

AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN  
INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

*Te Paepae Kaiwawao Motuhake o te Mahere Kotahitanga o Tāmaki Makaurau*

---

**Report to Auckland Council  
Hearing topic 058**

**Open space**

**July 2016**

---

# Report to Auckland Council – Hearing topic 058 Open space

## Contents

1.	Hearing topic overview .....	2
1.1.	Topic description .....	2
1.2.	Summary of the Panel’s recommended changes to the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan.....	2
1.3.	Overview .....	3
1.4.	Scope.....	4
1.5.	Documents relied on .....	4
2.	Relationship between the Reserves Act 1977and the Resource Management Act 1991	5
2.1.	Statement of issue.....	5
2.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons .....	5
3.	Open space and intensification.....	7
3.1.	Statement of issue.....	7
3.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons .....	7
4.	Open Space - Sport and Recreation Zone.....	9
4.1.	Statement of issue.....	9
4.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons .....	9
5.	Amendments to the Open Space - Civic Spaces Zone .....	11
5.1.	Statement of issue.....	11
5.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons .....	11
6.	Open space.....	11
6.1.	Statement of issue.....	11
6.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons .....	11
7.	Consequential changes .....	11
7.1.	Changes to other parts of the plan .....	11
7.2.	Changes to provisions in this topic .....	12
8.	Reference documents .....	12
8.1.	General topic documents.....	12
8.2.	Specific evidence .....	13

# 1. Hearing topic overview

## 1.1. Topic description

Topic 058 addresses the district plan provisions of the Proposed Unitary Plan relating to open space:

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan reference</b>	<b>Independent hearings Panel reference</b>
Open Space: Conservation Zone Informal Recreation Zone Sports and Active Recreation Zone Civic Spaces Zone Community Zone	Chapter D2 – Zone objectives and policies  Chapter I – Zone rules	H7 Open Space zones

Under the Local Government (Auckland Transitional Provisions) Act 2010, section 144 (8) (c) requires the Panel to set out:

the reasons for accepting or rejecting submissions and, for this purpose, may address the submissions by grouping them according to—

- (i) the provisions of the proposed plan to which they relate; or
- (ii) the matters to which they relate.

This report covers all of the submissions in the Submission Points Pathways report (SPP) for this topic. The Panel has grouped all of the submissions in terms of (c) (i) and (ii) and, while individual submissions and points may not be expressly referred to, all points have nevertheless been taken into account when making the Panel's recommendations.

## 1.2. Summary of the Panel's recommended changes to the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan

The Panel accepts the five zones proposed to manage activities on open space. These zones are:

- i. Open Space - Conservation Zone;
- ii. Open Space - Informal Recreation Zone;
- iii. Open Space - Sport and Active Recreation Zone;
- iv. Open Space - Civic Spaces Zone;
- v. Open Space - Community Zone.

The Panel has amended the provisions of the above zones (objectives, policies and rules) to provide for more appropriate management of open space as follows:

- i. requiring resource consents for most buildings (other than small-scale public amenity buildings and buildings required for parks infrastructure) and activities seeking exclusive use of open space;
- ii. deleting the permitted activity status of buildings, other than the small-scale buildings in i. above, in the Open Space - Sport and Active Recreation Zone and requiring a resource consent;
- iii. deleting the permitted activity rule that permits activities if they comply with reserve management plans;
- iv. ensuring the space in the Open Space - Civic Spaces Zone is kept for outdoor civic functions and only buildings that support that function are considered appropriate.

The Panel has amended the provisions to refer to 'open space' rather than 'public open space' to reflect that some of the land in these open space zones is privately owned and/or that public access is not always available.

### 1.3. Overview

The Panel accepts the five zones proposed to manage activities on open space but, in the Panel's view, having so few zones has created issues of the appropriate management of all open space across Auckland.

The Panel accepts that there is a relationship between the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Reserves Act 1977, and in particular reserve management plans. However for the reasons set out later in this report, the Panel does not accept the notified Plan provision or the Council's amended position that activities be permitted as set out in the reserve management plans, where the approved date of that plan is in the rule.

The Panel has amended the provisions of the zones (objectives, policies and rules). These amendments are set out in the revised Unitary Plan, and provide for what the Panel considers more appropriate management of open space than provided for in the notified Plan, or in the amendments proposed by Council and some submitters (generally those seeking more intensive use of open space, particularly in relation to buildings and exclusive uses).

The Panel generally agrees with those submitters seeking that open space, and in particular publicly-owned open space, remains open, as much as possible, as a 'first principle'. The

Panel accepts that open space will be under greater pressure from a growing and more intensified Auckland and that as a result open space will need to be multi-functional. Notwithstanding this, the Panel is recommending changes to the provisions such that most buildings (other than small-scale public amenity and parks infrastructure buildings) and activities seeking exclusive use of open space would generally require resource consents. The main policy approach is that effects on the open space itself and the ability of the public to use that space, will need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

Related to the above is the issue raised by submitter A and A Broughton (5650) who challenged the appropriateness of the Open Space - Sport and Active Recreation Zone and its spatial distribution. This zone is applied to the larger sport venues as well as a number of smaller reserves within more developed urban/suburban situations where there are significant existing residential neighbourhoods (such as Saint Heliers). The Panel finds that the permitted scale of buildings (including a 15 metre height) in these neighbourhoods would potentially have significant adverse effects on the amenity and character of these areas. The Panel has recommended deleting the permitted activity status of these buildings and requiring a resource consent.

The Panel has also amended the provisions of the Open Space - Civic Spaces Zone. It was drafted with the same approach to the other zones in relation to permitting a range of buildings. However on closer inspection of their locations (e.g. Aotea Square) and purpose, buildings were not to be encouraged (as they would compromise the purpose of the zone). The policy direction is to ensure the space is kept for outdoor civic functions and only buildings that support that function are considered appropriate.

The Panel has made amendments across all the open space provisions to refer to 'open space' rather than 'public open space'. This reflects that some of the land in these open space zones is privately owned and/or that public access is not always available.

## **1.4. Scope**

The Panel considers that the recommendations in 1.2 above and the changes made to the provisions relating to this topic (see 1.1 above) are within scope of submissions.

For an explanation of the Panel's approach to scope, see the Panel's Report to Auckland Council – Overview of recommendations July 2016.

## **1.5. Documents relied on**

Documents relied on by the Panel in making its recommendations are listed below in section 8 Reference documents.

## **2. Relationship between the Reserves Act 1977 and the Resource Management Act 1991**

### **2.1. Statement of issue**

The relationship between the Reserves Act 1977 and the Resource Management Act 1991 and whether the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan appropriately integrates with the Reserves Act 1977. Also whether the Plan provisions should permit activities where they are provided for in a reserves management plan.

### **2.2. Panel recommendation and reasons**

The relationship between the Reserves Act 1977 and the Resource Management Act 1991 was extensively addressed in the evidence of Ms Rebecca Eng and the Council's opening legal submissions. It was also addressed at the hearing on Topic 080 Rezoning and precincts (general). The Council's primary submission, which the Panel accepts, is that the two Acts are complementary; neither statute takes precedence over the other and both statutes need to be complied with.

A number of submitters (including A Roche (5279), A and M Kirk (6610), Little Shoal Bay Protection Society incorporated (7391) and A Holman (5358 and FS 1189)) raised the issue whether activities permitted by a reserves management plan should be permitted in a Resource Management Act 1991 plan such as the Unitary Plan. The main concern was that reserves management plans are developed for a different purpose (and generally manage day-to day-activities) than resource management plans, and can be changed more simply than plans under the Resource Management Act 1991. To permit activities that are permitted in the reserves management plans, could effectively change the activities permitted under the Unitary Plan. The Panel has concerns about this, such that it has deleted the permitted activity rule.

The Panel finds that nothing arose during the hearing to undermine the validity of the position held by the Council, and that in preparing the Plan, the Council is required under section 74(2)(b) to have regard to any relevant reserve management plan. The Panel understands this was done. However this does not change the Panel's view that the reserves management plan provisions should not effectively determine what is permitted in the Unitary Plan.

The Panel raised a number of issues with the Council witnesses and submitters on this subject. These included whether the adopted relevant reserve management plans were reviewed and considered during the preparation of the zone provisions, and what the Council's commitment was to the these plans and their review.

The Panel was concerned by some of the Council witnesses responsible for the operation and review of the parks management plans. It appeared that many of the plans were out of date, with no clear commitment to their review. It also appeared that some witnesses did not agree with the existing reserves management plans. As an example Dr Stewart, in relation to Churchill Park, said in answer to a question from the Panel that she did not support the "countryside in the city" concept embodied in that Plan.

Mr Reidy, for the council, confirmed that a review of the reserve management plans had occurred as part of the consideration of the preparation of the zone provisions. However he accepted that there could be a perceived conflict between the Plan and reserve management plans in that an activity might be permitted by the Plan but not provided for, or specifically prohibited, in the reserve management plan. He stated in these circumstances both sets of controls still need to be complied with, consistent with the approach that the Reserves Act 1977 does not take precedence over the Resource Management Act 1991, and vice versa.

The Panel also queried whether the proposed permitted activity rule for “any activity in accordance with an adopted reserve management plan, conservation management strategy or conservation management plan” was *ultra vires* the Resource Management Act 1991. The concern was that by defining a permitted activity in terms of an approved management plan under another statute the rule would allow the Plan to be amended without a plan change, in contravention of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

The Council's response was to limit the adopted management plans to the date of notification of the Plan. For the reasons set out above the Panel does not accept this.

The Panel's concern about the use of reserve management plan provisions to determine what is permitted in the open space zones of the Unitary Plan was reinforced by the Council's closing remarks (section 9) for Topic 080 Rezoning and precincts (General) in respect of public open space and special purpose zones such as tertiary education and schools. In the closing remarks it was stated that:

9.3 Reserve management plans are prepared and administered under the Reserves Act 1977 and that Act specifies the process for the development of new plans. Under the existing Auckland Council governance structure Local Boards are responsible for these plans. The Council's long term intention is to develop management plans for all parks and reserves; however, there is no current programme in place to do so. In that context it is important to note that:

- (a) The Council is responsible for the management of 3055 parks and it is estimated that approximately 43% of these parks do not have existing reserve management plans. Given the number and diversity of parks, the development of new plans is a significant investment of resources;
- (b) The timeframe for the preparation of management plans is subject to resource availability, and at this time, allocation of resources to the development of management plans is at local board discretion;
- (c) It is anticipated that future management plans will primarily be omnibus plans, which include multiple parks and reserves of a similar type within a given local board area;
- (d) Local boards may choose to prepare site specific management plans as and when they consider that approach appropriate.

9.4 As an initial step, the Council is developing a standardised suite of non-statutory management policies to streamline the delivery of statutory management plans. These management policies will guide decision making as an interim

measure on parks that do not have a management plan.

9.5 The interim policies prepared by Council will address current issues, and the Council will assist Local Boards to prepare full management plans on the basis of already completed policy and template work.

It is clear that many parks (43 per cent) do not have existing reserve management plans, that there is no current programme in place to develop these plans for all parks and reserves, that the commitment to preparing them is subject to resource availability, and that they are likely to be 'omnibus plans' covering multiple parks. Due to this and the other reasons set out above, the Panel's clear view is that it is inappropriate in section 32 and 32AA terms to link what is permitted in the reserves management plans to those activities permitted in the open space zones of the Unitary Plan.

### **3. Open space and intensification**

#### **3.1. Statement of issue**

Pressure on open space from growth and proposed intensification of Auckland and the extent to which additional development and intensification on open space should be enabled.

#### **3.2. Panel recommendation and reasons**

The Panel considers that this issue was the most significant and contentious. There was a philosophical divide amongst submitters; the difference separated two broad groups of submitters.

- i. The Council, with submitters, 6980 -the Auckland Kindergarten Association, 3727 -Friends of the Regional Park and 7862 -Sport New Zealand (representing a large number of sports clubs).

This group considered that the pressure on open space from growth and proposed intensification of Auckland would be best catered for by enabling additional development and intensification on open space. They argued that the level of development was to be commensurate with the type of open space, but would involve some additional development particularly in the Informal Recreation and Sport and Active Recreation zones. The Council and these submitters generally supported the approach taken by the Council and the amended provisions proposed by the Council at the opening of the hearing.

- ii. A number of community groups and individual submitters (including 5279 - A Roche, 6610 -A and M Kirk, 7391 - Little Shoal Bay Protection Society incorporated, 5358 and FS 1189 - A Holman).

This group sought that development on open space (mainly the conservation, informal and community zones) be constrained and the land retain its open, green nature, as this type of land resource will become more scarce as intensification occurred. These submitters set out in some detail the policy



approach they sought and the activity status that should be applied to particular activities.

This group of submitters also raised concerns about the existing lack of public open space (for example in Mount Eden and Takapuna) and the council programme for acquisition of new public open space. While the council provided evidence about the council's acquisition programme and budget, the Panel notes that this issue is outside the scope of the district plan provisions to manage land zoned as public open space.

The Panel understands both positions, and finds that they are not mutually exclusive. One of the key issues in the Plan is the need to accommodate growth. Auckland is predicted to grow significantly. This will place pressure on open space and some additional development and intensification on open space is inevitable.

However the community groups and individual submitters considered that because there will be increased pressure on open space resources from growth this meant open space would become more important, and therefore should be retained for open space as a 'first principle'. They argued that open space should not be allowed to have a proliferation of buildings and exclusive use activities at the expense of more casual use by the public of these spaces. They generally sought a stricter activity status for buildings and exclusive use activities, and that applications for resource consent generally be publicly notified.

The Council's position in relation to the appropriate activity status and notification did not alter as a result of the hearing process. In the Council's submission the evidence of the Council planner, Mr Reidy, provided the most comprehensive expert planning opinion on these matters. His evidence considered which activity status was the most appropriate means to achieve the objectives and what level of regulation for each zone best matches the objectives and policies.

The Panel acknowledges Mr Reidy's opinion, but is more persuaded by the arguments posed by those submitters seeking that open space, particularly that which is publicly owned, remains open as much as possible, and that greater use of resource consents is required to determine the appropriate range of activities within areas zoned open space.

The Panel accepts that open space will be under greater pressure from a growing and more dense Auckland, and that as a result open space will need to be multi-functional. Notwithstanding this, the Panel is recommending changes to the provisions such that most buildings (other than small-scale public amenity and parks infrastructure buildings) and activities seeking exclusive use of open space, particularly publicly-owned open space, would generally require resource consents. The main policy approach is that effects on the open space itself, and the ability of the public to use that space, will need to be assessed on a case-by- case basis. An example is the following policy in the Open Space - Informal Recreation Zone:

Buildings and exclusive-use activities are limited to maintain public use and open space.

The Panel notes here that the definition of 'parks infrastructure' has been amended to add buildings for storage and maintenance purposes. This is a consequence of the change to the

activity status of buildings, to enable small scale buildings necessary to maintain the park as permitted activities.

As a consequence of the recommended approach set out above, the Panel has also separated activities and buildings. This is set out in the activity table. The Panel found the Plan as notified confusing in this respect. There is a need to be able to address separately the effects of buildings and activities (which may or may not be in a building) in terms of their effect, both positive and adverse, on open space values and on enabling people and communities to provide for their social, cultural and economic well-being.

The approach recommended by the Panel does not preclude additional development and intensification on open space. However applicants will need to demonstrate that any additional development or intensification on open space, especially if it requires exclusive use of that space, is appropriate.

## **4. Open Space - Sport and Recreation Zone**

### **4.1. Statement of issue**

The appropriateness of the spatial distribution of the Open Space - Sport and Active Recreation Zone as well as the permitted height of buildings.

### **4.2. Panel recommendation and reasons**

Submitter A and A Broughton (5650) provided comprehensive evidence on the appropriateness of the spatial distribution of the Open Space - Sport and Active Recreation Zone as well as the permitted height of buildings. This zone is applied to the larger sport venues as well as to a number of smaller reserves within developed urban/suburban situations where there are significant existing residential neighbourhoods, such as Saint Heliers. The Broughton submission stated:

The specific provisions of the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (PAUP), our submission concerns is the Public Open Space: Sport and Active Recreation Zone, development controls relating to the maximum building height on the southern part of the Vellenoweth Green. The matter we are concerned about is the proposed maximum building height of 15 meters. The specific site our submission relates to is the land situated on the north side of Goldie Street, St Heliers, being the southern part of Vellenoweth Green, occupied by the St Heliers Tennis Club, the St Heliers Bowling Club and the St Heliers Croquet Club. We consider that the maximum building height needs to be the same as that specified for the rest of the Vellenoweth Green. A 15 meter high building or recreational structure would result in a significant loss of sunlight, day light, views and have a significant adverse effect on the visual amenity of the adjacent residential area.

The Council addressed this matter in its closing statement (paras 4.3 to 4.5) saying:

4.3 One development control of particular concern to some submitters and the Panel was the maximum height in the Sport and Active Recreation Zone. The height limit in the notified plan is 15m which allows a three storey building or larger recreation facilities such as swimming pools, indoor recreation centres and gymnasia. These are

expected developments in the Sports and Active Recreation Zone. A three storey height limit also encourages multipurpose buildings to be developed and achieves Policies 3 and 5 of the Zone regarding that matter. Mr Reidy, in answer to questions from the Panel, considers that the effects of any 15m high buildings on adjoining properties will be mitigated through the setbacks and height in relation to boundary controls.

4.4 The Council therefore considers that the 15m height limit is appropriate on Sport and Active recreation zoned sites, especially on larger sites, in order to cater for the potential intensive use and that the adverse effects can be appropriately mitigated.

4.5 However, if the Panel retained concerns about the appropriateness of the height limit on smaller sites a potential solution could be that a lower height limit of 10m could apply to sites that are smaller than 1ha while the 15m limit is retained for sites that are 1ha or larger. The Council would prefer this amendment to the rezoning of smaller Sport and Active Recreation sites to other Open Space zones, like Informal Recreation, as such rezoning might conflict with the purpose of those other zones which do not positively provide for sport and activity recreation.

In response to the matter addressed in 4.5 (which had not been raised in the hearing), the Panel sought clarification from the Council on the number, location and size of sites zoned Open Space - Sport and Active Recreation Zone that were less than 1 hectare in area (Memorandum dated - 24 August 2015 - Topic 058 - Public Open Space: Closing Statement from Auckland Council).

The response was that there were 121 reserves in this category. This is a large number of reserves and changing the height would have been a significant change to that zone based upon no evidence. Accordingly the Panel has not recommended this change. It is also relevant to note that the Vellenoweth Green reserve is larger than 1 hectare and was not included in the list provided by the Council. Accordingly the concerns raised by the Broughtons would not have been addressed by the Council's suggested amendment.

The Panel finds that the permitted scale of buildings, including a 15 metre height limit, in these neighbourhoods has the potential to have significant adverse effects. The Panel does not accept that the height in relation in boundary would mitigate the potential impacts as suggested by the Council planner. As noted earlier, the Council's decision to have a limited number of zones has meant that for some locations the zoning framework is not the most appropriate. The Council's suggestion that the smaller areas zoned Open Space - Active Sport and Recreation have a different height appears to reinforce this point.

For all the reasons set out above and those in section 3 of this report (Open space and intensification), the Panel has recommended deleting the permitted activity status of these buildings, including deleting the height requirement, and requiring a resource consent to assess the effects of any development on a case-by-case basis.

## 5. Amendments to the Open Space - Civic Spaces Zone

### 5.1. Statement of issue

This zone applies to open spaces such as squares and plazas in centres and other urban areas. The Plan as notified sought to enable buildings in these spaces. However it became apparent at the hearing that these areas are relatively limited in number (e.g. Aotea Square, Hurstmere Road Takapuna, King and Seddon St Pukekohe) and are open space squares and plazas as opposed to enclosed spaces with buildings.

### 5.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

The Panel accepts that these spaces are becoming increasingly important as Auckland grows and becomes more compact and access to open spaces for civic purposes is needed for residents, workers and visitors.

The Panel has recommended a policy shift, in accordance with those submitters who seek that public open space remain so, to limit buildings and structures to those that are necessary to support the purpose of the zone and, where this is demonstrated, ensure that they enhance the amenity values, functionality and use of the zone.

## 6. Open space

### 6.1. Statement of issue

Land zoned public open space includes some privately owned land so the term 'public open space' is incorrect.

### 6.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

At the hearing on Topic 080 Rezoning and precincts (General) the Council sought to amend the introductory section of the public open space provisions to make clear that while most of the land zoned public open space was vested in the Council or the Crown, some was privately owned (e.g. some golf courses). Wording has been added to the provisions to make this clear.

However the Panel was of the view that the term 'public open space' was not appropriate – and it was more correctly 'open space'. The plan provisions have been amended accordingly to reflect this.

## 7. Consequential changes

### 7.1. Changes to other parts of the plan

As a result of the Panel's recommendations on this topic, there are consequential changes to other parts of the Plan as listed below.

- i. Where the term public open space is used in other parts of the Plan this will be changed to open space where appropriate.

- ii. The definition of 'parks infrastructure' has been amended to add buildings for storage and maintenance purposes. This is a consequence of the change to the activity status of buildings within land zoned open space, to enable small-scale buildings necessary to maintain the park as permitted activities.

## 7.2. Changes to provisions in this topic

As a result of the Panel's recommendations on other topics, there are consequential changes to the provisions in this part of the Plan as set out below.

- i. It is noted that a set of general objectives and policies have been included at the beginning of the public open space provisions. These are provisions that have been 'dropped down' from the regional policy statement. The reasons for this have been set out in the Panel's Report to Auckland Council – Overview of recommendations July 2016, namely that the regional policy statement is to be a 'standalone' document and not tagged as being regional policy statement as well as regional and district plan provisions.

## 8. Reference documents

The following documents, as well as the submissions and evidence presented to the Panel on this topic, have been relied upon by the Panel in making its recommendations.

The documents can be located on the aupihp website ([www.aupihp.govt.nz](http://www.aupihp.govt.nz)) on the hearings page under the relevant hearing topic number and name.

You can use the links provided to locate the documents, or you can go to the website and search for the document by name or date loaded.

(The date in brackets after the document link refers to the date the document was loaded onto the aupihp website. Note this may not be the same as the date of the document referred to in the report.)

### 8.1. General topic documents

#### **Panel documents**

[058-Submission Point Pathway Report - 31 August 2015](#) (2 Sep 2015)

[058-Parties and Issues Report -1 May 2015](#) (1 May 2015)

[058 - Mediation Joint Statement - Session 1, 2 and 3 \(13, 18 and 19 May 2015\)](#)(25 May 2015)

[058 - Post Hrg – Memorandum – Panel request to Auckland Council for additional information - Sport and Recreation Zone - Spatial Extent and Height](#) (25 August 2015)

#### **Auckland Council marked up version**

[058 - Hrg - \(Juliana Cox\) – Planning – Objectives and Policies – Attachment B – Marked-Up Version](#) (2 June 2015)

058 - Hrg - (Juliana Cox) – Planning – Objectives and Policies – Attachment C – Marked-Up Version – Legacy Zone Equivalents of proposed Auckland Unitary Plan - Public Open Space Zones (2 June 2015)

058- Proposed marked-up version (Activity Table and Controls) - LATE (07 May 2015)

058- Proposed marked-up version (D2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 Objectives and Policies) - LATE (7 May 2015)

058 - Hrg - (Juliana Cox) – Planning – Objectives and Policies – REBUTTAL – Attachment A – Marked-up Version (25 June 2015)

### **Auckland Council closing statements**

058 - Hrg – CLOSING STATEMENT (23 Jul 2015)

058 - Hrg – CLOSING STATEMENT -Attachment A -Example of Regional Parks with designations (23 Jul 2015)

058 - Hrg – CLOSING STATEMENT -Attachment B -Regional Parks With Overlays (23 Jul 2015)

058 - Hrg – CLOSING STATEMENT -Attachment C1 - Marked up Version (Objectives and Policies) (23 Jul 2015)

058 - Hrg – CLOSING STATEMENT -Attachment C2 - Marked up Version (Rules) (23 Jul 2015)

## **8.2. Specific evidence**

### **Alex and Andrea Broughton**

058 - Hrg 12 June 2015

058 - Hrg - Attachment 1 - Location Plan and PAUP Zones (12 June 2015)

058 - Hrg – Attachment 2 - St Heliers Bay Reserve Act 1995 SO Plan (12 June 2015)

058 - Hrg – Attachment 3 - Vellenoweth Green Uses Structures (12 June 2015)

058 - Hrg - Attachment 4 - Auckland City Council - St Heliers Bay Reserve Act 1995 (12 June 2015)

### **A Holman**

058 - Hrg (3 July 2015)

### **A and M Kirk**

058 - Hrg (15 June 2015)

058 - Hrg - Attachment - Activity Table (15 June 2015)

### **A Roche**

058 - Hrg (12 June 2015)

### **Auckland Council**

058 - Hrg - (Rebecca Eng) – Planning – Parks and Recreation Policy (2 June 2015)

058 - Hrg - (Tony Reidy) – Planning – Public Open Space Zones Rules (2 June 2015)

058 - Hrg - (Tony Reidy) – Planning – Public Open Space Zones Rules – Attachment B – Marked-Up Version (2 June 2015)

058 - Hrg - (Tony Reidy) – Planning – Public Open Space Zones Rules – Attachment C – Examples of Buildings and Structures on Public Open Space in the Auckland Region (2 June 2015)

058 - Hrg - (Tony Reidy) – Planning – Public Open Space Zones Rules – Attachment D – Legacy District Plan Combined Activity Table v PAUP Activity Table (2 June 2015)

058 - Post Hrg – Memorandum – Panel request to Auckland Council for additional information - Sport and Recreation Zone - Spatial Extent and Height – Auckland Council Response - Analysis for hearings panel (9 September 2015)

058 - Post Hrg – Memorandum – Panel request to Auckland Council for additional information - Sport and Recreation Zone - Spatial Extent and Height – Auckland Council Response -Hearings Panel Table including cities and suburbs (9 September 2015)

058 - Post Hrg – Memorandum – Panel request to Auckland Council for additional information - Sport and Recreation Zone - Spatial Extent and Height – Auckland Council Response -Index map for hearings panel (9 September 2015)

### **Auckland Kindergarten Association**

058 - Hrg - (Catherine Richards) – Planning – Attachment A – Sites zoned Public open space – Informal recreation in the PAUP – LATE (15 June 2015)

058 - Hrg - (Catherine Richards) – Planning – Attachment B – Proposed Amendments to D.2 and I.2 – LATE (15 June 2015)

058 - Hrg - (Catherine Richards) – Planning – LATE (15 June 2015)

058 - Hrg - (Richard Hall) – Corporate (12 June 2015)

### **Friends of regional parks**

058 - Hrg - Summary Statement (3 July 2015)

### **Little Shoal Bay Protection Society Incorporated**

058 - Hrg - LATE (22 June 2015)

058- Hrg – Attachment 1 - LATE (22 June 2015)

058 - Hrg - Summary Statement (3 July 2015)

### **Sport New Zealand**

