

AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN  
INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

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

---

**Report to Auckland Council  
Hearing topics 059 - 063**

**Residential zones**

**July 2016**

# Report to Auckland Council Hearing topics 059 - 063 Residential zones

## Contents

Contents .....	1
1. Hearing topic overview .....	3
1.1. Topic description.....	3
1.2. Summary of the Panel's recommended changes to the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan 4	
1.3. Overview.....	7
1.4. Scope .....	8
1.5. Documents relied on.....	9
2. Enabling capacity .....	10
2.1. Statement of issue .....	10
2.2. Panel recommendation and reasons.....	10
3. The purpose of the Residential - Single House Zone.....	13
3.1. Statement of issue .....	13
3.2. Panel recommendation and reasons.....	13
4. Retaining the Mixed Housing Urban and Mixed Housing Suburban Zones.....	14
4.1. Statement of issue .....	14
4.2. Panel recommendation and reasons.....	14
5. Removal of the density provisions .....	16
5.1. Statement of issue .....	16
5.2. Panel recommendation and reasons.....	16
6. Permitted development and outcome-led development .....	17
6.1. Statement of issue .....	17
6.2. Panel recommendation and reasons.....	17
7. Integrated residential development (including retirement villages).....	22
7.1. Statement of issue .....	22
7.2. Panel recommendation and reasons.....	22
8. Affordable housing .....	24

8.1.	Statement of issue .....	24
8.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons.....	24
9.	Matters of discretion and assessment criteria.....	25
9.1.	Statement of issue .....	25
9.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons.....	25
10.	Design statements.....	25
10.1.	Statement of issue.....	25
10.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons .....	25
11.	Consequential changes .....	26
11.1.	Changes to other parts of the Plan .....	26
11.2.	Changes to provisions in this topic .....	26
12.	Reference documents .....	26
12.1.	General topic documents.....	26
12.2.	Specific evidence .....	27

# 1. Hearing topic overview

## 1.1. Topic description

Topics 059, 060, 061, 062 and 063 address the district plan provisions of the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan relating to:

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan reference</b>	<b>Independent hearings Panel reference</b>
Residential - 059, 060, 061, 062 and 063.	D1.1 General objectives and policies for the residential zones D1.2 Large Lot Zone D1.3 Rural and Coastal Settlement Zone D1.4 Single House Zone D1.5 Mixed Housing Suburban Zone D1.6 Mixed Housing Urban Zone D1.7 Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone I1.1. Activity table I1.2. Notification I1.3. Land use controls I1.4. Development Controls - Large Lot Zone I1.5. Development Controls - Rural and Coastal Settlement Zone I1.6. Development Controls - Single House Zone I1.7. Development Controls - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone I1.8. Development Controls - Mixed Housing Urban zone I1.9. Development Controls -	H1 Residential – Large Lot Zone H2 Residential – Rural and Coastal H3 Residential – Single House Zone H4 Residential – Mixed Housing Suburban Zone H5 Residential – Mixed Housing Urban Zone H6 Residential – Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone

	Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone  I1.10. Assessment – Restricted discretionary activities  I1.11. Assessment – Development control infringements  I1.12. Special information requirements  D.8.7 Retirement Village Zone  I.21 Retirement Village Zone  C.7.8 Affordable Housing  H.6.6 Affordable Housing	
--	---	--

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**

Overall the purpose of the Panel’s recommended changes to the residential provisions of the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan is to:

- i. provide greater residential development capacity (linked with the spatial distribution of the residential zones);
- ii. greater development on sites as of right, provided they comply with the development standards;

- iii. a more flexible outcome-led approach to sites developed with five or more dwellings in the Mixed House Suburban Zone and Mixed House Urban Zone and for all development in the Terraced Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone; and
- iv. to provide for 'integrated residential developments', which include retirement villages, recognising that while a range of activities may be provided on site, they are essentially for residential purposes.

This report needs to be read in conjunction with the Panel's Report to Auckland Council – Overview of recommendations July 2016 and Report to Auckland Council – Rural Urban Boundary, rezoning and precincts July 2016 relating to residential zones and precincts, as the combined recommendations provide an integrated approach to residential development – i.e. the various residential zones and the provisions within them and their spatial distribution.

Key changes recommended are set out below.

- i. Overall the residential development capacity has been better enabled by the changes recommended.
- ii. The Panel recommends the retention of the zoning structure of the six residential zones, but has recommended a number of changes to the zone provisions. The zones are:
  - a. Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone;
  - b. Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone;
  - c. Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone;
  - d. Residential - Single House Zone;
  - e. Residential - Rural and Coastal Settlement Zone; and
  - f. Residential - Large Lot Zone.
- iii. The purpose of the Residential - Single House Zone has been amended and clarified to better reflect its purpose.
- iv. There are no density provisions for the Mixed Housing Suburban, Mixed Housing Urban and Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zones, but development standards and resource consents are applied, as addressed below.
- v. Up to four dwellings are permitted as of right on sites zoned Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone and Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone which meet all the applicable development standards.
- vi. Five or more dwellings require a restricted discretionary activity consent in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone and Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone.

- vii. All dwellings require a restricted discretionary activity consent in the Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone.
- viii. A new category of activity - integrated residential development - is included and this includes retirement villages.
- ix. Where a restricted discretionary activity for five or more dwellings or for an integrated residential development complies with the core development standards, being height, height in relation to boundary (including the alternative height in relation to boundary standard) and yards, it will not be publicly notified.
- x. For restricted discretionary activities, other than the core development standards, all other development standards are matters of discretion.
- xi. If one or more of the core development standards are not met, then the normal tests for notification apply.
- xii. A range of other (some non-residential) activities are provided for, such as visitor accommodation, care centres (including child care centres), supported residential care, boarding houses, dairies, restaurants, community facilities and healthcare facilities. Some are permitted activities where they are small-scale, and some will require a consent where they are of a larger scale to ensure they are compatible with the surrounding residential environment.
- xiii. The following development standards, particularly in Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban, Residential - Mixed Housing Urban and Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zones, have been deleted; some recommended by the Council and others by the Panel:
  - a. separation between buildings on the site;
  - b. dwellings fronting the street;
  - c. maximum building length;
  - d. front fence requirements (side and rear retained);
  - e. garages (percentage of front façade and setbacks);
  - f. minimum dwelling size;
  - g. servicing and waste;
  - h. storage;
  - i. universal access;
  - j. minimum dimensions of principal living rooms and principal bedrooms;
  - k. dwelling mix; and
  - l. minimum frontage and site width.

- xiv. Design statements have been deleted (noting that the reasons for this are set out in the Panel's Report to Auckland Council – Hearing topic 077 Sustainable design July 2016).
- xv. Minor dwellings are provided for in the Residential - Large Lot Zone, Residential - Rural and Coastal Settlement Zone and the Residential - Single House Zone.
- xvi. Conversion of dwellings is provided for in all zones except the Residential - Large Lot Zone, and a purpose statement included for this activity/rule.
- xvii. The retained affordable housing provisions are deleted (noting that the reasons for this are set out in the Panel's Report to Auckland Council – Overview of recommendations July 2016 and Report to Auckland Council – Hearing topic 013 Urban Growth July 2016).
- xviii. Restricted discretionary activities and the matters of discretion and the assessment criteria have been redrafted in line with a general restructuring and redrafting across the entire Plan.

### 1.3. Overview

The issues of the capacity for residential growth and the spatial distribution of the various residential (and mixed) zones are addressed in the Overview of recommendations (as referenced above) and the Report to Auckland Council – Rural Urban Boundary, rezoning and precincts July 2016 respectively. This report needs to be read in conjunction with those reports, as the combined recommendations provide an integrated approach to residential development.

There was considerable evidence on this topic, and a significant number of the issues were either agreed at mediation and or through the hearings process and contained in the mediation statements and the Council's opening and closing statements. This report focuses on the key changes recommended by the Panel, and those not otherwise already agreed by the parties.

The Panel accepts the zoning structure of the six residential zones:

- i. Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone (THAB);
- ii. Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone (MHU);
- iii. Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone (MHS);
- iv. Residential - Single House Zone (SHZ);
- v. Residential - Rural and Coastal Settlement Zone (R&CS); and
- vi. Residential - Large Lot Zone (LLZ).

However a number of changes have been recommended to address matters raised by the Council and submitters. The main thrust of the changes is to:

- i. set out more clearly the purpose of the Residential - Single House Zone;

- ii. be more enabling in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban, Residential - Mixed Housing Urban and Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zones by removing density provisions, allowing more as of right residential development (Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone and Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone) and also enable a more flexible consenting regime for multi- dwelling/unit developments and integrated residential developments (Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban, Residential - Mixed Housing Urban and Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zones);
- iii. delete specific provisions for retirement villages and incorporating that form of development under the category of integrated residential developments;
- iv. remove a number of the development standards;
- v. remove the affordable housing provisions for the reasons set out in the Overview of recommendations and the Report on Urban growth as referenced above;
- vi. remove the need for design statements for the reasons set out in the Panel's Report to Auckland Council – Hearing topic 077 Sustainable Design July 2016; and
- vii. remove many of the prescriptive urban design provisions and those that cross over the jurisdiction of the Building Act 2004, and their replacement with a more outcome-led consenting process, without the need for rigid compliance with development standards which have little or no effect on adjoining or nearby properties.

The Panel is clear that based on much of the evidence from the Council and submitters, the residential provisions needed to be more enabling and to provide for greater residential capacity. At the same time it was acknowledged by all parties that good quality residential and urban design outcomes needed to be achieved. These submitters included Housing New Zealand, Ockham Holdings Limited (Ockham), Todd Property Group Limited (Todd), Fletcher Construction Developments Limited, Fletcher Residential, The New Zealand Institute of Architects, The Urban Design Forum, Generation Zero, Auckland 2040, the Property Council, a number of community and resident and ratepayer groups and others.

While the need for an appropriate set of residential provisions could be agreed at a conceptual level, there was not agreement on how that outcome could be achieved. The Panel's findings on these matters and reasons for its recommendations are set out in the following sections of this report.

## 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 Panels' 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 in full below. See section 12 Reference documents.

## 2. Enabling capacity

### 2.1. Statement of issue

The Council and many submitters, including those listed earlier, did not consider that sufficient residential capacity had been enabled in the notified proposed Auckland Unitary Plan. Concerns included the spatial distribution of the zones (addressed in the Panel's Overview of recommendations and Report on the Rural Urban Boundary, rezoning and precincts as referenced above) and that the provisions within the zones were too restrictive, prescriptive and costly. In summary the combination of the zonings and zone provisions would not give effect to the regional policy statement's objectives and policies relating to a quality compact urban form, a centres plus strategy and housing affordability. These are also major policy directives in the Auckland Plan to which the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan must have regard.

It is the Panel's view that the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan did not have sufficient regard to the Auckland Plan and would not give effect to the regional policy statement as notified nor as amended through the submission and hearing process.

### 2.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

The Panel recommends enabling greater residential development capacity by changing a number of the provisions in the zones. In doing so the Panel has relied on a number of submissions and the position taken by the Council.

The Council, in opening at the hearing, had changed its position on density provisions, essentially supporting no density in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone (on sites greater than 1,000m<sup>2</sup>), Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone and Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone. This was supported by many submitters. However in relaxing the density provisions, the Council sought a less enabling position in relation to the number of dwellings that could be built as of right, generally a reduction from three to two, and retention of an extensive list of development standards.

While many submitters supported the relaxation of the density provisions, they sought more enabling development provisions. Housing New Zealand and the submissions made by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment and the Minister for the Environment probably best capture the sentiments of the many submitters seeking more enabling provisions. Housing New Zealand, the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment and the Minister for the Environment, while strongly supporting the strategic direction of the Auckland Plan, considered that the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan fell well short of implementing this strategic direction of providing greater residential intensification. Housing New Zealand, in particular, provided extensive legal submissions and evidence on this issue.

As stated in Housing New Zealand's submission:

Overall, Housing New Zealand considers that the provisions of the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan as notified (30 September 2013) do not sufficiently provide for the long term residential development capacity needed to meet the population growth expected in Auckland, as set out in the Auckland Plan. While the objectives and policies of the Regional Policy Statement are, in the main, supported by Housing

New Zealand, it is concerned that they are not adequately reflected in the District Plan provisions. In particular, the additional consenting requirements and the complexity of the District and Regional Plan provisions, particularly the rules, are not the most appropriate policies and methods to achieve the urban and economic growth goals of the Regional Policy Statement. This is particularly the case in respect of provisions relating to use, development and subdivision within the existing 2010 metropolitan area. (Page 4, Housing New Zealand Corporation (submission number 839, 28 February 2014).)

The Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment in its submission stated:

MBIE's concern with the Unitary Plan as proposed is that it does not follow through on its strategic objectives (which are generally supported) with the appropriately-aligned policies and rules:

By not providing sufficient capacity through appropriate zonings and density provisions to meet Auckland's forecast growth.

By failing to free development from complicated policies and rules that will create high transaction costs, thereby limiting innovation and responsiveness of supply to demand.

In doing so, the proposed Unitary Plan does not provide for the growth that Auckland needs over the next thirty years, and to the extent that it does not, Auckland's housing market will not perform efficiently and house prices will become even more unaffordable. (Paragraphs 8 and 9, Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment).

A similar submission regarding the need for greater residential development capacity was made by the Minister for the Environment:

The proposed development controls and zoning (including future and urban land) do not provide the needed long-term residential development capacity to meet the projected population growth. (Paragraph 17, Minister for the Environment)

While the Panel acknowledges the many other submissions seeking a similar outcome to Housing New Zealand, the evidence of Housing New Zealand was comprehensive and addressed the many concerns raised by others. The Housing New Zealand position was set out in the joint planning evidence of Ms Linzey and Mr Lindenberg. They stated:

The overarching basis of the Corporation's submission on the PAUP is the need to enable the increased supply of housing choices, particularly within the existing urban area, in order to achieve the intensification and 'quality compact city' aspirations of both the Auckland Plan and the Unitary Plan (para 18). Indeed, the Corporation's position with regard to the PAUP process as a whole, is that Auckland has a unique opportunity through this plan development process to identify a policy framework for the future growth of Auckland which seeks a 'step change' or 'transformational shift' (to use the Auckland Plan language) with regard to how urban growth and intensification should occur in the future. This transformational shift requires an innovative response, and recognition that the planning framework of the past will not achieve the urban growth and 'quality compact city' aspirations which both the

Auckland Plan and Unitary Plan are seeking. We support the need for zone provisions of the PAUP (particularly the Residential, 'Centre' and Mixed Use zone rules and development controls) to be bold in their intentions to enable a form of urban intensification within the Isthmus area in order to achieve the urban intensification outcomes which the Council's Auckland Plan and PAUP RPS provisions describe.

We suggest that such a bold and innovative approach within the key 'urban' zoned locations, which will provide for residential activities and development, would need to include:

- Moderate increases to the permitted height limits in appropriate locations (being in and around centres, and within walking distance of public transport facilities and other recreational, community, commercial and employment opportunities and facilities);
- Significant reductions in, or removal of, land use density controls (particularly in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban and the Residential – Mixed Housing Urban zones);
- A reduction in the currently proposed extensive suite of quantitative development controls, such that a limited number of quantitative controls are retained to address the key matters which have the potential to create adverse effects external to a site, most notably in relation to amenity effects (such as retention of building height, height in relation to boundary and yard, building coverage, impermeable surface controls for instance); with the remainder of controls which relate to potential effects internal to a site being addressed in a more flexible way through the use of design-related matters of discretion and assessment criteria; and
- A simplified yet potentially strengthened, suite of matters of discretion and assessment criteria, particularly in relation to development control infringements (in order to address concerns of neighbours in relation to amenity impacts, and provide clear guidance to processing planner to assist in their assessment), as well as design assessment. (Paragraphs 27 to 30.4).

The Panel in general agrees with the evidence presented by Housing New Zealand, as set out above. In response to Housing New Zealand's evidence and other submitters' evidence (addressed below) the Panel has amended the residential provisions to enable greater residential capacity. At the same time the Panel believes the amended provisions will also enable good urban design and planning outcomes. This is necessary to give effect to the regional policy statement and to have due regard to the Auckland Plan.

Other provisions have also been included to enable greater capacity and more flexibility in the supply of housing. These include the provision of minor dwellings in the Residential - Large Lot Zone, Residential - Rural and Coastal Settlement Zone and the Residential - Single House Zone. It is not necessary to have these as a class of activity in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban, Residential - Mixed Housing Urban and Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zones as these zones provided for a number of dwellings as of right. The conversion of dwellings is provided for in all zones except the Residential - Large Lot Zone, and a purpose statement has been included for this activity/rule.

## 3. The purpose of the Residential - Single House Zone

### 3.1. Statement of issue

There was considerable contention with respect to how the Council had proposed to 're-cast' the Residential - Single House Zone, and whether it was in scope of submissions lodged. The issue from submitters' perspective, in particular Auckland 2040, Cockle Bay Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated and the Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association Incorporated, appeared to be that the Council was providing a platform to reduce the spatial extent of the Residential - Single House Zone and provide for greater upzoning (Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban, Residential - Mixed Housing Urban and the Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zones) as part of its case at the hearings for topics 080 and 081.

The Council had intended to up zone areas to enable greater residential capacity, and had publicised its maps to demonstrate this and these were to be presented in evidence at the 080/081 hearings. Included as part of those maps was what the Council referred to as its 'out of scope' rezonings. At the hearing for 081, in response to a Council resolution (24 February 2016), Council's counsel advised that the Council no longer supported its 'out of scope' upzonings and that no expert planning evidence would be called.

With respect to the Residential - Single House Zone the question that the Panel addressed was - what the purpose of that zone, and what therefore is the appropriate zone purpose statement. This is important as it describes the characteristics of the zone and helps determine its spatial identification as well as the relevant zone provisions.

The Panel has proposed, and recommends, a revised zone purpose statement. This is to better reflect that the zone does not have a single purpose; but multiple purposes.

### 3.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

The Panel's view is that the purpose statement proposed by the Council (Mr Roberts, Council's expert planner) for the Residential - Single House Zone is not appropriate, as it did not reflect the multiple purposes of the zone. As the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan has restricted the residential zones to six, it was inevitable that the zones would not have a single purpose. This is particularly so for the Residential - Single House Zone. In Council's closing statement version of the provisions it stated:

The purpose of this zone provides for low density suburban housing to:

- provide for development that complements identified natural and built heritage values within identified areas; or
- recognise the limited ability of areas with significant environmental or infrastructure constraints to support more intensive development; and
- recognise the limited ability of areas which are not in close proximity to the City Centre, Metropolitan, Town or Local Centres, the public transport network or large urban facilities, to support more intensive development.

The Panel's view is that the zone does not only provide for “low density suburban housing” and the zone is not only applied to areas “not in close proximity to the City Centre, Metropolitan, Town or Local Centres, the public transport network or large urban facilities” as was set out in the notified Plan. The zone is applied to:

- i. some inner city suburbs, albeit with the special character overlay;
- ii. some coastal settlements (e.g. Kawakawa Bay); and
- iii. other established suburban areas with established neighbourhoods (e.g. parts of Howick, Cockle Bay, Pukekohe and Warkworth).

This view was strongly supported by a number of the residents and ratepayer groups and community groups, who presented to the Panel on a number of occasions on this and related issues. These included the Howick Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated, the Cockle Bay Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated, Auckland 2040 and the Herne Bay Residents Association Incorporated.

The Panel finds that the Residential - Single House Zone is an important zone and contributes to the range of living options and choices available. It should not be constrained in the way proposed by the Council. The Panel has reworded the purpose statement as a zone description to reflect what it considers, based on the evidence, as the purpose/description of the zone. This has incorporated the issues of maintaining and enhancing the amenity values of established residential neighbourhoods in an array of locations, and that these neighbourhood amenity values may be based on special character informed by the past, spacious sites with large trees, a coastal setting or other factors such as neighbourhood character. Also, to provide choice for future residents, the Residential - Single House Zone may be applied in greenfield developments.

The zone description is set out in the Panel's recommended version of the Plan.

## **4. Retaining the Mixed Housing Urban and Mixed Housing Suburban Zones.**

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

A number of submitters, in particular Ockham Holdings Limited, sought that the Residential - Mixed Housing Urban and Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zones should be merged. This was based on the need to provide greater residential capacity, and the submitters' view that there was little distinction between the zones, given the Council's position on removing density. The Council and other submitters such as the Institute of Architects and the Urban Design Forum did not agree and submitted that they should remain as separate zones.

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

Witnesses for Ockham Holdings (Messrs Todd and Kaye) in their presentation at the hearing suggested that any differences between the Residential - Mixed Housing Urban and the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban zones were indistinct and that the zones ought to form a single zone. Mr Todd, in his evidence, called for a merging of the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban and the Residential - Mixed Housing Urban zones. Mr Kaye, Ockham

Holdings' expert planner, noted that, having looked at the spread of the residential zones on the Council maps, he was unable to identify any distinguishing characteristics of a Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone versus a Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone. In his view, the only distinguishing feature was height control.

It was also Mr Kaye's opinion that a fundamental part of delivering a compact urban form was to be more proactive in recognising a zoning enabling three-storey developments, including a mix of uses. He said this could be more easily achieved if the two zones were rolled together.

It was the Council's position, one that the Panel supports, that the Residential - Mixed Housing Urban and the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban zones should remain separate for the reasons set out in Mr Roberts' evidence in chief (paragraph 13.18 and section 24) and evidence in rebuttal (at paragraph 4.6 onwards).

In summary Mr Roberts described the key difference between the two zones as being the planned built character (evidence in chief, paragraph 24.2). The objectives and policies for the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone provide for a planned suburban character of up to two storey buildings within a more spacious setting, whereas in the Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone greater intensification is provided through providing for an urban character of up to three storey buildings. In his opinion, the distinction between the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone and the Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone is justified as it provides greater choice in neighbourhood character, and will enable a higher level of intensification to be directed into areas identified as being more appropriate for a greater level of growth (evidence in chief, paragraph 18.13).

The Panel finds that the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone will facilitate some intensification while retaining a more suburban character, generally defined by buildings of up to two storeys. The Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone will provide for a more intensive building form of up to three storeys, facilitating a transition to a more urban built character over time. The Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone also provides for a transition in built character between suburban areas (zoned Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone) and areas of higher intensification with buildings of five to seven storeys in areas zoned Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone.

The difference in height and height in relation to boundary provisions, as well as the different subdivision site size standard, will assist in the transition in character described above and are important points of distinction. Mr Roberts notes that the difference between two and three storey height will make a fundamental difference in terms of character. The Panel agrees. The Panel also notes that the difference in height between the two zones was supported by more than 100 community groups represented by Auckland 2040.

For all of the above reasons that Panel supports the retention of both zones. However it is noted that this needs to be read in conjunction with the changes made to the zones, including removing the density provisions (including the Panel's recommendation to remove the 200m<sup>2</sup> limit in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone) and the other provisions seeking a more flexible approach to multi-unit developments where core standards (those directly affecting adjoining and nearby sites) are met.

## 5. Removal of the density provisions

### 5.1. Statement of issue

The Council, with the support of a number of submitters, including Auckland 2040, sought to remove the density provisions from the Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone and the Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone, and from the Mixed Housing Suburban Zone on sites over 1,000m<sup>2</sup>, but to include a 200m<sup>2</sup> density requirement for sites less than 1,000m<sup>2</sup>.

Other submitters sought to retain density provisions as a means of limiting development and 'densification' of Auckland.

The Panel recommends that all density provisions in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban, Residential - Mixed Housing Urban and Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zones be removed. The Panel further recommends that the development standards (e.g. height, height in relation to boundary, yards, building coverage etc) and the resource consenting process determine the appropriate level of development on a site. Density limits are retained for the Residential - Single House Zone, the Residential - Large Lot Zone and the Residential - Rural and Coastal Settlement Zone.

### 5.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

The capacity for growth and the need to accommodate more people in Auckland has been fully set out in the Panel's Overview of recommendations (as referenced above). The removal of the density provisions is a key planning tool to enable greater intensity of development. The Council and a number of submitters supported the removal of the density provisions.

The Panel recommends that the density provisions in their entirety be removed; and this includes the density proposed by the Council in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone on sites less than 1,000m<sup>2</sup>.

This density 'relaxation' is on the basis that:

- i. the density provisions can lead to an inefficient use of land as only the prescribed number can be placed on the land;
- ii. due to the bullet point above, limiting the number of dwellings encourages the maximisation of the site development by building larger units. This leads to fewer smaller dwellings being built and has an impact on affordability as the larger units tend to be more expensive;
- iii. no density limits would enable considerably greater housing capacity and housing choice as this would likely result in a range of dwelling sizes rather than only larger units being built; and
- iv. along with a number of development standards and consenting processes (generally restricted discretionary activity), these would ensure good living environments and good environmental outcomes.

For the reasons set out above the Panel does not support the density restrictions in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone (1:200m<sup>2</sup> up to 1,000m<sup>2</sup> and no density after this). The Panel and a number of submitters did not understand what these restrictions were trying to achieve. The section below sets out the Panel's recommendation on how the combination of permitted activities, development standards, consenting processes (mainly restricted discretionary activities) and notification will achieve good quality outcomes. This, in the Panel's view, negates the need for any density provisions.

## **6. Permitted development and outcome-led development**

### **6.1. Statement of issue**

A number of submitters, in particular those seeking a more enabling policy/rule framework to enable residential development, considered the provisions proposed by the Council were too 'rules' driven, especially the urban design requirements, and would stifle innovative outcomes and add cost with little or no benefit. They sought more enabling plan provisions which could be more outcome-led rather than rule-led.

The Council's position was that all of the development standards were required to ensure development adhered to good urban design principles, and this in turn would lead to good urban design outcomes.

The Panel finds that the combination of a rule-based approach, with a more enabling approach (as set out below) is the most appropriate to help achieve a quality compact city and 'unlock' needed residential development capacity.

### **6.2. Panel recommendation and reasons**

The notified proposed Auckland Unitary Plan provided for up to three dwellings per site in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban and Residential - Mixed Housing Urban zones and one dwelling per site in the Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone as a permitted activity. The Council in its opening submissions to the hearing provided a tracked change version of the residential provisions. In those provisions, up to two dwellings per site in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban, Residential - Mixed Housing Urban and Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zones was a permitted activity.

It was the Council's position and the expert evidence of Mr Roberts (the Council's planner) that the change in the number of dwellings permitted was due to the removal of the density provisions. Mr Roberts was of the view that this was necessary as a closer scrutiny was needed to ensure that the design outcome was appropriate.

The Panel did not agree and considered that a greater level of development needed to be provided for as of right, given the matters as follows:

- i. that the extensive development standards would ensure appropriate amenity levels where the number of dwellings permitted per site was limited;
- ii. if a development standard was not met, this would trigger a restricted discretionary activity consent requirement, with the potential for notification, and this would ensure an assessment of the effects of the development; and

- iii. limiting the number of dwellings as proposed would potentially create inefficient land use as land owners 'underdeveloped' their sites in order to avoid a consenting process.

Also the Panel agrees with a number of submitters, such as Generation Zero, that more development needs to be enabled (see above, section 2 Enabling capacity).

The Panel recommends the following provisions which will, in its opinion, enable greater and appropriate development, while at the same time providing safeguards to ensure quality outcomes. The provisions are set out in the Panel's recommended version of the Plan and are summarised below.

- i. Up to four dwellings are permitted as of right on sites in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone and the Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone that meet all the applicable development standards.
- ii. Five or more dwellings require a restricted discretionary activity consent in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone and the Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone.
- iii. All dwellings require a restricted discretionary activity consent in the Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone.
- iv. If the core development standards in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban, Residential - Mixed Housing Urban and Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zones are met (height, height in relation to boundary and yards) any application will, unless special circumstances apply, be non-notified. If one or more of the core standards are not met, the normal tests of notification will apply.
- v. As a restricted discretionary activity for multiple dwellings or all dwellings in the Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone, the development standards become matters of discretion rather than actual standards which must be met.

As part of the above provisions there are a number of development standards that the Council (in its closing statement) did not support. The Panel agreed but has recommended the deletion of more of the development standards. The reasons for this are those set out in the Council's evidence, and addressed below. These standards considered by the Panel to be either unnecessary and/or inappropriate in terms of:

- i. achieving quality urban design outcomes;
- ii. providing for a more outcome led approach as opposed to a more prescriptive rule- based approach; and
- iii. imposing costs which have little benefit.

The standards are:

- i. separation between buildings on the site;

- ii. dwellings fronting the street;
- iii. maximum building length;
- iv. front fence requirements (side and rear retained);
- v. garages (percentage of front facade);
- vi. minimum dwelling size;
- vii. servicing and waste;
- viii. storage;
- ix. universal access;
- x. minimum dimensions of principal living rooms and principal bedrooms;
- xi. dwelling mix; and
- xii. minimum frontage and site width.

It is the Panel's finding, largely agreeing with the Council on those it sought to delete and a range of submitters seeking a more enabling regime, that the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan's approach is too prescriptive in urban design terms, will not assist in providing a supply of residential dwellings and the costs (both money and in terms of quality outcomes) outweigh the benefits.

There was considerable debate between the Council and submitters about the need for standards such as dwelling sizes, minimum ceiling heights and minimum dimensions of principal living rooms and principal bedrooms (the latter two being detailed assessment criteria). Considering the arguments for and against, the Panel recommends that these provisions be deleted, noting that the Council recommended that minimum ceiling heights and minimum dimensions of principal living rooms and principal bedrooms standards be deleted as part of the assessment of multi-unit developments.

With respect to the issue of minimum dwelling/apartment sizes, there was clearly support for and opposition to the specification of dwelling/apartment sizes. As set out in the Council's closing statement, the purpose of minimum dwelling size is:

dwellings are functional and of a sufficient size to provide for the day-to-day needs of residents, based on the number of occupants the dwelling is designed to accommodate.

Much of the debate focussed on the need for the rule. The Council and other submitters argued that it was necessary to ensure functional spaces and part of amenity for the residents and the wider community (not having 'shoe box' apartments). Many of the submitters who developed apartments argued that the rule was not needed as the market, in combination with the other development standards, would ensure appropriately-sized dwellings and there was a significant cost imposed with specifying minimum size of dwelling.

It is the Panel's position and recommendation that minimum dwelling sizes be deleted as a standard. There are two main reasons: the relationship between the Building Act 2004 and

the Resource Management Act 1991; and whether a minimum dwelling size is a resource management issue and, if it is, whether it is the most appropriate method to ensure 'amenity' and 'functionally'. This is addressed further below.

The Council's position on the relationship between the Building Act 2004 and the Resource Management Act 1991 was set out in legal submissions, evidence and in the Council's closing statement. The Panel notes that formal submissions concerning the relationship between the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Building Act 2004 were filed in response to the Panel's 8 October 2015 direction on the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Building Act 2004 in the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan. Also the relationship of the Building Act 2004 and the Resource Management Act 1991 is more fully addressed in the Panel's Overview of recommendations (as referenced above).

The primary thrust of those submissions for the Council was that section 18 of the Building Act 2004 does not limit the ability to include rules in the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan that may require buildings to achieve higher performance standards than the Building Code where the rules meet the statutory tests of the Resource Management Act 1991 and have a legitimate resource management purpose. This was also addressed in Part 2C of the Council's opening submissions (para 2.19 to 2.23 onwards), and reiterated the justifications for all the onsite amenity controls set out in the evidence of the Council's witnesses, including Mr MacIndoe, the Council's urban design expert, (see his evidence in rebuttal: section 6 on daylight control; section 8 on minimum dwelling size; and section 9 on floor to ceiling height). Mr Roberts, the Council's expert planner, also supported the provisions.

The Council's position, as set out in legal submissions and the evidence, is that the controls address what it considers are resource management issues. It was further stated that they also achieve the health and social well-being purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 and support the quality compact city objectives of the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan.

As already addressed in this report, a number of submitters sought a substantial 'freeing up' of the residential development controls. As examples, Mr Kaye, expert planner for Ockham Holdings Limited sought the removal of all development controls in the residential zones other than those relating to yards, height, height to boundary, and landscaped area standards (referred by him as core development controls). It was his opinion that the core development controls should be limited to those that directly constrain the built form and site development outcomes that directly impact on the residential amenity of surrounding land.

Generation Zero, in Mr Christensen's written evidence, supported the lowering of minimum studio apartment sizes to 30m<sup>2</sup> although noting that:

- (a) this still precludes many "tiny house" designs seen overseas; and
- (b) minimum sizes for 1 bedroom apartments also need to be reduced (paragraph 7 of Mr Christensen's evidence).

He also supported simplifying the requirements for interior design, stating that while "interior design is an important part of 'density done well', hard and fast requirements aren't necessarily the best way to achieve good outcomes" (paragraph 8 of Mr Christensen's evidence in chief).

Based on the submissions and evidence, and the Panel's position on the relationship of the Building Act 2004 and the Resource Management Act 1991, the Panel recommends the deletion of the provisions relating to dwelling sizes, minimum ceiling heights and minimum dimensions of principal living rooms and principal bedrooms. The reasons are those already set out but in summary are:

- i. the package of provisions proposed, especially the development standards and the outcome-led consenting process, will:
  - a. enable quality developments and urban design outcomes;
  - b. provide greater choice of housing options;
  - c. assist in improving housing affordability as there is a cost to specifying these development controls, and the costs outweigh the benefits in section 32 terms;
- ii. minimum standards are required pursuant to the Building Act 2004, and these will ensure functionality is considered as well as health and well-being.

The Panel also recommends the deletion of a number of the development standards which have largely been predicated on urban design grounds. While the Panel supports good urban design and quality outcomes, it was the Panel's view that these had been over-prescribed and the costs and benefits had not been sufficiently evaluated. The Panel agrees with those submitters, such as Todd Property Group Limited, Fletcher Construction Developments Limited, Fletcher Residential and Ockham Holdings Limited, that the provisions would not necessarily achieve better quality outcomes, would add to cost, with little benefit, stifle innovation and would generate significant costs and delays as a result of needing to obtain consent to breach any of the standards.

Auckland's typography, site orientation, existing street and subdivision patterns (especially for smaller-scale brownfields redevelopment or infilling) will mean these many potential developments would not be able to comply (and that many of the standards were not appropriate). This will trigger a number of consent applications to justify why particular development standards cannot be met. In this regard the Panel notes the comments of Ms Mackereth of the Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association Incorporated who stated that people need to be able to build houses to orient to the sun and views, and that as sites can be steep (either above or below the road) it is not always possible or desirable to orientate houses to the street.

The Panel accepts that for large-scale developments (five or more dwellings and all development in the Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone and integrated residential developments) will require a restricted discretionary consent where an overall design assessment will be undertaken and evaluated. Many of the matters set out above will be relevant in that evaluation, however they do not need to be prescribed for the reasons already set out. It is the Panel's view, based on evidence, that the provisions are not the most appropriate or efficient to achieving a good quality residential outcome. Accordingly the Panel recommends the provisions be deleted.

## 7. Integrated residential development (including retirement villages)

### 7.1. Statement of issue

The Panel issued a procedural minute (5 June 2015) in relation to the hearings process for Hearing topic 061 Retirement villages and affordability. It stated:

Following the mediation on Topic 061 Retirement Villages held on 25-26 May 2015, it was agreed by all parties present that the removal or replacement of the Special Purpose Retirement Village Zone as proposed by Auckland Council was appropriate provided specific retirement village provisions are incorporated into the Residential and Business Zones, and/or a Retirement Village Auckland-Wide Precinct.

The issue before the Panel is what specific retirement village provisions should be incorporated into the residential zone provisions. The Panel's recommendations are set out below.

### 7.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

The Panel has not provided for a particular class of activity called 'retirement village' but has instead provided for 'integrated residential developments', which would include a retirement village.

The Panel notes there was considerable discussion, negotiation and evidence on this topic from the Council (mainly Ms Rogers, the Council's expert planner) and the industry including the Retirement Villages Association and Ryman Healthcare Limited, Bloom St George Limited, Aria Bay Retirement Village Limited and Summerset Group Holdings Limited.

Much of what was presented to the Panel centred on what constituted a retirement village and whether it should be limited to retirement villages pursuant to the Retirement Villages Act 2003. The Retirement Villages Association and Ryman Healthcare Limited considered that it should be so limited and Bloom St George Limited (that offers apartment/ living accommodation that does not constitute a retirement village under that Act) did not.

The Panel notes that it gave leave for the Retirement Villages Association and Ryman Healthcare Limited (in a memorandum dated 23 October 2015) to file reply submissions clarifying their positions on the definition of retirement villages and to respond to the submissions from Bloom St George Limited. The Panel essentially agrees with the Council's closing statement, which in summary are:

The primary purpose of the Retirement Villages Act 2003 is to protect the interests of residents and intending (i.e. future) residents. section 3(c) of that Act sets out the matters of interest and these are primarily around ensuring that residents understand the financial and ownership nature of what they are purchasing (often a licence to occupy as opposed to outright ownership (paragraph 12.2 of the closing statement).

Neither the Retirement Villages Act 2003 nor the Retirement Villages Code of Practice 2008 prescribes detailed design standards for retirement villages relating to onsite/internal amenity. Ms Rogers notes that there appears to be nothing in the Retirement Villages Act

2003 that requires a retirement village operator to provide a wide range of services or even high-quality accommodation or amenity.

It is the Panel's view, and that of the Council, that the focus of the Plan needs to remain on the resource management reasons relating to villages, primarily due to their typical site/building size and scale and the management of effects associated with accessory activities that tend to establish with the village – matters not determined by a particular ownership model.

As discussed at the hearing on 20 October 2015, some of the issues around the definition of retirement villages related to maintaining a broad resource management-based definition which enabled a variety of comprehensive residential development activities (catering to aged people) regardless of the ownership or business model on which the retirement village is based.

It is the Panel's position that using the residential provisions that apply to residential developments which are a restricted discretionary activity in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban, Residential - Mixed Housing Urban and Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zones (i.e. those involving five or more dwellings) is appropriate as the criteria are applicable to assessing a retirement village or other forms of integrated residential development.

These provisions, as amended, are focused on the size and scale of buildings and site development, and how that development responds to its surrounds and the planned character of the zone. The Panel considers that in terms of built form and the likely larger site sizes, a retirement village complex and a larger-scale residential development are likely to have similar effects and should therefore be subject to similar assessment matters. Furthermore, this approach fits with the structure of the residential provisions, which do not include separate lists of criteria applying to different activities.

The activity status for integrated residential developments is restricted discretionary in the Residential - Single House Zone, the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone, the Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone and the Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone. The provisions are largely the same as those applying to larger scale residential developments, with a focus on the effects on the neighbourhood character, residential amenity and the surrounding residential area from all of the following:

- i. building intensity, scale, location, form and appearance;
- ii. traffic;
- iii. design of parking and access; and
- iv. noise, lighting and hours of operation.

Taking into account all of the above, the Panel does not support a definition of retirement villages being limited to that in the Retirement Villages Act 2003. It is the Panel's view that a retirement village is essentially a residential activity. While a range of other complementary activities (such as recreation, social, community, cultural and health) may be offered in an integrated manner, it is still essentially part of a residential activity. In the Panel's view any residential activity that offers a range of other complementary activities (other than for

retirement purposes) should be treated in the same way as a retirement village and vice versa.

Accordingly a class of activity termed 'integrated residential development' has been defined and could apply to a range of activities such retirement villages, campus-style student accommodation, community and cultural style residential developments.

The Panel notes that the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan already provides for integrated developments in the Auckland-wide precinct (Chapter K.1.1.3), and can apply anywhere providing they meet the following definition (as proposed by the Council):

#### Integrated residential development

Residential development on sites more than 2,000m<sup>2</sup> where elements of the development such as building design, open space, landscaping, vehicle access, roads and subdivision are designed to form an integrated whole. The height in relation to boundary and yards development controls do not apply to internal site boundaries within the integrated residential development.

This definition and activity status of this Auckland-wide precinct has been recommended for deletion, in large part due to the recommended changes made to the residential provisions as has been addressed in this report, i.e. it is no longer necessary.

Mr Brown, expert planner for the Caughey Preston Trust, was concerned that the Caughey Preston Trust development might be defined as a hospital as opposed to a residential activity (and therefore be treated as a non-complying activity in residential zones). The Panel's position is that would not be the case as the Caughey Preston facility does not provide for any medical or surgical treatment of residents other than day-to-day care. The Panel finds that this development and similar forms of development would meet the definition of an integrated residential development.

## 8. Affordable housing

### 8.1. Statement of issue

The issue is the extent to which the residential provisions should require (retained) affordable housing.

### 8.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

The issue of affordable housing has been fully addressed in Panel's Overview of recommendations (as referenced above). For the reasons set out there, there are no provisions of affordable housing in the residential section of the Panel's recommended version of the Plan.

## **9. Matters of discretion and assessment criteria**

### **9.1. Statement of issue**

That the matters of discretion, and in particular the assessment criteria, were written in a way that was prescriptive and read more in the nature of rules.

### **9.2. Panel recommendation and reasons**

The Panel has, across most of the Plan, redrafted the matters of discretion and the assessment criteria. The redrafting has been to make it clearer what the actual matters of discretion are (i.e. more specific) and that the assessment criteria are drafted as matters to consider in assessment as opposed to rules, and better align to and in some cases link to the zone policies. Most of the residential assessment criteria were drafted as 'should' or 'must' statements and read much more like rules, and things that should or must be undertaken rather than matters for assessment.

The Panel has redrafted the assessment criteria to be statements of 'whether' or the 'extent to which'. Mr Donnelly of Todd Property Group Limited was particularly concerned about the assessment criteria 'masquerading' as de facto rules. The Panel requested Mr Donnelly to provide what he considered to be appropriate criteria based on the 'whether' and the 'extent to which' statements. The Panel largely accepted Mr Donnelly's approach. The Panel also notes that Mr Roberts, the Council's expert planner, stated in response to a question from the Panel that he also preferred the 'whether' and 'extent to which' convention rather than that used in the notified version of the Plan.

## **10. Design statements**

### **10.1. Statement of issue**

The issue is whether design statements should be retained as part of application for residential developments, including integrated residential developments.

### **10.2. Panel recommendation and reasons**

The issue of design statements and their recommended deletion has been fully set out in the Panel's Report to Auckland Council – Hearing topic 077 Sustainable design July 2016. In summary the Panel does not support the use of design statements as proposed by the Council. In this respect the Panel accepts the evidence of Mr Donnelly for Todd Property Group Limited and others who consider the design statement simply adds cost for little or no benefit.

While the Panel accepts that a design statement may be prepared as part of an assessment of environmental effects, the Panel does not accept use of a design statement as a procedural tool as set out in Council's closing statement on topic 077.

## 11. Consequential changes

### 11.1.Changes to other parts of the Plan

There are no consequential changes to other parts of the Plan as a result of the Panel's recommendations on this topic.

### 11.2.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. Design statements have been deleted (noting that the reasons for this are set out in the Panel's Report to Auckland Council – Hearing topic 077 Sustainable design July 2016).
- ii. The retained affordable housing provisions are deleted (noting that the reasons for this are set out in the Panel's Report to Auckland Council – Overview of recommendations July 2016 and Report to Auckland Council – Hearing topic 013 Urban Growth July 2016).

## 12. Reference documents

The documents listed below, 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 below to locate the documents, or you can go to the website and search for the document by name or date loaded to the website.

(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.)

### 12.1.General topic documents

#### **The Submission Points Pathway report**

[059-Submission Point Pathway Report - 5 October 2015](#) (06 Oct 2015)

[060-Submission Point Pathway Report – 29 April 2015](#) (29 Apr 2015)

[062-Submission Point Pathway Report - 27 August 2015](#) (28 Aug 2015)

[063-Submission Point Pathway Report - 27 August 2015](#) (28 Aug 2015)

#### **The Parties and Issues Report**

[059, 060, 062 and 063-Parties and Issues Report -12 October 2015](#) (12 Oct 2015)

### **Council closing statement**

059, 060, 062 and 063- Hrg - CLOSING STATEMENT (18 Nov 2015)

### **Council closing statement – marked up version**

059, 060, 062 and 063- Hrg - CLOSING STATEMENT - Annexure D -proposed mark ups (18 Nov 2015)

### **Mediation statements**

059, 060, 062 and 063 – Mediation Joint Statement – Session 1 – 11 (27 – 31 July, 4 – 7 August and 10 – 11 August 2015) (12 Aug 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - memorandum - Issues arising in mediation on Single House zone (01 Sep 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063- Hrg - Point Chevalier Residents Against THABs Incorporated - Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone Mediation Tracked Changes (12 Aug 2015)

### **Panel direction**

022, 50, 59-63, 64 and 77 - Panel direction on the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Building Act 2004 in the PAUP (8 October 2015)

### **Procedural Minute**

The Panel issued a procedural Minute (5 June 2015) in relation to Hearings Process for Topic 061 Retirement Village and Affordability.

<http://aupihp.govt.nz/documents/docs/aupihproceduralminute13.pdf>

## **12.2. Specific evidence**

### **Aria Bay Retirement Village Limited**

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Craig Moriarty) - Planning - LATE (24 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Craig Moriarty) - Planning – Summary Statement (22 Oct 2015)

### **Auckland Council**

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - LEGAL SUBMISSIONS (13 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Graeme McIndoe) - Architecture and Urban Design - general - LATE (9 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Graeme McIndoe) - Architecture and Urban Design - general – REBUTTAL (6 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Nick Roberts) - Planning- LATE (10 September 2016)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Deanne Rogers) – Planning – Retirement Villages (9 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Deanne Rogers) – Planning – Retirement Villages – Attachment A, B and C – VERY LATE (15 September 2015)

### **Auckland 2040 Incorporated**

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Pre-hrg - additional hearing time (15 May 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Auckland 2040 Incorporated and others – JOINT STATEMENT (21 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Richard Burton) (23 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Brian Putt) - Planning (24 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - LEGAL SUBMISSIONS (15 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Richard Burton) - Summary statement (16 October 2015)

### **Bloom St George Limited**

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (James Klein) – Architecture (29 September 2015)

### **Caughey Preston Trust**

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Jeff Brown) - Planning (23 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Jeff Brown) - Planning - Attachments B-E (23 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Jeff Brown) – Planning – Summary Statement (20 October 2015)

### **Fletcher Construction Developments**

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Vijay Lala) - Planning (23 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Vijay Lala) - Planning - Supplementary Evidence - Presentation (20 October 2015)

### **Fletcher Residential Limited**

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Auckland 2040 Incorporated and others – JOINT STATEMENT (21 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Ian Craig) - Planning (23 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Fletcher Residential Ltd - (Ian Craig) - Planning - Appendices 3 and 4 (24 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Ian Craig) – Planning – Summary Statement (19 October 2015)

### **Generation Zero**

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Luke Christensen) (23 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Luke Christensen) - Appendix A (23 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (David Gibbs) - Architecture and Urban Design (24 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Graeme Scott and David Gibbs) – Architecture - Good and bad development examples (26 November 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Graeme Scott and David Gibbs) – Architecture - Good and bad development examples - Memorandum (26 November 2015)

### **Housing New Zealand Corporation**

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Auckland 2040 Incorporated and others – JOINT STATEMENT (21 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Housing New Zealand - (Matthew Lindenberg & Amelia Linzey) - Planning (24 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Tim Heath & Philip Osborne) – Economics – (29 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Matthew Lindenberg & Amelia Linzey) – Planning - REBUTTAL (06 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - LEGAL SUBMISSIONS (20 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Supplementary Evidence – Presentation – Residential Zones Evidence (20 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Supplementary Evidence –Comparison of AP / PAUP / HNZC Sub (20 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Supplementary Evidence –Photos (20 October 2015)

### **Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association Incorporated**

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Gayleen Mackereth) - Cockle Bay case (25 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Gayleen Mackereth) - Residential controls (25 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association - (Gayleen Mackereth) - Speaking Notes (22 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association - (Gayleen Mackereth) - Photo 1 (22 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association - (Gayleen Mackereth) - Photo 2 (22 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association - (Gayleen Mackereth) - Photo 3 (22 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association - (Gayleen Mackereth) - Photo 4 (22 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association - (Gayleen Mackereth) - Photo 5 (22 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association - (Gayleen Mackereth) - Photo 6 (22 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Gayleen Mackereth) –Good and bad development examples (27 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Gayleen Mackereth) – Supplementary Evidence - Essay: Fire Rated Separation (19 November 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Gayleen Mackereth) – Supplementary Evidence – Fire Danger (19 November 2015)

### **Ockham Holdings Limited**

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Barry Kaye) - Planning (23 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Mark Todd) - Corporate (23 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Barry Kaye and Mark Todd) - Attachment 1 (23 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Mark Todd) – Corporate – Supplementary Evidence – Presentation (14 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Barry Kaye) – Planning – Summary Statement (19 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg – (Mark Todd) - Corporate– Summary Statement (19 October 2015)

### **Property Council New Zealand**

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Auckland 2040 Incorporated and others – JOINT STATEMENT (21 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Adam Thompson) - Economics (22 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Vijay Lala) - Planning (23 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - Patrick Fontein and Property Council New Zealand – (Patrick Fontein and Adam Thompson) – Supplementary Evidence on Panel direction for additional information on capacity forecasts (09 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Adam Thompson) – Economics – Summary Statement (20 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Vijay Lala) - Planning - Supplementary Evidence - Presentation (20 October 2015)

### **Retirement Villages Association**

[059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - LEGAL SUBMISSIONS](#) (20 October 2015)

[059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - \(John Kyle\) – Planning – Summary Statement](#) (20 October 2015)

[059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - \(Clinton Bird\) - Architecture and Urban Design – Summary Statement](#) (20 October 2015)

[059, 060, 062 and 063 – Hrg – Reply Submissions](#) (12 November 2015)

### **Ryman Healthcare Limited**

[059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - \(John Kyle\) - Planning](#) (24 Sep 2015)

[059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - \(Andrew Mitchell\) - Corporate](#) (24 September 2015)

[059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - \(Clinton Bird\) - Architecture and Urban Design](#) (24 September 2015)

[059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - LEGAL SUBMISSIONS](#) (20 October 2015)

[059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - \(John Kyle\) – Planning – Summary Statement](#) (20 October 2015)

[059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - \(Clinton Bird\) - Architecture and Urban Design – Summary Statement](#) (20 October 2015)

[059, 060, 062 and 063 – Hrg – Reply Submissions](#) (12 November 2015)

### **Summerset Group Holdings Limited**

[059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - \(Craig Moriarty\) - Planning - LATE](#) (24 September 2015)

[059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - \(Craig Moriarty\) - Planning – Summary Statement](#) (22 October 2015)

### **The New Zealand Institute of Architects**

[059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - \(David Gibbs\) - Architecture and Urban Design](#) (24 Sept 2015)

[059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - \(Graeme Scott\) - Architecture](#) (24 September 2015)

[059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - \(Graeme Scott and David Gibbs\) – Architecture - Good and bad development examples](#) (26 November 2015)

[059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - \(Graeme Scott and David Gibbs\) – Architecture - Good and bad development examples - Memorandum](#) (26 November 2015)

### **The Urban Design Forum New Zealand**

[059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - \(David Gibbs\) - Architecture and Urban Design](#) (24 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Graeme Scott) - Architecture (24 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Graeme Scott and David Gibbs) – Architecture - Good and bad development examples (26 November 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Graeme Scott and David Gibbs) – Architecture - Good and bad development examples - Memorandum (26 November 2015)

### **Todd Property Group Limited**

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Neil Donnelly) - Planning (22 September 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Neil Donnelly) – Planning - Revised design criteria – Auckland Council marked up version (30 October 2015)

059, 060, 062 and 063 - Hrg - (Neil Donnelly) – Planning - Revised design criteria - Suggestions (30 October 2015)