

2.20 – Conversion of dwellings - section 32 evaluation for the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan

1	OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE	2
1.1	Subject Matter of this Section.....	2
1.2	Resource Management Issue to be Addressed	2
1.3	Significance of this Subject	2
1.4	Auckland Plan	2
1.5	Current Objectives, Policies, Rules and Methods	2
1.6	Information and Analysis	3
1.7	Consultation Undertaken.....	4
1.8	Decision-Making.....	5
1.9	Proposed Provisions	5
1.10	Reference to other Evaluations	5
2	OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND RULES	5
2.1	Objective	5
3	ALTERNATIVES	9
4	CONCLUSION	13
5	RECORD OF DEVELOPMENT OF PROVISIONS	13
5.1	Information and Analysis	13
5.2	Consultation Undertaken.....	13
5.3	Decision-Making.....	13

1 Overview and Purpose

This evaluation should be read in conjunction with Part 1 in order to understand the context and approach for the evaluation and consultation undertaken in the development of the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (the Unitary Plan).

1.1 Subject Matter of this Section

The provisions for the conversion of existing dwellings relate to and assist in achieving the objective of enabling greater housing choice. The approach allows an existing dwelling to be converted into two dwellings within the Single House, Mixed Housing Suburban and Mixed Housing Urban zones. Conversion of dwellings is a restricted discretionary activity in the Large Lot and Rural and Coastal Settlement zones. Such a conversion would be subject to development controls to ensure an adequate level of amenity is achieved and there is sufficient capacity for on-site wastewater servicing. This policy approach can assist in improving housing affordability by enabling the two converted dwellings to exist on a single certificate of title. This approach can be seen as a continuation of the minor household units which were enabled in many of the legacy District Plans in Auckland.

1.2 Resource Management Issue to be Addressed

Conversion of dwellings also referred to in legacy plans as minor household units, minor units, secondary dwellings have been commonly used as a method for allowing for more flexible living arrangements and creating potential for additional income for the main household.

1.3 Significance of this Subject

Conversion of dwellings has a long history in Auckland. Converted dwellings allow for families to more easily accommodate older children living at home, semi-independent living or provide for rental income. Converted dwellings have also been seen to be useful for character suburbs where additional households can be accommodated with no perceivable change in the built form.

1.4 Auckland Plan

Chapter eleven of the Auckland Plan deals with Auckland's Housing. Priority 2 of that chapter aims to increase housing choice to meet diverse preferences and needs. Auckland's households, families and communities are increasingly diverse. Housing must cater for different life stages, cultures and families, whanau of different sizes and types. Ideally, the mix of housing in a neighbourhood should allow people the choice of a suitable dwelling within the same community as they move through different life stages.

1.5 Current Objectives, Policies, Rules and Methods

Some legacy plans mention minor dwellings or minor residential units in their objectives and policies. Some of the Plans that do specifically mention them are:

The Auckland (North Shore) Section Policies 3,4 and 7 states:

“3. By providing opportunities for the establishment of a variety of housing forms throughout the residential zones, including houses, units, and apartments and minor residential units, by the inclusion of such activities as Permitted, Controlled and Discretionary Activities.

4. By enabling minor residential units to be established:

- a) as a Permitted activity in the Residential 1,4 to 7, except for Residential 5 zoned sites in the Birkenhead area, and Structure Plan zones on sites 600m² or larger; and*
- b) as a Discretionary activity in Residential 1,4 to 7 and Structure Plan zones on sites smaller than 600m², and in the Residential 5 zone in the Birkenhead area.*

7. By providing opportunities for elderly persons' housing in all its forms, including units, minor residential units, complexes, rest-homes and retirement villages, by the inclusion of these activities within the Permitted, Controlled and Discretionary activities.”

The Auckland (Rodney) Section Policy 8.8.1.2.2 states:

“There should be no more than one household unit per site in the Low Intensity Residential Zone except that a second Household Unit can be established where this is a Minor Household Unit.”

A similar policy exists with the Landscape Protection Residential Zone-

“The intensity of development in the Landscape Protection Zone should equate to no greater than one household unit per 8,000m² except that a second Household Unit can be established where this is a Minor Household Unit.”

Policy 8.8.3.2.2 also indicates that minor household units can be established in other zones too:

“The intensity of development in the Medium Intensity Residential zone should average to no greater than one household unit per 600m² of site area, except in the Township Policy Area where the average should not exceed one household unit per 800m² of site area, and except that a second household unit can be established where this is a minor household unit.”

The Auckland (Waitakere) Section District Plan has extensive policy guidance on where minor household units are permitted or not permitted depending on the sensitivity of the natural environment. As a summary – minor household units are only allowed in bush covered areas in the Waitakere Ranges where they are attached to the main dwelling house. In urban areas, they can be separate from the main dwelling. In the Foothills they should be located within six metres of the main dwelling. Policy 3.1 states:

“Intensive housing should be encouraged around main town centres, railway stations and major roads to help provide for the efficient use of land within the urban area. Intensive development should be accommodated in the City’s town centres and in specific Living Environments, providing further opportunities for urban consolidation. Within the Community Environment (New Lynn) and Living 6 Environment, purpose-built apartment developments should be a minimum of 4 storeys in height to ensure efficient use is made of a limited land resource. The conversion of existing buildings, as well as additions to buildings, for residential activities, is also encouraged.”

Minor dwellings or converted dwellings do not feature in other legacy zone policies and objectives.

1.6 Information and Analysis

Converted dwellings are common in existing legacy plans. The legacy provisions are summarised in the table below:

North Shore District Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor units must not exceed 60m² gfa • No more than one minor unit on the same site as a dwelling • Need to comply with outdoor living space and service court provisions
Rodney District Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor household units provided for across residential zones as a controlled activity in the Medium Intensity Residential zone (1:600m²) and as a RDA in the Low Intensity (1:4000m²) and Landscape Protection (1:8,000m²) zones • All other residential zones were non-complying • Minimum area of open space shall be 30m²
Waitakere District Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor household units with a minimum 600m² net unit area for the minor household unit and associated dwelling • Dwellings and minor household units may share the same outdoor space, or they each may have a separate outdoor

	<p>² per bedroom and the outdoor space must meet certain slope and accessibility requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One on-site carpark for the minor dwelling • Minor units must be connected to the main dwelling in some situations • Limited to 65m² GFA
Manukau District Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stand-alone minor units limited to 60m² and 5m maximum height • Where the minor unit is incorporated into the original household the height limit is the same as for the residential dwelling • No internal access permitted between the minor unit and any attached garage or accessory building • Allocated private open space • A carpark provided for the minor unit must be functional and accessible
Papakura District Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No minor units except at Pararekau Island Countryside Living zone
Franklin District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No minor units in residential zones
Auckland Isthmus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not provided for

1.7 Consultation Undertaken

Consultation of the draft provisions has involved:

- consultation with the Political Working Party in 2012,
- discussion with local boards,
- the release of the March draft
- presentation to the Auckland Plan Committee in August 2013.

The Council's decision-making body (councillors and local boards) have been keen to retain conversion of dwellings conceptually. There has been a broad understanding that they must be carefully managed so that they do not detract from residential amenity, they cannot be readily subdivided off from the main dwelling particularly in areas of high landscape value, and while they should provide for housing choice, they should not undermine the policy intent of zones.

The feedback on converted dwellings as a result of the March draft can be summarised into the following points:

- many operative plans provide for separate minor units. Minor units should be allowed to locate anywhere on a site as long as they meet the development controls of the relevant zone
- minor units are important for enabling extended families to live together
- there should be no limit on the number of dwellings that a house can be converted into, provided they all meet minimum size
- conversion should only allowed in the Single House and Mixed Housing Zone, Large Lot has infrastructure and landscape constraints
- 30m² gross floor area for a dwelling is too small
- Should have a maximum gross floor area of 60m² to ensure new unit does not dominate the existing dwelling

- The plan will allow for garages, basements and attics to be poorly converted
- Minor units should be permitted in the Single House zone in addition to converted dwellings
- Single House sites of 700-900m² which cannot subdivide could accommodate a minor unit.

1.8 Decision-Making

The council has considered provisions on converted dwellings at various workshops and Auckland Plan Committee sessions. These have confirmed the direction taken for the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan.

1.9 Proposed Provisions

The proposed provisions allow for:

- A converted dwelling as a permitted activity in the Single House, Mixed Housing Suburban and Mixed Housing Urban zones
- A converted dwelling as a restricted discretionary activity in the Rural and Coastal Settlement zone and Large Lot zone
- Converted dwellings as a discretionary activity in the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone.
- Where a dwelling is converted each dwelling must have a net internal floor area of at least 40m²
- The second dwelling must have direct access to an outdoor living space that can be exclusive to the dwelling or shared with the primary dwelling
- Have a common wall with the primary dwelling of no less than 3m or share a ceiling or floor with the primary dwelling
- Comply with daylight controls
- Must comply with all development controls in the zone except carparking
- Must be held on the same title and not subdivided from the principal dwelling
- The primary dwelling must exist as at 30 September 2013.

1.10 Reference to other Evaluations

Refer to the Section 32 Topic Matrix for reference to related section 32 evaluations. These include:

- 2.3 Residential zones
- 2.7 Design statements
- 2.21 Affordable housing

2 Objectives, Policies and Rules

2.1 Objective

The following objectives are proposed:-

Part 2, Chapter D, Section 1 –

1.1.1.2 A diverse range of housing provides choice for households and communities to meet their varied needs and lifestyles.

Appropriateness of the Objective(s)

Relevance

The objective seeks to enable greater housing choice and flexibility by providing for an additional residential unit within an existing dwelling. The objective relates to all of the residential zones although conversion of a dwelling in the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone is a discretionary activity. The objective foreshadows policies restricting its application.

The objective addresses Part 2 of the Act by ensuring new development responds to the neighbourhood context. This is in fulfilment of s. 7(f) which requires council to have regard to the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment.

Providing for an additional residential unit within an existing dwelling also contributes to an efficient use of land while maintaining character. Objective has potential to increase the number of dwellings on a single site. This recognises the importance Auckland's land resource under s. 7(g) and encourages landowners to make efficient use of the land available.

Usefulness

The objective adds value by describing the outcome that this zone should achieve. The addition of a dwelling within a single building that maintains the character of an area. Therefore, an additional dwelling which does not maintain the character of the area would not meet the outcomes expressed in this objective. This provides clarity in the decision-making process.

The objective also contributes to the wider objective of the plan and the residential zone to provide for greater housing choice (Objectives 2.2.4.1 and 3.2.1.1.2)

Providing two residential units within a single building has the potential to provide an affordable form of housing within areas of Auckland that will not be subject to significant growth or intensification. The principal reasons for this increased affordability are:

- low capital construction costs. In theory, the building could be existing and, therefore, an internal conversion would require minor physical alterations and the introduction of building code compliant internal walls separating the two residential units
- the two units could exist on the same title, so there is no need subdivide which can add cost to a development
- the second unit could be provided as an addition to an existing building and therefore utilise existing on-site infrastructure and amenity such as open space.

Achievability

Council has the ability to achieve this outcome through the use of policies and rules.

The outcome will be achieved by enabling the creation of an additional dwelling existing building as a permitted activity in the Single House, Mixed Housing and Large Lot Residential zones. The permitted activity status is subject to land use and development controls summarised below:

- The additional unit must have a net site area of at least 40m²
- The additional unit must have direct access to an outdoor living space
- The additional unit must share a common wall or ceiling with the main dwelling.
- Comply with all other development controls for the zone except that it does not need to provide for carparking
- The primary dwelling must exist as at 30 September 2013

The success of the objective will be known through regular monitoring, particularly resource consent and building consent information on the number of additional units. This will provide council with an overview on a two to five-yearly basis of how successful the provisions are. Monitoring will also be required to ascertain whether the additional units:

- provide an appropriate level of amenity for the occupants

- maintain the character of an area.

Reasonableness

The objectives and rules are considered to be reasonable because it enables flexibility and affordability for housing by providing for a second unit within an existing dwelling.

There are costs associated with enabling an additional unit within an existing building. This includes costs associated with infrastructure supply and capacity and greater demand for public utilities, parks and community facilities. This cost will be more acute in areas already subject to constraints, or have limited or no additional capacity.

The approach of legacy councils in relation to minor household units or secondary dwellings provides evidence that this form of housing does not always guarantee a standard of amenity which would be provided for the primary dwelling on the site. Sufficient standards need applied to the both units within a dwelling to ensure appropriate design and amenity outcomes are achieved. The approach to the notified version differs from legacy council provisions because it requires compliance with the other bulk and location requirements except for parking.

Legacy issues

The ability to provide an additional unit within a single dwelling is an evolution of the common approach to minor household units or secondary dwellings. Legacy plans generally enabled such development subject to development or land use standards specific to individual zones. Generally more restrictive controls were applied to rural zones or zones with landscape values or known constraints.

Some legacy district plans such as the Rodney Plan tried to remove conversion of dwellings or minor household units when it was first notified but ended up re-introducing them due to public demand for them. Other legacy plans refused to cater for them because they either provided sufficient opportunities for additional dwellings through intensification or because there were specific exceptions for worker accommodation in rural zones.

Most legacy plans which enabled such dwellings to be converted and were supported by development controls which dealt with the following:

- maximum floor area to ensure subservience to the main dwelling on the site
- private outdoor space provisions to ensure adequate outdoor amenity
- minimum site size to ensure the parent site was large enough to accommodate two residential units. In some cases this also relate to the ability to subdivide.
- separation distances or the need to share a common wall to ensure clustering of the building form on a site.

2.1.1 Policies

The following policies are proposed:

In Part 2, Chapter D, Section 1 the general residential policies 2.1.1. 1-5 provide:

1. *Require developments to contribute positively to the visual quality and safety of streets, public open space and neighbourhoods.*
2. *Recognise that the density of Auckland's residential areas will increase, to varying degrees over time and apply controls to manage that change.*
3. *Provide a range of residential zones that enable different housing densities, a variety of housing opportunities and different housing types that are appropriate for the*

4. *Require a percentage of medium to large scale residential development to provide equal physical access and use for people of all ages and abilities.*
5. *Enable an existing dwelling to be converted into two, in specific zones, in a manner that provides high quality internal and on-site amenity.*

The policies above, particularly policies 1 and 5 clarify that converted dwellings should still contribute positively to the visual quality of streets and neighbourhoods. The rules for conversion of dwellings are designed to apply across several zones and are set out before the development controls for the zones as it is a land use activity.

The activity status for converted dwellings is set out in the activity table for the residential rules (Part 2, Chapter I, Section 1) Rule 3.3 covers the conversion of a dwelling into two dwellings:

1. *Where a dwelling is proposed to be converted into two dwellings each dwelling must have a net internal floor area of at least 40m²*
2. *The second dwelling must*
 - a. *have direct access to an outdoor living space. This space may be exclusive to the dwelling or shared with the primary dwelling*
 - b. *have a common wall with the primary dwelling of no less than 3m in length or share a ceiling and/or floor with the primary dwelling*
 - c. *comply with the daylight and minimum dimension of principal living rooms and principal bedrooms development control.*
3. *The primary dwelling must exist as at 30 September 2013.*
4. *Car parking is not required for the second dwelling.*

Converted dwellings are a discretionary activity in the THAB zone to ensure the outcomes of the zone – accommodating change and growth in population – is not undermined or fragmented through the development secondary dwellings on sites which currently contain a single house. The THAB zone also has specific rules relating to dwelling mix that could be undermined if an applicant was later able to convert a two or three bedroom apartment into smaller dwellings.

2.1.2 Rules and other methods

The proposed provisions are summarised in 1.9 above.

The rules are achievable in all of the residential zones. In the Single House, Mixed Housing Suburban and Mixed Housing Urban zones conversion of dwellings is a permitted activity. This means that an applicant will apply for a building consent to convert a dwelling and at the time of application a planning check will occur. If the development complies with all building and resource management matters, consent will be issued within the statutory timeframes and a development contribution for the additional dwelling and any connection fees and charges will be payable at that time.

In the Large Lot and Rural and Coastal Settlement zones, the council has limited its discretion to wastewater issues.

In the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone conversion of dwellings is a discretionary activity. This reflects the fact that multi-unit development is intended to occur in this zone, but where 10 or more dwellings are applied for, the dwelling mix rule applies

requiring applicants to put some two and three bedroom dwellings into the overall design. The conversion of dwellings rule could potentially undermine that outcome of achieving a dwelling mix after an initial resource consent was granted.

The minimum net internal floor area rule relates to the minimum dwelling size in the residential provisions. People can choose to build a larger secondary dwelling or converted dwelling but it will still need to comply with daylight to dwellings and either share or provide for its own outdoor living space.

The converted dwelling does not need to provide for any carparking on-site. In practice applicants may choose to provide for one, but it is not mandatory.

2.1.3 Costs and Benefits of Proposed Policies and Rules

The benefits of the proposed policies and rules are that converting a dwelling will allow for gentle intensification to occur in many zones without it becoming apparent to neighbouring sites that there is a new secondary dwelling. It allows people to make efficient use of an existing resource without subdivision occurring. From a social wellbeing perspective a converted dwelling may enable flexible living arrangements for older adults, extended families and rental/income. Many cultures prefer to have older family members or extended family live with them. This is also becoming a more common phenomenon amongst Pakeha who may be supporting adult children at university or while they save for a house deposit. There is likely to be flow-on effects for the local economy of more people living in an area in the form of greater support for cafes, restaurants and spending on goods and services in general. There should also be a short term benefit from the costs of construction and services from builders, plumbers and electricians.

The costs of the proposed policies and rules relate to normal effects of development:

- Development contribution fees are payable when a building consent is issued – there is a provision in the development contributions policy for a less expensive rate where a new dwelling has a floor area of 60m² or less. This may be a strong incentive for people to keep a converted dwelling at a modest scale.
- Infrastructure costs – if more people take up these opportunities in the Single House and both Mixed Housing zones, then there may be less water and wastewater capacity for other forms of development
- More people living in Auckland will expect to make use of parks and public amenities such as leisure centres and community halls
- There may be more people living within a catchment for schools than the Ministry of Education may have expected under legacy plans which may affect school roll numbers.

There has been no specific cost-benefit analysis of the converted dwelling provisions undertaken by qualified economists. However, the provisions are considered to be similar to most legacy plans.

2.1.4 Adequacy of Information and Risk of Not Acting

It is considered that there is sufficient information on which to base the proposed policies and methods.

3 Alternatives

The proposed preferred alternative is discussed in 2.0 above. The status quo alternative is outlined in 1.5 above.

Alternatives are:

1. Status quo - Retain the existing policy approach from the legacy district plans, which involves:

- a zone-based approach
- an the application of maximum GFAs
- an ability to have separated secondary units.

The controls vary depending on the plan and the zone.

2. Preferred - Enable a single dwellings to be converted into two dwellings subject to standards relating to:
 - minimum net internal floor area
 - having direct access to an outdoor living space.
 - having a common wall with the primary dwelling of no less than 3m or share a ceiling with the primary dwelling
 - satisfy other bulk and location controls.
 - not requiring an additional carpark for the new dwelling
 - limit its application to dwellings existing as at 30 September 2013.
3. Do nothing - do not regulate. Secondary dwellings allowed in all residential zones without design or amenity standards
4. Do not allow for secondary dwellings. A secondary dwelling would be a non-complying/prohibited activity

The table below discusses each alternative compared to the Proposed Alternative

	Status Quo Alternative	Alternative 2 – Preferred	Alternative 3 – do nothing	Alternative 4 - Do not allow for secondary dwellings
Appropriateness	The current legacy provisions support the legacy objectives, not the objectives of the Auckland Unitary Plan.	The provisions support the objectives	There would be no objectives, policies or rules.	A prohibited activity status would not align with Part 2 objectives on enabling housing choice.
Effectiveness	<p>The current legacy provisions vary across the board but in restructuring Auckland into one council the efficiencies of creating one combined regional and district plan, with a single set of standards for secondary dwellings, outweigh the value of continuing implementing a variety of different approaches to this issue</p> <p>The risks of continuing a variety of different approach is the complexity that this would create.</p>	<p>The effectiveness of introducing this new set of standards is that it creates consistency across Auckland and for many areas will increase the potential for providing an additional residential unit on a site.</p> <p>The risks involved are political as some groups will object to change in their neighbourhoods and in some areas the introduction of more restrictive controls. It is unclear how communities in historic character areas will respond to the provisions, as many of them currently have no ability for secondary dwellings.</p>	The effectiveness of the do nothing approach would free the market to provide a greater number of secondary dwellings. However, as discussed above, the lack of design and amenity standards may result in poor quality housing that would not be effective in delivering the council's wider objectives.	The effectiveness of this approach can be measured against the reduction in regulation and the reliance on a more simple density control. Public feedback will enable the council to moderate or refine its policy position.
Efficiency	The efficiency of continuing with the legacy provisions is outweighed by the benefits of pursuing the new single set of provisions for secondary dwellings. There is a lack of consistency across Auckland currently for this activity despite commonality in the outcome they are trying to achieve.	The benefits of introducing the new provisions outweigh the costs and there will be some significant efficiencies as discussed previously.	Efficiencies would be achieved through reduced regulation. However, greater inefficiencies would be introduced through ad-hoc development that would potentially undermine comprehensive redevelopment of sites in areas/zones identified for growth.	Efficiencies would be achieved through reduced regulation.
Costs	<p>There would be a significant cost to Auckland in keeping all of the variation in controls and activity status for a secondary dwelling on a site.</p> <p>This would increase the time and cost to the development industry and maintain the existing complexity of the current set of controls. Having a variety of different standards is not good for ease of business and often adds complexity and leads to delays in investment. This is further amplified because the basic outcomes sought by each legacy council were generally the same, although the detail of the method was different.</p> <p>There is also a concern that a rollover of some existing controls which allow for detached secondary dwellings do not deliver the desired design and character outcomes. This is considered an issue for Single House and the Large Lot zones where maintaining character is a principle objective. The ability to provide for detached secondary dwellings also gave rise to difficulty in maintaining minimum site sizes through the subdivision process. As the building was already present, the effects of subdividing that building onto a new title were somewhat reduced.</p>	<p>From council's perspective, the direct costs associated with implementing the new provisions for a secondary dwelling relate to costs of notification, hearings and decision process and staff time.</p> <p>Property owners and developers will need to reassess the provisions in terms of how it affects their property and development potential. Standardisation means there is greater certainty for property owners with landholdings across Auckland. Most landowners will be keen to see their current ability to provide a secondary dwelling is not diminished.</p> <p>RIMU do not collect data on minor units or converted dwellings currently.</p>	<p>The cost of no regulation on secondary dwellings would fall to council. This has implications for infrastructure management.</p> <p>There could be an influx of poorly designed secondary dwellings which would not provide appropriate standard of amenity</p> <p>There would be no controls to ensure the character of streets and neighbourhoods are maintained.</p>	<p>The costs of this approach relate to restricting the availability of housing choice, particularly in zones which are not subject to change and there for may already have limited housing options.</p> <p>Secondary dwellings can be an affordable form of housing and have been widely implemented in Auckland through legacy plans. Removing the ability provide for secondary dwellings could negatively affect housing affordability.</p>
Benefits	The benefits of the status quo are that each legacy council has had its debates with the local community through progressing their district plans over several years. To some degree the controls on a secondary dwelling have been tailored to the issues facing that district. Those debates will be	<p>The anticipated environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits of implementation of the provision are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ability to have two dwellings on one site within the same building is an affordable means of increasing housing due 	The benefits of the do nothing approach are that the costs of administration and enforcement in relation to secondary dwellings would be reduced.	<p>The benefits would relate to a simpler approach that relies on density standards to determine how many dwellings are permitted on a site.</p> <p>It would also remove uncertainty surrounding the subservience of the second dwelling.</p>

	Status Quo Alternative	Alternative 2 – Preferred	Alternative 3 – do nothing	Alternative 4 - Do not allow for secondary dwellings
	<p>re-opened through notifying a draft and proposed Unitary Plan.</p> <p>Similarly, it could be considered that many of the existing controls within the legacy councils had more restrictive controls on amenity and design that what is contained in the Auckland Unitary Plan. For example:</p> <p>Rule 8.10.6.2.3 from the Rodney District Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each Minor Household Unit a single area of open space shall be provided for the exclusive use of the Minor Household Unit occupants that meets the following standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the minimum area of the open space shall be 30m²; and (b) the open space shall be directly accessible from the main living room of the minor household unit; and (c) the entire open space area required by this rule shall be located to the north, east or west of the household unit, but not south of east or west measured from the southernmost part of the minor household unit; and (d) the minimum dimension of the open space shall be 4 metres and be capable of containing a rectangle of 4 metres by 6 metres; and (e) the open space shall not be obstructed by buildings, parking spaces or shared vehicle access and manoeuvring areas. 	<p>to minimal construction costs and no requirement to subdivide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision enables an increase in density while maintaining the character/appearance of a neighbourhood or streetscape, particularly in zones where this is a principle objective of maintaining character Socially, it provides the ability for large household or extended families to be accommodated on a single site Provides greater housing choice within zones not identified for significant change or redevelopment The ability to create a second dwelling can provide additional income to a household. 		
Risks	The risks of maintaining the status quo relate to the complexity of a variety of different controls as highlighted above	<p>The risks of not acting are that Auckland continues to have a variety rules on secondary dwelling that in some areas are twenty years out of date, which do not deliver the desired amenity or design outcomes.</p> <p>There is also risk associated with the removal of the ability to provide for separate secondary dwellings. This may reduce the potential for this provision to increase housing choice and affordability in certain areas (based on what is provided for in the legacy plans).</p>	There are significant risks of providing for secondary housing across all zones without appropriate design and amenity standards	There are significant risks of not providing for secondary housing would result in reducing housing choice and flexibility and may also negatively impact on the affordability of housing.

4 Conclusion

Based on the above discussion, the following conclusions are drawn.

Conversion of dwellings provides for housing choice in Auckland and is an affordable way for many families to provide for extended family, adult children or for rental income without subdividing. The fact that the dwelling is required to share a floor/ceiling with the principal dwelling and the main dwelling means that in most cases, it will still look like one building on a site from a streetscape perspective.

The council has maintained minimum standards for net internal floor area, outdoor living space and daylight to windows to ensure that dwellings are liveable for new residents. Overall, it is considered that the proposed objectives, policies and rules will assist people to provide for housing choice.

5 Record of Development of Provisions

5.1 Information and Analysis

- Review of legacy district and regional plans along with supporting design guidance. 2011 -2012
- Resource Management Act
- Building Act
- Local Government Act

5.2 Consultation Undertaken

Incorporated as part of the wider Auckland Unitary Plan engagement programme

5.3 Decision-Making

Presentation to the PWP workshop on 4 and 12 December with the following decision recorded in the minutes:

- The development controls include:
 - minimum floor area of 40m²
 - maximum floor area of 75m²
 - must have direct access to private open space
 - minimum daylight standards (windows/glazing)
 - must share a common wall of no less than 3m
 - maximum of one additional unit per site
 - no car parking required
 - title would remain with a single owner.
- At a further presentation to the PWP workshop on 8 February 2013, PWP supported the removal of the maximum floor area.
- PWP approved the proposal for two dwellings to remain on the same title but this has not been included in the Unitary Plan.
- Presentation to the Auckland Plan Committee still pending supporting:
 - Minimum net internal floor area of 40m² and no maximum floor area
 - Must comply with all other bulk and location controls except it can share outdoor living space with the primary dwelling
 - Must have a common wall with the primary dwelling of no less than 3m or share a ceiling or floor with the primary dwelling
 - Must be held on the same title and not subdivided from the principal dwelling
 - The primary dwelling must exist as 30 September 2013-08-13
 - No car parking required