

## Wairaka Precinct Plan Change

### Further Information Requests from Auckland Council (pursuant to Clause 23(2) 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule RMA)

#### Open Space

As preliminary comments to these further information requests please note the following.

1. In the Clause 23 OS1 and OS2 responses, the Applicant refers to the increase in scale of development enabled by the plan change as being “moderate” - in the order of 500 – 1,000 dwellings. Analysis based confined to a number of dwellings is not considered appropriate as dwellings enabled by the plan change can be provided in different typologies and with different sizes, with implications for the size and type of the household residing at each dwelling. Rather than an “existing – plus” approach, analysis of open space needs for the new community should be based on the total community able to be established after the plan change is in place. These further information requests are based on that premise.
2. Please refer to the attached plans – Existing Precinct and Proposed Precinct - which inform the further information requests identified below. These plans have been compiled by Auckland Council’s GIS Unit. The Existing Precinct Plan identifies three open space areas. The southern area is a “key open space private” area totalling 61,992m<sup>2</sup>. The middle “Mason Clinic” area is also a “key open space private” area and is 9,310m<sup>2</sup>. The northern area is an indicative neighbourhood park and is 3,611m<sup>2</sup>. The total committed open space area is approximately **7.4913ha**. The Proposed Precinct proposes a southern park comprising a 10,264m<sup>2</sup> area within the Unitec campus and another 14,187m<sup>2</sup> area in the same location; a 14,356m<sup>2</sup> “knoll park” area; a 2,181m<sup>2</sup> “Te Auaunga Access Park” area; a 9,813m<sup>2</sup> central open space area; and a 8,008m<sup>2</sup> northern park. The total committed open space area is approximately **5.8809ha**.
3. The Clause 23 responses make several references to what is or may be vested as “public” open space, including by reference to the proposal that there will be eight times the amount of public open space relative to the existing precinct. That appears to assume that all open space shown will be accepted for vesting. These decisions are yet to be made and will depend on a wide range of factors, including assessments arising from the further information that has been sought on the plan change. It is the total amount of committed open space shown on both the existing and proposed precinct plans, whether that ultimately becomes publicly or privately managed, that gives rise to the further information requests contained in both the original clause 23 requests for information, and these further requests.

#### Further Information Requests

*OS(F)1 Please clarify and illustrate on a plan or plans all of the open space figures used in the Clause 23 responses.*

The open space areas depicted on the attached plans are not the same figures as used in the Clause 23 responses. It is noted that, in respect of the existing precinct, figures have been calculated from Council’s own (AUP) records. In respect of the proposed precinct they have been calculated off

plans provided electronically by the Applicant (via Boffa Miskell). It is important that the differences that currently exists are removed so that the process from this point can rely on correct information.

*OS(F)2 Please clarify the basis for reducing the amount of open space to be provided in the precinct.*

Rather than providing more open space, as may be expected for the increased population that will be enabled by the proposed plan change, less open space is being committed for that greater population. In addition, of the areas proposed, the northern park, while not shown on the existing precinct plan, is already required as open space as being the curtilage to a heritage building – that makes the difference even greater.

*OS(F) 3 Please provide information on the methodology that has been used to calculate open space needs of the total community to be enabled after the plan change is in place.*

RFI OS1 requested this information. The reduced amount of committed open space to be provided emphasises this need for a clear methodology or at least a better understanding of the analysis behind the proposed provision of open space. While it is accepted this is not as simple quantity of open space issue the amount and type of open space is relevant. The “1ha per 1,000 dwellings” ratio mentioned in Point 37 of the OS1 / OS2 response should be explained, as to its adequacy, by reference to an acknowledged methodology. While the Clause 23 request OS1 specifically indicated reliance should not be placed on current Council guidelines, the responses nevertheless proceeded to do that.

The Clause 23 responses also focus on describing the open space areas proposed rather than conducting a needs analysis based on the community to be established within the precinct. That needs analysis should be based on the best possible assumptions that can be made regarding the needs of future residents, ideally with commentary on how those needs can be met by open space provided, and the functions those open spaces will perform, in different parts of what is a large site.

*OS(F)4 Please provide further information justifying that the Mason Clinic Open Space Area is in fact being replaced.*

The Applicant’s response to OS6 – replacement of the committed open space in the Mason Clinic area relates to parts of revised open space areas that total significantly less than currently committed. The information provided may have made more sense if the new precinct had at least the same total open space area committed as the current precinct, however that is not the case. Council’s current view is that insufficient information has been provided to confirm that the Mason Clinic open space has been replaced.

*OS(F)5 Please clarify, and illustrate on a plan, the logical / possible functions of the open space areas to be provided, and clearly separate out areas proposed as drainage reserves (i.e. with a stormwater function).*

Limited information has been provided on the functions of each proposed open space area. As an example, Response OS4 13, relating to the central park, refers to the OS3 response, which does not provide detail of the function of that important park. If, as appears to be the case, any particular reliance is being placed on the potential quality of that central park further detail should be provided on how that park could function to serve the needs of the future community. In general, this matter is not made easier by the absence of an updated master plan. In the absence of a master plan the logical / function of each open space area should be illustrated on a plan or plans.

The illustrated plan should clearly delineate areas required for stormwater management purposes and which may ultimately become drainage reserves.

*OS(F)6 Please illustrate on a plan the open space areas proposed to be provided as relocation of the currently committed “private” key open space from the Mason Clinic site.*

The OS6 response explains relocation of “private” key open space from Mason Clinic site, however this would be clearer if shown on a plan.

*OS(F)7 Please provide information on the proposed relationship between the proposed ‘Southern open space and Park’ and the adjacent privately owned open space within Unitec site.*

It is not clear from the information provided how these open spaces and the shared boundary between these open spaces will be managed.

*OS(F)8 Please provide a response to the following original OS2 request.*

*“The application documents refer to private open space, and communal open space, however do not specify standards or any other explanation or provisions as to how this should be provided. For instance, Appendix 3 to Boffa Miskell’s Landscape Assessment refers to Pocket Parks, however also to these being “Voluntarily provided”.*

As already noted information is sought on further standards or provisions to ensure provision of a variety of open spaces to ensure a connected network of open spaces will be provided within the precinct plan. The current information does not provide any potential possibility for a functional and connected open space network within the precinct area.

*OS(F)9 Please provide information confirming what provision is made within the precinct for sporting facilities to provide for the community enabled by the proposed provisions.*

While the Applicant has made clear indication of not supporting for provision of a sportsfield within the PC area, no clear reason has been provided that the precinct could not contribute to the sportsfield network (except that MHUD has other priorities). If sportsfield provision cannot be accommodated within the precinct, please demonstrate other sport and recreation facilities that could be incorporated into the development. It is noted in this respect that the former Unitec campus offered two sportsfields and a recreation centre with two indoor courts – all of which have already been closed and lost to the network without replacement provision.

## **Transportation**

*T(F)1 Subject to ongoing discussion and agreement with Auckland Transport (AT), please provide up to date traffic modelling assessment of the effects of the plan change on the adjoining road network, based on the latest information available in relation to road and intersection layouts associated with the Carrington Road Upgrade, and any other appropriate updates. Please also confirm the key assumptions adopted in agreement with AT in relation to trip generation, modal share, any discounts applied to through traffic on Carrington Road, etc.*

It is understood that the scope and details for the Carrington Road upgrade project, as assumed in traffic modelling undertaken to date, are still to be confirmed with AT. Areas of uncertainty include issues which appear to be significant in nature with regards to potential traffic effects, e.g. widening of bridging points over SH16 Motorway and railway over-bridge, use of priority lanes for bus priority versus ‘T2’, future intersection forms.

*T(F)2 Please undertake an assessment of parking effects on nearby residential streets resulting from development enabled by the plan change, in the event that parking controls indicated in the ITA, including Residential Parking Schemes, are not progressed by AT.*

It is understood that AT have yet to agree in principle to the parking controls proposed in the ITA, including residential parking schemes in the surrounding streets, aimed at mitigating against parking and traffic related impacts which are otherwise expected to occur as a result of the Plan Change.

### **Ecology**

*E(F)1 Please provide a response to E10 of the original Clause 23 request, in respect of the NZCPS.*

This request was for an assessment against the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement because of the proximity to the coastal marine area and SEA Marine.

### **Planning**

*P(F)1 Please provide further clarification of the mix of household types that could logically be expected to establish in the precinct, as revised. Please also provide an estimate of the total population that may be expected as a result of this housing mix.*

Information has been provided on the possible number of apartments and terrace houses. However, without further information, such as bedroom numbers, it is difficult to assess what population may be expected to establish, including how that may compare to what is enabled in the current precinct provisions. For instance, a simple dwelling number analysis does not enable a good comparison where the composition of the current dwelling mix includes 1,000 student units – which it is assumed would be only one person units.