critical movements contributing towards these.	As the levels of service provided at Beach Road in 2031 are the same regardless of the development yield at HGL's landholdings south of Park Estate Road, the mitigation of such traffic issues are not considered to be within the scope of the plan change. This request is therefore not considered to be appropriate to the scale and significance of the actual or potential environmental effects anticipated from the implementation of the change or plan.
8(b)	Based on traffic modelling outputs, the area bounded by Park Estate Road / Great South Road / Beach Road / The Southern Motorway appears to be subject to 'rat-running' movements, resulting from the additional traffic generated by the Hingaia 1 development. Has consideration been given towards mitigation measures to discourage these effects? If not, then we would recommend that further such analysis should be undertaken accordingly.	In terms of potential rat-running within the area identified, Auckland Transport has undertaken significant work within the Rosehill suburb to install speed humps, speed tables and raised intersections, alongside lowering the speed limit of these local roads (primarily to 30 km/h, with Park Estate Road decreased to 40 km/h). Following implementation of the works, there are considered to be no further feasible mitigation measures to discourage rat-running in this area. Further details of this project are available at this following website: <a href="https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/vision-zero-for-the-greater-good/safe-speeds-programme/residential-speed-management-programme/rosehill-papakura-road-safety-improvements/">https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/vision-zero-for-the-greater-good/safe-speeds-programme/residential-speed-management-programme/rosehill-papakura-road-safety-improvements/</a>  Also, such traffic issues are not considered to be the consequence of the requested changes (they are expected to result if the Hingaia 1 Precinct was development in accordance with the operative provision, regardless of the requested changes) and subsequently not within the scope of the plan change. This request is therefore not considered to be appropriate to the scale and significance of the actual or potential environmental effects anticipated from the implementation of the change or plan.
9.	[AT queries]	See below.

	Request	Response
10.	Can we please obtain HG Future (existing density) + Future Developed.	<p>The previously provided wastewater calculations have been updated to more accurately reflect the changes occurring as a result of the requested changes, with reference to the estimated existing and proposed yield outlined in the cover letter to this additional RFI response (1,300 and 1,660 dwellings, respectively). The updated calculations are attached as Appendix 5.</p> <p>Scenario 1 is the same as previously provided, including only the development areas that have obtained resource consent, plus the existing development of the upstream catchment.</p> <p>Scenario 2 is now the maximum probable development before the plan change, including full development of the upstream catchment (5,268 dwellings) and a total of 1,300 dwellings (plus the school) south of Park Estate Road.</p> <p>Scenario 3 is now the maximum probable development before the plan change, including full development of the upstream catchment (5,268 dwellings) and a total of 1,660 dwellings (plus the school) south of Park Estate Road. The additional 360 dwellings have been distributed throughout the areas of the development land for which resource consent has neither been obtained nor applied for, on the basis that the approval of the plan change is more likely to affect the final yield of these areas.</p> <p>The calculations continue to identify that there is sufficient capacity to cater for the whole wastewater catchment (after the plan change – Scenario 3), subject to the pumping of wastewater from upstream pump stations occurring off-peak. Scenario 2 also confirmed that this requirement exists as a result of the operative AUP provisions and so this is not a direct result of the requested changes.</p> <p>It is accepted that some assumptions have been made regarding the distribution of dwellings in future development areas. Should the future distribution (or number) of dwellings differ from the assumptions made by this plan change request, there is considered to be sufficient discretion available within the AUP provisions for the effects of this to be addressed and considered at resource consent stage – both for subdivision (e.g. E38.12.1(7)(b)) and land use (e.g. H5.8.1(2)(c)) applications.</p>

	Request	Response
11(a)	Can you please update the update the ecological documentation to reflect the recent National Policy Statement for Fresh Water Management and National Environmental Standards for Freshwater;	<p>The requested changes are only to district plan provisions of the AUP and do not affect the applicability of all regional plan provisions of the AUP and the National Environment Standards for Freshwater. It is considered inappropriate for the scope of this private plan change request to be opened further to address any changes that may be necessary to operative provisions of the AUP that relate to freshwater management in order to reflect the NPS-FW (unless Council decides to adopt the plan change and propose a variation).</p> <p>In addition, the land is already zoned for urban residential development and the diversion and discharge of stormwater is already authorised by Stormwater Management Plan under a network discharge consent. The effects on freshwater (including streams and wetlands) are considered to be no different from the effects that can arise through development provided for by the operative provisions of the AUP and the NES-FW.</p> <p>Therefore, this request is not considered to be appropriate to the scale and significance of the actual or potential environmental effects anticipated from the implementation of the change or plan, particularly when compared to the effects anticipated by the operative provisions.</p>
11(b)	Complete a delineation across the plan change area as per the Landcare Research Wetland Delineation Guidelines (Clarkson, 2018) and complete a determination made in regard to the applicability of NPS 'Natural' wetlands	<p>The requested changes are only to district plan provisions of the AUP and do not affect the applicability of all regional plan provisions of the AUP and the National Environment Standards for Freshwater. In addition, the land is already zoned for urban residential development and all wetlands at the sites south of Park Estate Road are subject to valid resource consents that either enable their reclamation or require their enhancement.</p> <p>Therefore, the mapping of wetlands within the precinct area is not considered to be of any substantial benefit to the consideration of the requested changes and the request to do so is not considered to be appropriate to the scale and significance of the actual or potential environmental effects anticipated from the implementation of the change or plan (when compared to the effects anticipated by the operative provisions).</p> <p>For the purposes of this private plan change request, reliance on the mapping of wetlands included in the ecological reports attached to the previous RFI response is accepted, with the expectation that most, if not all, of these areas likely to meet the NPS definition of 'natural wetland' (noting that any area not classified as a wetland under the RMA, which is what has been mapped, would not be a natural wetland). As per the above, the exact extent and location of wetlands is not considered to significantly affect the changes requested to district plan provisions in an area that is already subject to a residential urban zone.</p>

	Request	Response
	Attachment 1 – Urban Design	
1.	Why is the Precinct capable of supporting greater development potential for higher density residential development than the underlying MHS and MHU zones?	<p>The suitability of the precinct to support greater development potential than that of the underlying MHS and MHU was determined by Plan Variation 1 (through the precinct-specific integrated residential development rules). That determination forms part of the existing environmental outcomes anticipated by the operative provision, which the requested changes are to be assessed against.</p> <p>The ‘blank canvas’ of this greenfield precinct also results in greater development potential having much lower adverse effects on existing neighbourhood character and amenity (which for the most part has yet to establish) than brownfields development elsewhere in the region.</p> <p>In addition, the provisions that provide greater development potential for higher density residential development is supported by Policy 3(d)(ii) of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020, given the demand for housing within greenfield areas.</p>
2.	What is the objective and policy basis for this?	<p>The Hingaia 1 Precinct already provides for provisions that enable greater building bulk for higher density residential development (the precinct-specific integrated residential development rules). It is considered that the objective and policy basis for these existing rules are the (existing) Objective 2 (<i>“choice of living environments and affordability options”</i>) and Policies 3 (<i>“enabling higher density integrated residential development to be dispersed between lower density vacant lots”</i>) – noting that the precinct-specific definition of integrated residential development is multiple dwellings on lots over 800 m<sup>2</sup>) and 4 (<i>“with more intensive housing to be generally located in close proximity to the neighbourhood centre and locations with high amenity (e.g. locations close to public open space)”</i>).</p> <p>Objective 2 and Policies 3 and 4 (as amended) continue to be considered the objective and policy basis for the revised provisions that enable greater building bulk for higher density residential development.</p> <p>The requested changes retain Objective 2 as per the operative version.</p> <p>Policy 3 is amended to replace the reference to <i>“enabling higher density integrated residential development”</i>, since the precinct-specific definition is being deleted, with <i>“enabling greater development potential for higher density residential developments and integrated residential development”</i>.</p>

	Request	Response
		<p>Policy 4 is amended to include public transport routes as an area where intensive housing should be encouraged. Alongside the already stated neighbourhood centre and areas with high amenity (which include the coastline, future parks and open spaces where existing streams and wetlands are located), all of the land south of Park Estate Road is considered to be captured by this policy's directive to encourage intensive housing.</p>
3(a)	<p>I am unclear why there is a need for a separation of activities of 'Two or more dwellings per site' (A3 and A6) and 'Four or more dwellings per site' (A4 and A7). Comment requested.</p>	<p>(A3) and (A6) are each for two or three dwellings per site (not two or more), with no overlap with (A4) and (A7), which are for four or more dwellings per site.</p> <p>The key difference between (A3)/(A6) and (A4)/(A7) – which otherwise list the same standards to be complied with and are grouped for the matters of discretion and assessment criteria in later sections – is that (A3)/(A6) only applies a restricted discretionary activity status if the two or three dwellings do not comply with the underlying zone coverage standards. If two or three dwellings fully comply with the underlying zone coverage standards, then they can be a permitted activity under H4.4.1(A3) or H5.4.1(A3). For (A4)/(A7), this distinction is irrelevant as there is no difference in activity status for four or more dwellings between the zone and precinct, both being restricted discretionary activities with equivalent matters of discretion.</p> <p>If (A3)/(A6) was removed and (A4)/(A7) were amended to instead refer to <i>"two or more dwellings per site"</i>, then, to use an example, the development of two dwellings on a site 600 m<sup>2</sup> in area with a building coverage under 240 m<sup>2</sup>, an impervious area under 360 m<sup>2</sup> and a landscaped area over 240 m<sup>2</sup> would be a restricted discretionary activity under the precinct rules even though it would a permitted activity under the zone rules.</p> <p>As the precinct provisions are intended to enable additional development opportunities greater than those enabled by the underlying zone (as per the policy direction), activities (A3) and (A6) are necessary and their deletion (resulting in development permitted in the zone becoming a restricted discretionary activity) would be inappropriate.</p>
3(b)	<p>Greater clarity would be desirable around the reference in A3, A4, A6 and A7 to 'less than 400m<sup>2</sup>'. Why is there a need for a reference to a specific site size? Is the reference to 'less than' to encourage greater density?</p>	<p>Yes, <i>"where the site area per dwelling is less than 400 m<sup>2</sup>"</i> is the key qualifier in these rules as it creates an incentive for higher density so that the higher building coverage and impervious coverage and lower landscaped area provisions can be used. Without this qualifier, there would be no incentives in place and no method by which higher densities are encouraged (as per the policy direction).</p>



	Request	Response
3(c)	Why was 400m <sup>2</sup> chosen?	<p>This has been stated in the evaluation report:</p> <p><i>Given that the existing integrated residential development provisions would be applicable when two dwellings are proposed on a site 800 m<sup>2</sup> in area, the density of 1 dwelling per 400 m<sup>2</sup> or higher is considered to be a suitable alternative trigger. This also correlates with similar provisions provided for in the Flat Bush and Drury 1 precincts.</i></p> <p>This was also addressed in the response to RFI item 34:</p> <p><i>What constitutes 'higher density development' has been determined in accordance with the precinct-specific definition for "integrated residential development". As specified in section 5.2.2 of the evaluation report, "Given that the existing integrated residential development provisions would be applicable when two dwellings are proposed on a site 800 m<sup>2</sup> in area, the density of 1 dwelling per 400 m<sup>2</sup> or higher is considered to be a suitable alternative trigger." Therefore, 'higher density development' refers to residential development where the site area per dwelling is less than 400 m<sup>2</sup>, including integrated residential development (using the AUP-wide definition). This is given effect to through the standards specified for "higher density development" only applying to these activities. The standards are not listed in the activity table as to be complied with for any other activities, such as dwellings where the site area per dwelling is over 400 m<sup>2</sup> (as per (A6), the underlying zone standards for coverages apply).</i></p>
3(d)	How is 'site area' defined in A3, A4, A6 and A7? Is this net site area or gross site area?	<p>As "net site area" is not used, "site area" refers to the gross site area.</p> <p>In relation to the above explanation for choosing 400 m<sup>2</sup>, the operative precinct-specific definition for integrated residential development referred to "sites more than 800 m<sup>2</sup>", which uses gross site area (and not net site area).</p> <p>Equivalent provisions in the Flat Bush and Drury 1 Precincts also use gross site area rather than net site area.</p>

	Request	Response
4(a)	<p>Enabling such greater bulk, particularly through a permitted activity status, may have an effect on neighbourhood character. What is the quantum of these effects, and are they consistent with expected character outcomes, both within the Precinct (as set up by objectives and policies) and in the underlying zones?</p>	<p>The following response has been prepared in collaboration between Aaron Grey, planner, and Nick Rae, urban designer.</p> <p>As the precinct is, for the most part, undeveloped, there is no established neighbourhood character. The requested changes therefore are an opportunity for the desired outcomes for planned neighbourhood character being established to be reconsidered, with minimal adverse effects. The residential community being established would 'buy in' to the character enabled by the requested changes.</p> <p>The residential character currently anticipated by the operative precinct provisions are summarised as being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Development in accordance with the MHU zone provisions within an area of 14 ha (excluding the school and neighbourhood centre); and</li> <li>▪ Development in accordance with the MHS zone provisions across the remainder of the precinct; with</li> <li>▪ Multi-dwelling development on sites over 800 m<sup>2</sup> in area in both zones utilising coverages similar to the THAB zone, while being limited in height to the zone provisions.</li> </ul> <p>The change in character resulting from the change in zoning from MHS to MHU and the additional precinct provisions proposed will change the expected outcomes as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ For the land south of Park Estate Road, a height expectation of three storeys will apply (due to the zone change), which will be more easily realised (due to the new precinct permitted activity height in relation to boundary standard);</li> <li>▪ For the land south of Park Estate Road currently zoned MHS, a small decrease to front yards would be enabled (due to the zone change);</li> <li>▪ Coverages similar to the THAB zone continue to be enabled for multi-dwelling development but the qualifier will instead be related to density rather than lot size in order for the provision to be an incentive to increase density rather than undertake land-use-led development, whilst resulting in a similar character to that already provided for;</li> <li>▪ For the land south of Park Estate Road, the use of the coverages similar to the THAB zone is made available for subdivision-led development that meets the density requirements (through the permitted activity standard for one dwelling on a site under 400 m<sup>2</sup>);</li> </ul>

	Request	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the land south of Park Estate Road that does not meet the above density, a relatively modest 5% change to buildings coverage (increase) and landscaped area (decrease) is provided for (due to the change in zoning).</li> </ul> <p>As mentioned earlier, requested changes should be assessed against the existing environmental outcomes anticipated by the operative provisions. In some cases (particularly when considering the impacts of retaining use of the coverages similar to the THAB zone), the neighbourhood character as a result of the requested changes is near the same to that anticipated by the operative provisions, and otherwise is similar.</p> <p>These changes do not necessarily result in negative or positive effects, just a different impact on the environment and a potentially different built form response. The changes are further considered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>People could expect a more urban built form over most of the land due to the requested changes, rather than this potentially occurring only in some areas of the land (through the operative integrated residential development provisions), with it being unknown where comprehensive development might occur.</li> <li>The proposed zone change results in the HIRB standard increasing to 3 m plus 45 degrees (from 2.5 m plus 45 degrees), and will provide an additional 0.5 m of building height adjacent to boundaries. This will result in the potential for buildings to be 0.5 m higher as experienced from neighbours and a potential small reduction in sunlight to neighbouring sites as compared with the current MHS zone. The permitted use of the AHiRB recession plane (with limitations) further enables an increase in height (up to 1.9 m rather than 0.5 m) adjacent to boundaries at the front of sites. This changes the expectations for people rather than affects people as nothing is as yet built.</li> <li>The changes to the impervious area, building coverage and landscape area restrictions do not necessarily result in different outcomes as experienced from the street. The additional building coverage could be located to the rear of a dwelling for example, which may result in more building along a side boundary. Again, these changes are not necessarily resulting in new effects, as they are currently provided for in the operative precinct-specific IRD provisions.</li> <li>Additional bulk to the street can also assist with a sense of scale such that elements such as garage doors can become a more minor element in the building façade which can reduce the potential dominance of this element. More bulk also provides more opportunity for habitable rooms to exist in the street façade and contribute to passive surveillance.</li> </ul>

	<p>Focussing specifically on whether the changes are consistent with the expected character (outlined in the objectives and policies) of the Mixed Housing Urban Zone, the following is noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ A three-storey built character as anticipated by Objective H5.2(2) and Policy H5.3(2) will not necessarily result in the MHU zone (without precinct provisions), even though Standard H5.6.4 allows for buildings up to three storeys. The achievement of three storeys is reliant on the size of the site (noting the restrictions in relation to boundaries specified by Standards H5.6.5 and H5.6.7) and whether developers choose to apply for resource consent (in order to use Standard H5.6.6 or provide for over three dwellings on their site), as well as the developers' preferences.</li> <li>■ The MHU zone methods, particularly the alternative height in relation to boundary provisions, are considered to be inefficient in achieving the expectation of a character of predominately three storeys for subdivision-led development (creating smaller or narrower sizes where fewer than four dwellings are proposed). Only buildings developed on a comprehensive scale are able to achieve this, as HiRB along internal boundaries does not need to be complied with.</li> <li>■ The proposed precinct-specific HiRB standard, which applies only in the MHU zone, would replace the zone HiRB and AHiRB rules (no longer requiring resource consent to be obtained for any use of the AHiRB recession planes) while having the same purpose as the zone HiRB and AHiRB standards. The changes made to this precinct standard from the zone standard includes effectively moving the assessment criteria to specific standards to be complied with.</li> <li>■ The proposal to use the AHiRB (through I444.6.1.5(3)) as a permitted activity better enables the potential for three level development on smaller individual sites which supports Objective H5.2(2) and Policy H5.3(2). No resource consent would be required to construct three storey buildings when it is demonstrated that the following is achieved – all of which are expected to be achievable for a three-storey building: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The neighbouring site will receive the prescribed sun access or is undeveloped and/or any proposed development is unknown;</li> <li>■ Sufficient glazing and a front door facing the road is provided;</li> <li>■ Any garage doors will be recessed in order to reduce their visual dominance; and</li> <li>■ Overlooking to neighbouring sites is sufficiently minimised through restrictions on outdoor living spaces and windows.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--

	Request	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The intent of the permitted activity precinct standard is that development incorporates the above design elements in order to achieve a larger building bulk (in accordance with the MHU expectations) without the penalty of needing to obtain resource consent. By doing so, it will contribute to the expected outcome in terms of the streetscape character and relationships between properties. The current approach of requiring resource consent (although without the need for notification) is not considered to be efficient for developments that otherwise would not require resource consent (such as single dwellings) nor effective in a greenfield environment, with the requested changes increasing the ease for such development to meet the expectations of the MHU of an urban built character of predominantly three storeys.</li> <li>■ The expectation of the Mixed Housing Urban Zone for a planned urban built character is shared with the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone (albeit, with different height expectations). It is noted that the impervious area, building coverage and landscaped area standards in each zone have identical listed purposes, mostly in relation to achieving the planned urban character. Therefore, coverage provisions that are more similar to the THAB standards than the MHU standards (as currently apply to the precinct-specific integrated residential development and are to apply to 'higher density residential development') can be considered to achieve the expectation of urban built character identified by the MHU zone, even if the methods (metrics) in the precinct differ from those in the zone.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the permitted activity statuses and standards proposed in the precinct by the requested changes are expected to more effectively and efficiently achieve the outcomes anticipated in the MHU zone, even if the methods differ from those applying in the MHU zone. The key difference of the precinct from the zone in general is that the Hingaia 1 Precinct area south of Park Estate Road is a greenfield environment where there is no existing built character, allowing for the expected character to be adjusted prior to residential development. In terms of the precinct objectives and policies, this was discussed in the response to Urban Design RFI item 2, above, and is not repeated.</p>

	Request	Response
4(b)	<p>The MHS and MHU zones remove density caps to encourage housing intensification, while ensuring that that intensification is achieved in a manner consistent with the zones' character by (broadly speaking) applying the same bulk and location standards irrespective of proposed number of dwellings (although some become matters of discretion). Why/how is permitting greater building bulk (more liberal HIRB, greater impervious and building coverages and reduced landscaping) for a single dwelling on a small site consistent with this approach?</p>	<p>The approach of allowing greater impervious and building coverages and reduced landscaping for higher density residential developments are already provided for in the Hingaia 1 Precinct, through the precinct-specific integrated residential development provisions. Plan Variation 1 has therefore already determined that it is suitable in the Hingaia 1 Precinct for this to occur regardless of the zone provisions (particularly as the operative precinct provisions apply across both the MHS and MHU zones).</p> <p>As mentioned above, the more liberal AHIRB recession plane better achieves the urban character outcomes of the MHU zone, including enabling buildings to be predominantly three storeys in height. This more liberal AHIRB recession plane will not apply to the MHS zone as a permitted activity, where suburban character is sought.</p> <p>Similar provisions also already apply in the Flat Bush and Drury 1 Precincts, demonstrating suitability for permitting greater building bulk on sites under 400 m<sup>2</sup> in a greenfield setting.</p>
5.	<p>What is the objective and policy basis for this?</p> <p>Why should IRDs in the Precinct have a presumption for greater building bulk than in the underlying zones?</p> <p>What are the neighbourhood character effects of this greater bulk?</p>	<p>The provisions applying to integrated residential developments are the same as those in the operative Hingaia 1 Precinct, simply formatted differently. In particular, it is considered that any development meeting the Auckland-wide definition of "Integrated Residential Development" would also meet the precinct-specific definition of "Integrated Residential Development", noting that the precinct-specific definition applies to all residential development and is not limited only to multiple dwellings.</p> <p>The determination under Plan Variation 1 to allow for IRDs to have a greater building bulk than in underlying zones forms part of the existing environmental outcomes anticipated by the operative provision, which the requested changes are to be assessed against.</p> <p>These matters are therefore outside the scope of the requested changes.</p>

	Request	Response
6(a)	Comments on the character effects of the above requested.	<p>The following response has been prepared in collaboration between Aaron Grey, planner, and Nick Rae, urban designer.</p> <p>When considering the outcomes resulting from using the alternative height in relation to boundary standard (either the precinct provision or the underlying zone provision), it is important to compare with the outcome from <u>not</u> using this standard (as a permitted activity). In this case, this could be a comparison to the existing precinct provisions and/or the zone provisions (without the proposed precinct provisions).</p> <p>The operative precinct provisions (specifically, Development Control 4.6) require garages to be no more than 45% of the width of the dwelling façade facing the street, must not be forward of the dwelling and must be at least 5 m from the front boundary. As was discussed in section 5.2.19 of the evaluation report, this provision has had the inadvertent impact of reducing potential density for vacant sites subdivision, with developers creating lots at a width that would enable a double garage as a permitted activity (being more attractive to the market). If assuming a 4.8 m wide garage door (the minimum expected for a double garage, but still very narrow), this would require a lot width of 12.66 m (when also accounting for 1 m yards on each side). For a more standard double garage door width, lots with widths of around 14 m would be necessary.</p> <p>Drawing SK01, attached as Appendix 6, illustrates a number of examples of the façades of dwellings using a 5.6 m wide door.</p> <p>Example 1 illustrates the narrowest lot enabled while providing a 5.6 m wide garage door and complying with Development Control 4.6 and the 1 m side yard requirement (which is 14.44 m) and the maximum building envelope created by the zone height in relation to boundary standard. This illustrates the potential for a two level dwelling (potentially with a small third attic level). However, a single level dwelling would also be a permitted activity, which is illustrated in Example 2. Here, the potential dwelling façade that is not a garage door would be much less, with the door closer to half of the façade and is more dominant than the previous example. Both examples could currently (without any of the proposed changes) be established a permitted activity.</p>

	Request	Response
		<p>Assuming that it is considered appropriate to remove the garage standard to be consistent with the MHU zone (it is noted that this RFI appears to only be considering the introduction of a garage width standard for the precinct-specific AHiRB standard and not the retention of Development Control 4.6), it would then be a permitted activity for a dwelling to be constructed with a double garage without any restriction on where and how much of the façade is occupied by a garage door (and assuming that AHiRB is not used). The narrower the site the more impact the double door has on the ground floor façade.</p> <p>Example 3 illustrates one possible outcome using a 12 m wide site. There is the potential for such an outcome to have adverse effects on the quality and amenity values of the street depending on the width of the site and design of the resulting dwellings. There is nothing in the MHU zone preventing the full width of a frontage to be a double garage door. The MHU zone provisions therefore can result in a higher number of double garage doors occupying more of the dwelling frontage.</p> <p>This level of effect has been considered appropriate for the MHU zone by the decisions on the PAUP, particularly when less than four dwellings are proposed on a site. From an urban design perspective, this is not considered to be a good outcome – it is unknown how dwellings on vacant sites will be designed and how often a poor outcome is repeated along a street – but this is accepted to be the permitted baseline for the MHU zone.</p> <p>In the case of the proposed changes in the Hingaia 1 Precinct, the potential increase in garage door dominance needs to be weighed against the positive effects of increasing density and/or the number of dwellings fronting the street (the inadvertent outcome discussed above) expected by deleting Development Control 4.6.</p> <p>It is then noted that the use of the AHiRB by a dwelling in the MHU zone (without precinct provisions) is a restricted discretionary activity and that Council has discretion over the extent to which visual dominance of garage doors as viewed from the street are minimised. Meanwhile, the requested changes introduce a precinct provision that allow for development to use the AHiRB as a permitted activity with restrictions that do not include a direct limitation of the widths of garages. However, given the above discussions, there is an argument that could be made when applying for such a resource consent that the effects of a double garage door at the façade of a building utilising the alternative height in relation to boundary is no different than a building that does not and therefore any adverse effects resulting from the dominance of the garage door should be disregarded as part of the permitted baseline.</p>



	Request	Response
		<p>Example 4 (on Drawing SK01) illustrates the building envelope on a 12 m wide site that utilises the AHiRB recession planes with a 5.6 m garage door shown. The building appears bulkier from the street and therefore, with the ratio of garage door to façade reduced (in comparison to the zone permitted baseline), the door would become a less dominant element. Buildings that use the AHiRB recession planes therefore are expected to result in a better outcome (in terms of garage door dominance) than the permitted alternative (restricted by the standard HiRB recession planes), regardless of the garage door size proposed. Therefore, the requested changes, allowing for use of the AHiRB recession planes as a permitted activity would enable more bulk towards the street, which in itself reduces the potential for a garage door to dominate (especially compared to the zone permitted activity outcome of not using AHiRB). If the use of AHiRB remains a restricted discretionary activity, it is less likely that development of less than four dwellings would use this provision (in order to avoid the need for resource consent) and therefore the dominance of garage doors on the streetscape (enabled as a permitted activity) is expected to be more prevalent.</p> <p>A standard limiting the width of garage doors as a percentage of the front façade of buildings is not considered to be an efficient provision at minimising the dominance of garage doors as it has the potential to make house designers choose to not utilise the alternative height in relation to boundary recession planes so that a double garage can be enabled (a double garage potentially being more attractive to the market than an increased second or third storey of floor space). A standard limiting the width of garage doors as a percentage of the front façade of buildings is also not supported on the basis that it has the perverse outcome of incentivising wider lots at vacant subdivision design stage, as discussed earlier and in section 5.2.19 of the evaluation report.</p> <p>While there is the potential for a prevalence of double width garage doors as a result of the requested changes, a provision that limits the width of the garage door in proportion to the width of the building is not an effective method (in a greenfield setting) when also part of a wider suite of provisions that seek to increase the density of residential activity, as it instead results in the market delivering a decrease in density than what would otherwise be achievable.</p> <p>The proposed controls that seek to control the dominance of garages (being garage setback and the requirement for garages to be set back further than the front façade of a building) are considered to be design aspects that are easily achievable but may otherwise not be provided for if not for the incentive. They therefore are considered to be efficient and effective at minimising the dominance of garage doors without unintended outcomes.</p>

	Request	Response
6(b)	Clause (3) of I444.6.1.5 refers to the rear boundary. How does this apply to a corner site, which has two side boundaries, but no rear boundary?	<p>For corner sites, Standard I444.6.1.5(3) would enable the alternative height in relation to boundary recession plane to be used along all side boundaries that are within 20 m of the site frontage – as there are no rear boundaries, the additional text of <i>“and more than 6 m from any rear boundary”</i> would not apply.</p> <p>The criteria in Standard I444.6.1.5(4) are considered to suitably avoid, remedy and mitigate potential adverse effects on sites adjacent to corner sites, including requirements to avoid shading on outdoor living spaces and to reduce overlooking from windows on upper storeys.</p>
	Attachment 2 – AT	
1.	Auckland Transport recommends that solutions are further investigated to mitigate traffic issues along Beach Road in the vicinity of this interchange in 2031; please complete this assessment.	As the level of service provided at Beach Road in 2031 are the same regardless of the development yield at HGL's landholdings south of Park Estate Road, the mitigation of such traffic issues is not considered to be within the scope of the plan change and this request is therefore not considered to be appropriate to the scale and significance of the actual or potential environmental effects anticipated from the implementation of the change or plan.
2.	Can you please provide clarification on what remains to be finalised. If not why not?	<p>The position and design of local roads are determined at resource consent stage. The large majority of the precinct is not subject to any subdivision consents that confirm local road positions and layouts.</p> <p>It is noted that the operative precinct plan specifies that local roads have a flexible location and the proposed precinct plans specifies that local roads are indicative. The request from AT suggests that they expect that all local road positions be fixed as part of the plan change, with limited opportunity for changes at resource consent stage, which is an approach that is not supported nor considered to be practicable.</p> <p>Given this, it is considered inappropriate for the requested information regarding local roads to be provided as part of a plan change request.</p>

	Request	Response
3.	Auckland Transport recommends that appropriate standards and assessment criteria be provided to give guidance and clarity on new road design. Assessment criteria should include whether the new roads adequately provide for network connections, accessibility, operations and safety. Auckland Transport recommends that a more in-depth review of the assessment criteria be undertaken addressing matters raised in Auckland Transport's feedback that was provided back in December 2020. Auckland Transport would welcome further discussions to ensure alignment with previous discussions/decisions in the Precinct.	<p>The only roading standards being deleted from the operative precinct relate to road cross-sections. Auckland Transport has made it clear that it prefers for road cross-sections to be determined through its own Codes of Practice rather than AUP rules. The complications of AUP cross-section rules when AT has this position have been discussed in the evaluation report. On this basis, the Auckland-wide provisions (including Policy E38.3(17) and matter of discretion E38.12.1(7)(k)) are considered to be sufficient.</p> <p>The introduction of roading standards further to that already provided in the operative Hingaia 1 Precinct (which it appears that AT is suggesting occur) are considered to be outside the scope of the requested changes. AT is welcome to contend with this position through a submission on the plan change (should it be accepted) and this be determined by a hearings panel.</p> <p>The updated precinct plan following the decision to delete the precinct-specific roading plans was provided as part of the previous RFI response. This still shows collector roads and indicative local roads, alongside requirements for a cycling network.</p>
4.	Auckland Transport recommends that the applicant identify appropriate and effective mechanisms to address the network-wide transport effects.	<p>The appropriate and effective mechanisms to address transport effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The Auckland-wide provisions of the AUP, which are unaffected by the requested changes, applying to all applications for subdivision that include new roading, including Standard E27.6.1(1)(c) and matter of discretion E38.12.1(7)(k);</li> <li>■ The requirement under Standard I444.6.2.1(1) for collector roads and cycle facilities shown on the precinct plan to be provided for as part of proposed subdivision;</li> <li>■ The matter of discretion under I444.8.1(9)(b), applying to subdivision in the Hingaia 1 Precinct, which requires Council to consider the consistency of the subdivision with the precinct plan, including the indicative local road locations; and</li> <li>■ The requirement to adhere to AT's Code of Practice through the engineering approval process.</li> </ul> <p>No further mechanisms are considered necessary.</p> <p>Despite AT's concerns, no significant changes have been made to the precinct plan, with this continuing to provide a suitable indicative road network that serve the precinct area, including connections to adjacent land.</p>

	Request	Response
5.	Auckland Transport seeks further information to understand the threshold or trigger for clarity and implementing mitigation measures.	We continue to hold the position that it is inappropriate to relitigate the determination on Variation 1 <i>“that the density (or dwelling number) threshold trigger for determining when certain traffic related works should occur is a clumsy and inequitable method and should be deleted from the variation”</i> , especially with the relatively modest increase in yield anticipated as a result of the requested changes (10% – not an additional 800 dwellings or 53% as referenced by AT). Requirements to assess the traffic effects as part of resource consent applications (including all subdivisions – specifically matter of discretion E38.12.1(7)(k) and, when applicable, Standard E27.6.1(1)(c)) – continue to be considered the appropriate method to use in order to determine whether mitigation measures are required.
6.	The Transport Assessment should incorporate the Hingaia Master Plan as part of the assessment. This should include any information on the street layout and design to provide further explanation of the internal road network servicing the precinct e.g. circulation, characteristics of the internal roads.	<p>The only roading-related transport provisions being removed completely from the Hingaia 1 Precinct are those related to strict roading cross-sections. In relation to that, refer to the response to AT RFI matter 3, above. The street layout will be guided by the indicative roads on the precinct plan, which remains part of the Hingaia 1 Precinct provisions and resolved through the resource consent process. Detailed design of roading would then be resolved as part of the engineering approval process.</p> <p>The Hingaia 1 Precinct provisions do not contain <i>“reliance on Master Plan”</i> as mentioned. The only indirect reliance on the master plan in the proposed precinct provisions is where the road alignment on the propose Hingaia 1 Precinct plan are identical and where the Hingaia 1 Precinct provisions require consistency with the precinct plan.</p>

S:\Jobs\2197 - Hugh Green - Park Green Plan Change\reports\rfi\Plan change RFI response v2.docx