

Local Board Resolutions

* Grey shading shows text is Feedback not official resolutions. All other text is official resolutions.

* Each Theme is sorted in to separate Tabs at the bottom of the excel sheet.

* In some cases the original numbering has been kept in the feedback text as a quick reference.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
AE001	Albert Eden	General		General approach to the development of the Unitary Plan i) The Board supports a staged approach to intensification, with the completion of an area plan for the board area, character and heritage assessments and the provision of infrastructure to meet the intensification targets.
AE002	Albert Eden	Growth		ii) The Board considers that before any development potential is unlocked it is important to have the following in place: a) Ensuring infrastructure required to handle population growth is planned and delivered to support the permitted development targets within the plan.
AE003	Albert Eden	Parks and Community		b) Working in partnership with the Ministry of Education for the adequate provision of schools in the area and identification of land for new schools.
AE004	Albert Eden	Parks and Community		c) Working with other Central Government agencies to provide for other social and physical infrastructure necessary to provide for growth.
AE005	Albert Eden	Business		d) Providing for a staged approach to developing town and local centres.
AE006	Albert Eden	Precincts		e) Undertaking good area/precinct planning that is timed prior to intensification.
AE007	Albert Eden	Heritage and Historic Character		f) The completion of heritage and character assessments.
AE008	Albert Eden	Infrastructure		g) A staged approach to intensification following area planning and provision of adequate infrastructure.
AE009	Albert Eden	General		h) Completion of the Albert-Eden Local Board area plan in the 2014/2015 financial year.
AE010	Albert Eden	Growth		iii) The Board supports quality intensification in the right place with growth phased to match the provision of physical and social infrastructure.
AE011	Albert Eden	Parks and Community		iv) The Board requests that the social and physical infrastructure requirements of the board area are planned for, phased and delivered to support the intensification proposed in the Unitary Plan.
AE012	Albert Eden	Infrastructure		v) The Board supports coordinated and integrated planning for infrastructure requirements with central government agencies.
AE013	Albert Eden	Quality Design		vi) The Board is concerned that the current threshold triggers for resource consent design assessment is set too low at five or more residential units and buildings five storeys and above.
AE014	Albert Eden	Quality Design		vii) The Board has been a strong advocate and supporter of the plan providing for controls relating to the quality and design of buildings and low impact, sustainable design and recommends that to ensure all intensification is of good design, the thresholds should be amended so that three units or more and four storeys or more trigger a resource consent for design assessment.
AE015	Albert Eden	Residential		Residential issues viii) The Board support a split in the Mixed Housing zone but would like to see the package of height, density and development controls for each sub-zone and the application of the zone in the board area before commenting further.
AE016	Albert Eden	Residential		ix) The Board considers that the split in the Mixed Housing zone has the potential to address some of the zoning issues raised in feedback, particularly where feedback sought changes to the height limit proposed in the THAB zone and to better manage zone transition and interface issues.
AE017	Albert Eden	Residential		x) The Board supports an increase in the minimum dwelling size from 30m2 to 40m2 (plus balcony).
AE018	Albert Eden	Residential		xi) The Board also supports the need for minimum dwelling size controls for two and three bedroom developments.
AE019	Albert Eden	Business		Business issues xii) The Board supports the protection of Albert Eden's character village centres with the retention of business character overlays in Mt Eden, Sandringham, Balmoral and Kingsland and the development of business character overlays for Mt Albert and Greenwoods Corner.
AE020	Albert Eden	Business		xiii) The Board supports the retention of the light industry zoning in Morningside and Normanby Road to provide for a range of light industrial activities and services that support and provide employment opportunities and help service the needs of the resident population.
AE021	Albert Eden	Heritage and Historic Character		Historic heritage and historic character issues xiv) The Board strongly supports the pre-1944 demolition overlay as an interim measure to assess the demolition of pre-1944 building prior to character assessment being completed.
AE022	Albert Eden	Heritage and Historic Character		xv) The Board strongly supports the historic heritage overlay and the identification of historic heritage items.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
AE023	Albert Eden	Heritage and Historic Character		xvi) The Board nominates the following streets and items for scheduling in the plan and requests further investigation of these prior to the notification of the Unitary Plan: (see table in feedback)
AE024	Albert Eden	Heritage and Historic Character		xvii) The Board supports additional funding for heritage investigations of the Mt Albert and Greenwoods Corner centres prior to the notification of the Unitary Plan.
AE025	Albert Eden	Coastal		Coastal issues xviii) The Board supports far stronger protection of coastal areas and riparian margins against development that exceeds the permitted development controls in these areas.
AE026	Albert Eden	Coastal		xix) The Board supports the protection of coastal pohutukawa in the board area as they protect against coastal erosion and provide significant amenity.
AE027	Albert Eden	Natural Environment		xx) The Board supports a process for the permitted removal of mangroves established after 1996; for all other mangroves, the Board supports a process for removal via a resource consent to enable consideration on a case by case basis.
AE028	Albert Eden	Rezoning Requests		Zoning issues xxi) The Board strongly opposes the approach for the zoning of schools and strongly supports the retention of special purpose education zoning rather than an underlying zoning with school overlay.
AE029	Albert Eden	Rezoning Requests		xxii) The Board has spent considerable time working through the zoning changes requested in feedback from the community and has provided detailed feedback to the governing body on the Board's zoning change requests.
AE030	Albert Eden	Precincts		xxiii) The Board requests that the Unitec Campus be re-zoned special purpose- education, with a precinct plan overlay to allow development within appropriate parameters
AE031	Albert Eden	Viewshafts		xxiv) That the Board strongly supports the full retention of the volcanic viewshafts and recommends that any infringement of the viewshafts should be a non-complying activity resource consent processed on a notified basis.
DT001	Devonport-Takapuna	Growth		7. The Board has received significant feedback on the issue of managing Auckland's growth. We have had feedback both supporting the compact city model and opposing the compact city model. By number the majority of feedback forms oppose the compact city model and its implications in the Unitary Plan.
DT002	Devonport-Takapuna	Growth		8. There is a third and major group of residents whose feedback acknowledges the need to provide for plan growth but suggests the different application of this growth approach to the Devonport-Takapuna area.
DT003	Devonport-Takapuna	Growth		9. The Board's view is that the growth approach outlined in the Auckland Plan of some intensification and some greenfields expansion is the correct approach. The Board agrees that growth needs to be managed. If we don't plan for growth and let it happen in an ad hoc way, then this will inevitably be to the detriment of our communities.
DT004	Devonport-Takapuna	Growth		10. The Board's view is that intensification should be provided for in clearly identified planned areas which are fully serviced with physical and social infrastructure. In this feedback we've identified areas suitable for this growth such as within Takapuna Metropolitan Centre and in the vicinity of Taharoto and Wairau Roads. In other areas the Board opposes the level of growth promoted in the plan. These specific requests are outlined in the rest of this feedback.
DT005	Devonport-Takapuna	Infrastructure		11. There has been considerable feedback on the need to relate infrastructure capacity to plan growth.
DT006	Devonport-Takapuna	Infrastructure		12. The Board fully supports this principle. Effective physical (e.g. water, public transport, general transport and utilities) and social/community (e.g. parks, community facilities and education) infrastructure must be provided concurrent with the provision of growth within Auckland this is particularly important in the growth areas including the mixed housing A and terraced housing and apartment zones.
DT007	Devonport-Takapuna	Infrastructure		13. A key example of this, which the Board will highlight later in this feedback, is that transport infrastructure in the Devonport peninsula e.g. Lake Road. Parts of this peninsula have been zoned for high density residential development. This level of intensification cannot be sustained given the demonstrable transport constraints that apply on the peninsula. In addition, the volcanic viewshafts which take precedence over the zoning height controls effectively restrict height in some areas to three levels. It is important that the Unitary Plan sets realistic expectations of what can be achieved. It is inappropriate to give a sense of targeted high density 4 storey development areas when in actual fact the volcanic viewshafts prevent this.
DT008	Devonport-Takapuna	Infrastructure		14. The Board's strong view is that no such high density housing should be contemplated until such time as these critical transport aspects are resolved and implemented.
DT009	Devonport-Takapuna	Business		15. The Board supports the metropolitan centre zoning of Takapuna. The Takapuna centre is the logical and appropriate growth node for the Devonport-Takapuna Board area. Metropolitan zoning and the activities and development controls reflected in this zone are similar to those of the Operative North Shore District Plan and some of the development that has occurred in this area.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
DT010	Devonport-Takapuna	Quality Design		16. Of fundamental importance to the Board in these high rise, high intensity areas is the quality of design and detailed urban design assessment of major new development.
DT011	Devonport-Takapuna	Business		17. The Board also supports the variable height limit approach in Takapuna. This provides for a cascading transition of height between the high rise core of this centre and the periphery of the metropolitan centre. In the case of Takapuna, the more restricted heights east of Hurstmere Road and Lake Road, preserve views and amenity aspects on the seaward side of the Takapuna area.
DT012	Devonport-Takapuna	Business		18. The Board supports a quality intensive urban form of development along the Hurstmere Road main street. A form and scale of development similar to the European cities with retail at ground floor along alleyways and mixed use above provides a good urban future for Takapuna. Providing for the Takapuna main street with medium height buildings built to the street at a human scale will provide the character to complement the seaside village and a level of intensity appropriate to the area and sufficient to generate significant activity within the metropolitan centre.
DT013	Devonport-Takapuna	Business		19. Considerable investment has been placed in preserving the Takapuna Beach foreshore adjacent to the centre. This "metropolitan centre on the sea" is the point of distinction for Takapuna. Preserving the amenity of this beach and the connections from the town centre to the beach, is fundamental. The open space areas and future planned enhancement of these areas does this. An important additional element the Board seeks is a sunlight control to the beach area. The commercial centre lying west of the beach has the potential to impact sunlight. The Board believes a sunlight control would appropriately preserve this important amenity.
DT014	Devonport-Takapuna	Heritage and Historic Character		Devonport • Specific provisions related to the form, design, site surrounds and public interface of buildings, be customised for the Devonport centre and recognising its unique character / heritage be introduced e.g. conservation overlay, particular assessment criteria that apply to Devonport.
DT015	Devonport-Takapuna	Heritage and Historic Character		• These controls focus on the design and relationship of buildings to other buildings, site surrounds and public spaces, to ensure new buildings are in keeping with the character of the area and the community.
DT016	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		• heights of buildings on Victoria Road be reduced to a maximum of three storeys and the design criteria for new developments and alterations to existing buildings be strengthened to ensure new development is consistent with the scale, form and character of the Victoria Road. The Board requests that officers investigate appropriate zoning for the east side of Wynyard Street in Devonport, currently zoned as light industry, noting that the balance of the block is town centre business zoning.
DT017	Devonport-Takapuna	Business		Milford The Board opposes the blanket eight storey height for a major town centre applied to Milford under the Draft Unitary Plan. This level of development is significantly above what is appropriate to this area both in terms of infrastructure, urban design and the character of the seaside townships.
DT018	Devonport-Takapuna	Business		The Board is particularly attracted to the detailed analysis which the Milford Residents Association (MRA) in conjunction with the Milford Business Association (MBA) and Milford Vision Forum (MVF) have undertaken. Their proposal for a gradation of height limits within the centre with a variable three levels on the main street stepping back to four levels, and selected portions of six levels on the current Milford Mall site, is fully supported by the Board. This is a sensible planning response which provides for an appropriate level of development within the Milford town centre but retains the character of the Milford main street and transitions development into the adjacent residential areas. The Unitary Plan needs to adopt the variable zoning height for the Milford centre as set out in the MRA and MVF submission.
DT019	Devonport-Takapuna	Business		The Board recognises that in Milford development within the Milford town Centre is considered in context to developments in the Taharoto/Smales/Wairau Precinct.
DT020	Devonport-Takapuna	Business		The Board identifies the importance of Auckland Council land (car park) to the character and amenity of the town centre. It is critical that this land be retained and protected for future enhancements to the Milford Town Centre. Such work should follow a centre Plan for Milford.
DT021	Devonport-Takapuna	Business		Sunnynook The Board supports the principle of emerging town centres but believes that particular planning controls around height should be introduced to recognise these transitioning areas. Consequently the Board believes that emergent town centres including Sunnynook should have a maximum height of three storeys.
DT022	Devonport-Takapuna	Business		Local Centres 21. The Board received significant feedback against the local centre zoning of Belmont and Hauraki Corner. The prime issue in the feedback was that scale of development in these centres, namely the provision of four storey buildings as permitted activity.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
DT023	Devonport-Takapuna	Business		22. Both these centres are currently developed with mainly single but some two storey development. The areas also have a limited property depth which impacts the form of development that can be achieved.
DT024	Devonport-Takapuna	Volcanic Viewshafts		23. The Belmont centre in particular is impacted by the volcanic viewshafts whose maximum height controls override the zonal height. Effectively the viewshaft sets a three storey limit at Belmont. In the Board's view it is inappropriate to have a maximum height within the business centre of three storeys with the surrounding residential areas able to achieve four storeys as proposed under the Terraced Housing and Apartment Building (THAB) zoning. The Board's view is that there should be a cascading of height from the town centres to the surrounding more intensive residential zonings and then to the general residential area.
DT025	Devonport-Takapuna	Business		24. Elsewhere in this feedback, the Board will ask for mixed housing A development around these two centres. The Board's view is that these areas are not suitable for four level development or the level of intensification proposed in the Draft Unitary Plan for the reasons outlined later in this feedback.
DT026	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		25. The Hauraki Corner centre has been significantly impacted by the road widening of Lake Road. The eastern side of the centre has virtually been removed. The western side lacks the critical mass and size of a typical local centre, being wedged between Lake Road and the car park. It exhibits the attributes of neighbourhood centre. In addition the Hauraki centre should also follow the transition approach outlined above in terms of the Belmont centre.
DT027	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		26. Consequently, given the character and height of the surrounding areas the Board is seeking, the nature of the two local centres at Hauraki Corner and Belmont, and the site configuration, the Board believes these two areas should be zoned as neighbourhood centres.
DT028	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		Smales Farm / Taharoto Road 27. The Board supports business park zoning for the majority of the Smales Farm area. The Board is committed to an office park in this location and does not want to displace the opportunity of employment in this area by indiscriminate application of mixed use zoning providing for residential.
DT029	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		28. However there is a portion of the historic Smales Farm block in the northern sector adjacent to Westlake Girls College and along Taharoto Road by the Atlas Concrete batching plant and a small part of the western end of Shakespeare Road which would appropriately be zoned for mixed use development.
DT030	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		29. The opportunity to create employment and housing in these areas [Smales Farm] is appropriate. It would provide intensive development and employment close to the Northern Busway, with good connections to the rest of the North Shore and with high amenity area given its proximity to Lake Pupuke, and other amenity areas.
DT031	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		30. Consequently the Board seeks mixed use zoning in this area.
DT032	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		31. The Devonport-Takapuna Local Board has received significant feedback on the residential zoning areas and the THAB and mixed housing zones.
DT033	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		32. The combination of seeking to control the entire residential areas within Devonport-Takapuna through these two plus single housing zones does not allow the necessary fine grained approach to zoning in the Board area.
DT034	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		33. The consequence is that there has been significant opposition to the zones and zoning, particularly of the THAB zone in the Devonport peninsula (Hauraki Corner and Belmont) and around Milford and Sunnynook.
DT035	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		34. There has also been significant opposition to the mixed housing zone and the availability of height and density concessions on a non-notified basis.
DT036	Devonport-Takapuna	Residential		35. Effectively for Devonport-Takapuna this has potentially turned an area of predominantly two storey housing into three and four storey housing.
DT037	Devonport-Takapuna	Residential		36. The proposal to split the mixed housing zone into two zones, one being three storey and the other two storey, and the consequent tightening up of the notification procedures so the normal RMA process applies to developments which exceed height, is in the Board's view a very positive step. The Board strongly supports the splitting of the zone.
DT038	Devonport-Takapuna	Residential		37. This submission is lodged on the basis that the Council will confirm the proposal to split the zone. It increases the residential zonings within the Devonport-Takapuna area from three core zones to four core zones. It means that the planning approach the Board seeks can be dealt with through the application of the different zones rather than the Board seeking to fundamentally change the planning controls of the THAB zones and the mixed housing zone as initially suggested in the Draft Unitary Plan. This is the basis on which the Board has approached these zoning issues.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
DT039	Devonport-Takapuna	Residential		38. If the decision of the Council is to keep the two basic zones as originally proposed in the notified Draft Unitary Plan, then the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board would need to seek significant changes to the zoning provision of the Terrace House and Apartment Building zone and mixed housing zone to achieve the planning objectives we think appropriate for the Devonport-Takapuna area.
DT040	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		Terrace House and Apartment Building (THAB) Zoning 39. The Draft Unitary Plan applies THAB zoning extensively in the Devonport-Takapuna area around Belmont, Hauraki Corner, Takapuna, Milford, Sunnynook and East Coast Bays Road.
DT041	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		40. The Board accepts that there should be a THAB zone with a variable height from 4-6 levels within the Unitary Plan as it applies across the region.
DT042	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		41. The Board also accepts that the Takapuna metropolitan centre is an important and appropriate growth node and some THAB zoning around the centre is appropriate.
DT043	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		42. The Board does not however agree to THAB zoning in the rest of the Board area. It is inappropriate for the Belmont, Hauraki Corner, Milford, Sunnynook and East Coast Bays Road to be zoned THAB.
DT044	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		43. The splitting of the mixed housing zone provides a solution to the zoning for these areas which is set out later in this report.
DT045	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		Mixed Housing Zone 44. Devonport-Takapuna Board strongly supports the proposal to split the mixed housing zone into two zones; one being a three level zone and the other a two level zone.
DT046	Devonport-Takapuna	Residential		45. The Board also strongly supports the notion that developments which exceed the height limit in these zones should be subject to the normal notification controls of the Resource Management Act. There should not be a presumption of non-notification from 2-3 levels as currently proposed in the Draft Unitary Plan.
DT047	Devonport-Takapuna	Residential		46. The Board supports the mixed housing A zone having a density of 1:300 for up to four units and for five or more units to be subject to urban design controls. However in the mixed housing B zone, the Board believes that the density should be set at 1:400. The two key drivers of density and height will create a distinction in character between these two zones. This will enable a more fine-grained approach in the application of the zonings to metropolitan Auckland including the Devonport-Takapuna area.
DT048	Devonport-Takapuna	Infrastructure		Belmont The Board does not believe the Devonport peninsula has the necessary infrastructure, particularly transport, to cope with significant intensification.
DT049	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		The THAB zoning proposed in the Draft Unitary Plan for Belmont provides for greater density than the Board feels the transport infrastructure can adequately cope with, and a four level height limit which is out of character with the area. The height limits of the volcanic viewshafts which crosses the Belmont area, significantly impact the potential level of development. The height limits effectively create a three storey zone. However because the viewshaft is limited in its extent, it can lead to aberrations in the nature of development which could otherwise occur under the THAB zone.
DT050	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		Furthermore, and as stated previously in this feedback, heights should have a cascading approach from the town centre to the higher intensity residential areas around the town centre to the standard residential areas. With the commercial height of the Belmont centre at three levels because of the volcanic viewshaft, it would be appropriate to have the surrounding residential areas also at three and two levels.
DT051	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		The Board would support a mixed housing A (three storey zone) adjacent to the adjacent rezoned Belmont neighbourhood centre and along Lake Road. Other areas in the Belmont area currently zoned THAB should be rezoned to mixed housing B (two level zone).
DT052	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		Hauraki Corner The Board believes the same principles apply to Hauraki Corner suggested THAB zoning as to Belmont. This zoning is inappropriate for reasons of infrastructure capacity, particularly transport, and for amenity and character reasons in this area. The transition or stepping down height limits referred to in Belmont above also apply in the Hauraki Corner instance.
DT053	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		However the Board would support a mixed housing A zone immediately around the town centre and along parts of Lake Road, with the rest of the THAB zone zoned mixed housing B.
DT054	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		Milford The Board opposes the proposition in the Draft Unitary Plan to zone extensive THAB areas around the Milford centre. As previously indicated, the Board sees Milford as a minor rather than major town centre. The catchment area given the coast and lake and the character of the area mean Milford is unsuitable for high intensity development.
DT055	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		The Board opposes THAB zoning in this area (including Rangitoto Terrace on the northern side of the Wairau Creek) but does support mixed housing A in the immediate environs of the centre with the rest of the THAB area as zoned to mixed housing B.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
DT056	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		The majority of the coastline in the Devonport-Takapuna area is zoned for single dwellings to reflect and protect the character of the coast. There are two blocks of land zoned mixed housing along the coast in the Milford area.
DT057	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		The Board believes these should be zoned single dwellings to be consistent with the other coastal margins of Milford. There are some properties in this area developed to a higher density than provided for under the Single Dwelling zone but these will have existing use rights.
DT058	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		Sunnynook The Board does not support the THAB zoning in Sunnynook.
DT059	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		As mentioned above, Sunnynook is an emerging town centre. It does not have the critical mass nor display the characteristics of the more significant town centres. There are also stormwater constraints in this area.
DT060	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		The appropriate zoning for this area is a combination of the mixed housing area A close to the bus station at Sunnynook centre and mixed housing B.
DT061	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		This new zone will provide some level of intensification to reinforce the bus station without dramatically changing the character of the existing area.
DT062	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		East Coast Road There is a strip of East Coast Road zoned THAB under the Draft Unitary Plan. We understand the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board is seeking to zone their side of the road to mixed housing.
DT063	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		The Board also considers that the mixed housing A zone is the appropriate zone for this area. A series of apartments along this ridge is not appropriate whereas the three storey mixed housing zone will provide for a range of housing typologies up to and including terrace housing. This provides the appropriate balance in terms of getting intensive development along this public transport corridor while reflecting the character of the area and its impact on the adjacent properties.
DT064	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		In the case of Devonport-Takapuna, these adjacent properties are on the southern side of the East Coast Bays ridge and would be over-dominated by four level development of the THAB zone.
DT065	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		Narrow Neck land – HMNZS Philomel The HMNZS Philomel land is zoned as mixed housing under the draft plan. Under the North Shore Operative Plan the land is zoned a mix of high density residential and recreation. The Operative Plan shows an area approximately 30m wide by the 150m zoned as Recreation at the southern end of the site and providing an open space connection between the cliff line reserve and Vauxhall Road. This has been removed and should be reinstated.
DT066	Devonport-Takapuna	Precincts		The Board would support a fine-grained precinct plan approach to this area. This could provide for a level of development consistent with the mixed housing A zone. The Board would not support THAB zoning or type development in this area.
DT067	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		Taharoto Road (south of Northcote Road) There is an area on the western side of Taharoto Road where, in the Board's view, some additional intensification could be provided for through the application of the mixed housing A zone. This portion of Takapuna with its proximity to schools, parks and high frequency public transport offers an appropriate location for increased density.
DT068	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		Coastal land /Lake Pupuke There is a portion of land on the eastern coast of the Devonport-Takapuna area which is zoned for mixed housing rather than single dwellings. Throughout the majority of the coastal rim within Devonport-Takapuna, the coastal margin properties are zoned for single dwellings. This is the appropriate character and scale of development along the coast. The Board believes that these portions of the Devonport peninsula eastern coastline should also be zoned for single dwellings. This also reinforces the cascading concept of the mixed housing A zone around the Belmont and Hauraki Centre down to the mixed housing A zone down to the single house zone on the coast.
DT069	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		In the same manner land on the margins of Lake Pupuke equally needs careful planning to ensure the impact of development is carefully managed in terms of the ecology and the amenity of the lake.
DT070	Devonport-Takapuna	Quality Design		Urban Design 48. Quality and urban design is a key principle that should underpin the growth management strategy.
DT071	Devonport-Takapuna	Quality Design		49. The Devonport-Takapuna Local Board fully supports the urban design approach set out in the plan. The Board also strongly supports the development of the Auckland Design Manual as a document to help promote high quality design. The Board accepts that this best practice guide needs to sit outside the Unitary Plan. However it is critical that the assessment criteria in the plan promote quality design and incentivise development to utilise the Auckland Design Manual. Stating that developments that follow the Auckland Design Manual will be deemed to have met the assessment criteria is one such way to incentivised quality development.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
DT072	Devonport-Takapuna	Quality Design		50. Best practice in urban design techniques and understandings will evolve over time. The advantage of the Auckland Design Manual is it provides the flexibility to evolve as design technologies and innovation develop.
DT073	Devonport-Takapuna	Quality Design		51. The issue for the Board is that it wants to promote this flexibility but at the same times does not want to dilute the urban design requirements and enable developers to undertake mediocre development. The Board's view is that strengthening the urban design objectives and policies of the Unitary Plan and the assessment criteria is important to achieve this balance.
DT074	Devonport-Takapuna	Quality Design		Minimum apartment size: Mixed Housing zone 52. The Board considers that the 30m ² minimum apartment size is too small. The Board supports the significant feedback to the Draft Unitary Plan which would set a 40m ² minimum apartment size excluding any balconies. The Board does support the provision of private open space or balconies with all apartments but this area should be in addition to the minimum apartment size requirement.
DT075	Devonport-Takapuna	Quality Design		Triggers for urban design assessment 53. The Board supports a multi-tiered approach to the triggering of significant urban design assessment.
DT076	Devonport-Takapuna	Quality Design		(a) For the development of one and two homes/units on a property, compliance with the normal development controls of the Unitary Plan is appropriate.
DT077	Devonport-Takapuna	Quality Design		(b) For 3-4 units, there needs to be a level of urban design assessment but this can be at a more generic level and assessed through the normal planning assessment approach of developments.
DT078	Devonport-Takapuna	Quality Design		(c) The Board supports the current proposal that five or more units would go through a rigorous urban design assessment.
DT079	Devonport-Takapuna	Quality Design		55. The Board also believes that any developments over three storeys should go through this urban design assessment. This includes developments in residential or business zones.
DT080	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		LARGE LOT COMPREHENSIVE ZONES 56. There are a few blocks within the Devonport-Takapuna area which comprise significant blocks of land and would benefit from some form of large lot comprehensive zone technique under the Unitary Plan. Other Board areas would have similar blocks which would benefit from such a technique.
DT081	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		57. A number of legacy plans had this form of zone available. This zone would trigger the need for a comprehensive planning evaluation of the development block and a structure planning approach. Applying the framework plan technique within the Unitary Plan goes some way to achieving this.
DT082	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		58. An example would be redevelopment of the significant navy housing sites within the board area. These sites quite rightly are zoned residential. However rather than have these large blocks of land developed piecemeal under the existing zoning, the Board would prefer some form of technique which would trigger the framework plan approach and the more integrated comprehensive zoning evaluation this brings.
DT083	Devonport-Takapuna	Heritage and Historic Character		Built heritage 59. There are a number of critical heritage areas within the Devonport-Takapuna Board area which significantly contribute to the character and amenity of the ward area. Devonport in particular has significant areas of heritage housing which presents a particular amenity, character and lifestyle which needs to be retained.
DT084	Devonport-Takapuna	Heritage and Historic Character		60. The Board strongly supports the heritage overlay technique within the plan and its application in various parts of the Board area, particularly Devonport town centre.
DT085	Devonport-Takapuna	Heritage and Historic Character		61. The Board also strongly supports this overlay having greater weight than the underlining zoning provisions. In the Board's view it is essential that the heritage controls are the dominant planning provision, in tandem with the provisions outlined in paragraph 20.
DT086	Devonport-Takapuna	Heritage and Historic Character		Plan change 38 62. The Board spent some time working through candidate heritage buildings, features and objects to be added to the schedules under plan change 38.
DT087	Devonport-Takapuna	Heritage and Historic Character		63. The Council subsequently withdrew plan change 38 on the basis that these initiatives would be left for inclusion within the Unitary Plan.
DT088	Devonport-Takapuna	Heritage and Historic Character		64. The Board requests that all the buildings, features and objects identified by the Board through the plan change 38 process are included within the Draft Unitary Plan.
DT089	Devonport-Takapuna	Heritage and Historic Character		Mt Victoria Historic Heritage Place The extent of the "Historic Heritage Place" overlay has moved to the west by approximately 30.9 metres into private residential property. On the eastern side of Mount Victoria there is a similar gap where the overlay does not apply to the Mount Victoria reserve. On Albert Road (specifically 2, 4, 6, 8, 10A, 12A & part 14A) at the rear of each property the overlay encroaches by approximately 4.4 metres. This appears to be a graphical error and needs to be rectified.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
DT090	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		ENVIRONMENT Significant Ecological Areas 66. There is a significant number of public feedback on the Significant Ecological Areas (SEA).
DT091	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		67. The Board has areas of important ecological land including bush areas and some wetlands.
DT092	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		68. SEAs also apply to critical water areas including Ngataringa Bay and Shoal Bay. The SEA covers both mangrove and harbour areas. These critical natural waterways are a fundamental part of the environmental quality and character of the Devonport-Takapuna area.
DT093	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		69. The Board fully supports the SEA approach. It is part of the character of the Devonport-Takapuna area and complements the critical coastal environment of the board area.
DT094	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		70. Some areas tend to be the former bush valleys and the rear of existing properties. They often border Council reserves and become an important interface between residential areas and the bush or wetland reserves.
DT095	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		71. The Board supports retention of important SEAs.
DT096	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		72. However there have been a large number of specific requests concerning SEAs on private land which appear to go beyond prime ecological areas. These should be addressed by the Council prior to notification of the Unitary Plan.
DT097	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		73. The Board therefore considers that the following needs to take place: (a) All of the SEA sites subject to submissions need to be reassessed to ensure only important ecological areas are being protected.
DT098	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		(b) A realistic house platform must be left on each of the properties subject to an SEA together with reasonable space around the buildings for normal domestic activity.
DT099	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		(c) The SEA should allow the formation of walking tracks, weed management, and other appropriate minor activities in accordance with Council defined standards typical for these SEA areas.
DT100	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		Stormwater 74. The Board fully supports the concept of managing earthworks and stormwater runoff and discharge from domestic and commercial industrial activities to assist in achieving good water quality. The Board area faces both the inner harbour and Rangitoto Channel. There are extensive streams, wetlands and mangroves within the Board area. Appropriate control and management of earthworks and stormwater is essential to retain the water quality in these areas. This is essential as the water and streams are used for recreation and amenity purposes as well as the ecological benefits stormwater management and earthworks control will bring.
DT101	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		Lake Pupuke 75. The other significant water body within the Board area is Lake Pupuke. This lake is unique being a volcano without any natural outlet to the lake. Rather it flows below ground through the volcanic geology of the area.
DT102	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		76. This means the lake doesn't have the normal flushing opportunity that other river drained lakes have. Managing earthworks and stormwater in the surrounding area is critical to achieving water quality within Lake Pupuke.
DT103	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		Noise 77. The Board supports the noise provisions within the Unitary Plan.
DT104	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		78. The Board has particular issues with helicopter flight paths into Mechanics Bay.
DT105	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		79. The general flight paths for helicopters from the north coming and going from Mechanics Bay is around the end of North Head and up the Rangitoto Channel or up above the motorway.
DT106	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		80. However, a number of helicopters do not follow this flight path and appear to descend through height limits over the Devonport area.
DT107	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		81. The Board seeks that these flight paths be identified and controlled through the Unitary Plan. The Board understands CAA sets flight paths. However the Board believes the Council should use its unitary plan controls to manage the issues of helicopter noise.
DT108	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		82. The Board fully accepts that emergency helicopters must take the quickest and most effective flight path. The Board's comments relate to the significant number of helicopters.
DT109	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		Clean Air 83. The Board supports strong provisions within the Unitary Plan relating to clean air.
DT110	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		Genetically Modified Organisms 84. The Board supports the Unitary Plan adopting a precautionary approach around the introduction of GE/GMOs in the Auckland region.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
DT111	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		85. These are important issues both nationally and regionally. The Board's view is that the plan should control GMOs and should adopt the precautionary approach. This obviously minimises environmental and economic risk.
DT112	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		Inappropriate trees 86. The Board is conscious of issues in the Board area with inappropriate tree species planted in residential areas. This can be particularly problematic with large species grown on southern boundaries casting significant shade over neighbouring properties. Effectively the Unitary Plan puts significant effort into preventing buildings over-dominating and shading adjoining properties, particularly where the impact is on properties to the south. However when it comes to trees there is no equivalent management of the impact of such vegetation.
DT113	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		87. The Board understands the Council's limits in its regulatory powers with managing trees and vegetation. Through this feedback the Board simply highlights this issue and requests that the planning officers review this to see if there is any practical measures that can be undertaken to manage this negative impact.
DT114	Devonport-Takapuna	Natural Environment		88. In addition the Council could target information packages assisting landowners to understand appropriate species and inappropriate species to be planted in urban settings.
DT115	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		Parking 89. The Board recognises the dilemma the Council faces in setting appropriate parking controls for development. On the one hand there is sound argument that less parking is required in developments which are located within town centres or on high public transport corridors. The ability for people to live, work and find entertainment and recreation within their own community without the need for extensive travel, and where travel is required to use public transport; is a critical success factor for Auckland's future.
DT116	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		90. By the same token the reality is that for the majority of the current urban areas, the level of public transport and the integrated transport cross-network of connections across the urban area is not yet evolved to the stage where most people will want to live without a car. If the Unitary Plan does not sensibly provide for parking levels, then the inevitable consequence will be inappropriate over parking within our streets and local communities.
DT117	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		91. Having debated these issues at some length, the conclusion the Board has come to by consensus view is that:
DT118	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		(a) the Board supports there being no minimum parking in the city centre, metropolitan centres, town centres, local centres, and Terrace House and Apartment Building zones;
DT119	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		(b) the Board supports a minimum parking standard in the mixed housing and single dwelling zones. This minimum should be one vehicle for home/unit/apartments of one or more bedrooms and 0.5 minimum car space for studio apartments;
DT120	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		(c) the Board supports the maximum levels of parking identified for the city centre, metropolitan centres, town centres and terrace house and apartment building areas as set out in the Draft Unitary Plan;
DT121	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		(d) the Board believes there should be no maximum carparking in the mixed housing zone and single dwelling zone;
DT122	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		(e) the Board supports the provision of visitor parking for all major developments at the ratio identified within the Draft Unitary Plan.
DT123	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		Third Harbour Crossing 92. The Board supports the provision of a third harbour crossing.
DT124	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		93. There has been significant feedback to the Draft Unitary Plan in support of this crossing. 94. The Board would support the Unitary Plan acknowledging and recognising the importance and need for this crossing, while also recognising that detailed location for the crossing and even the form of crossing cannot be determined at this stage. The Board also acknowledges that the location of the tunnel portals and road and rail connections will impact local areas and these will need to be carefully addressed through designations/consenting process.
DT125	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		Unformed roads 95. There are a number of unformed roads or the ends of roads within the Devonport-Takapuna area which remain legal road but are effectively used as open space.
DT126	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		96. These areas are a critical part of the open space network of the Devonport-Takapuna area. Similar situations will apply elsewhere within the region and other local board areas.
DT127	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		97. The Board understands that the legal process to turn these areas from legal road to part of the open space network does require public statutory processes under the Local Government Act and/or Public Works Act.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
DT128	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		98. The Board would however support a rule within the Unitary Plan which would enable these road closures to assume an underlining open space zone. This would prevent the need for two statutory processes – a road closure process and a rezoning process.
DT129	Devonport-Takapuna	Transportation		99. To legally achieve this, it may be necessary to highlight these areas within the Unitary Plan.
DT130	Devonport-Takapuna	Coastal		MARINAS 100. The Devonport-Takapuna area has two marinas being Bayswater and Milford.
DT131	Devonport-Takapuna	Coastal		101. The Board supports the marina activity in these locations and the facilities they provide to boating community.
DT132	Devonport-Takapuna	Coastal		102. In the case of the Bayswater Marina, the Environment Court process has carefully tested and identified the balance between providing for the needs of the boating community and providing for the amenity and other needs of the local community.
DT133	Devonport-Takapuna	Coastal		103. The Unitary Plan provides the opportunity for an incorporated concept plan to be included within the Unitary Plan as it relates to marinas. The impact of these incorporated concept plans is to provide for more extensive uses including residential activity and perhaps even additional development controls.
DT134	Devonport-Takapuna	Coastal		104. The Bayswater and Milford marinas have the potential to have a significant impact on the adjacent areas.
DT135	Devonport-Takapuna	Coastal		105. The Board requests the opportunity for formal feedback to the governing body before any concept plan for these marinas is incorporated within the Unitary Plan.
DT136	Devonport-Takapuna	Coastal		The Takapuna Boating Club based at Bayswater Marina 106. The swimming pool associated with the Takapuna Boating Club should be included within the marina zone as an active area for public uses.
DT137	Devonport-Takapuna	Precincts		Incorporated concept plans 107. The Board is aware that institutional properties such as North Shore Hospital and the Wilson Home could include incorporated concept plans within the Unitary Plan.
DT138	Devonport-Takapuna	Precincts		108. The Board would request the opportunity to provide feedback on these concept plans before their inclusion within the Unitary Plan.
DT139	Devonport-Takapuna	Precincts		Precincts 109. That the Board is aware that there are number of requests for precincts in the area. The Board believes that it should be involved in the consideration of any precinct, framework or concept proposal before they are applied in the Devonport Takapuna area.
DT140	Devonport-Takapuna	Precincts		The property at 2 Sir Peter Blake Parade, Bayswater
DT141	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		110. This property is owned by Council. It is currently zoned residential, but is public open space.
DT142	Devonport-Takapuna	Infrastructure		Undergrounding of utilities 112. The board supports the undergrounding of line based utilities and seeks that the Unitary Plan promotes through its RMA mechanisms the undergrounding of existing areas.
DT143	Devonport-Takapuna	Rezoning Requests		ZONING WORKSHOP 113. The Board appreciates the opportunity to work through the zoning for land within the Devonport-Takapuna area. The initial workshop on 12 July enabled the Board to provide detailed feedback to the governing body on the Board's zoning requests. To a large extent that feedback is summarised within this document.
DT144	Devonport-Takapuna	General		114. The Board understands that a further workshop on 2 August will report back on the conclusions of the 12 July zoning approach and give the Board the opportunity to validate the zoning requests that were sought.
DT145	Devonport-Takapuna	General		115. The Board appreciates this opportunity.
DT146	Devonport-Takapuna	General		116. This feedback is lodged on the basis that the Board will have the opportunity at the 2 August workshop to confirm the detail zonings and for any recommendations as part of the 2 August workshop to also be included within the Unitary Plan.
F001	Franklin (Resolution 18 on RUB)	Growth		That the proposed RUB boundary should be as shown on Attachment D, noting that the Paerata north boundary has been redrawn to align with the Whangapouri Stream.
F002	Franklin (Resolution 18 on RUB)	Growth		That a mixed use zone together with the town centre zone south of King Street allows for up to 4 storey housing development around the Pukekohe Town Centre, with the same zones north of King street allowing up to 2 storeys.
F003	Franklin (Resolution 18 on RUB)	Growth		That a general business zone is provided to the west of the Raceway (21 hectares).
F004	Franklin (Resolution 18 on RUB)	Growth		That a single house zone rather than mixed housing is provided to protect the character of Pukekohe Hill.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
F005	Franklin (Resolution 18 on RUB)	Growth		That the land immediately to the north of Grace James Road is zoned Countryside living, and that the land between the RUB to the east of Paerata and the Runciman Countryside living zone, extending up to where the railway and overhead power line meet, is zoned mixed rural rather than rural production.
F006	Franklin (Resolution 18 on RUB)	Growth		That the buffer area which lies between the Wesley College land to the north and the land to the south of Drury is zoned Countryside living, and the land adjacent to the Runciman Countryside living area and north to Walters Road is also zoned Countryside living.
F007	Franklin (Resolution 18 on RUB)	Growth		That the Agricultural and Pastoral Society Showgrounds and Franklin Trotting Club are zoned appropriately to reflect their current use and recreational activities.
F008	Franklin (Resolution 18 on RUB)	Growth		That the further zoning will be developed as part of the Pukekohe Area Plan.
F009	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	General		That the Franklin Local Board provides the following feedback on the draft Unitary Plan to inform discussions with the Auckland Plan Committee in July 2013 and decision-making by the Auckland Plan Committee in August 2013.
F010	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		That the Franklin Local Board provides the following feedback on the general and growth management approaches of the draft Unitary Plan: The general approach of one Unitary Plan for Auckland is endorsed.
F011	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		The Unitary Plan should have a number of triggers in place before the additional development potential provided by the plan can be uplifted, including:
F012	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	General		1. Planning and funding of all necessary infrastructure to handle increased population (including transport, water, wastewater, stormwater, and community and social infrastructure) is to be synchronised with new development.
F013	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	General		2. Providing, where appropriate, for a staged approach to development of town and local centres.
F014	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	General		3. Undertaking good precinct planning to ensure development does not occur in an ad hoc manner.
F015	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		Development of local area plans must be given a high priority to ensure that planning provisions are appropriate and well planned at the local level. There is a need to review the priorities for local area plans and clarity is required around the criteria for the area planning schedule. The Franklin Local Board notes concern with regard to the length of time it may take for area plans to be established for other settlements e.g. Waiuku.
F016	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Parks and Community		New developments should provide for, and enhance, existing parks and open space.
F017	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Quality Design		All new residential and business developments should be required to meet high standards of building design, quality and sustainability. Compliance with design guidelines should be required as part of the Unitary Plan and local boards and the public should be involved in the development of these design guidelines.
F018	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		The Franklin Local Board is supportive of the aims of the Auckland Housing Accord to increase housing supply and improve housing affordability through use of brownfield and greenfield land inside the proposed Rural Urban Boundary. The board requests consistency with the following principles:
F019	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		1. protection of elite soils. Further rural productive land needs to be provided to supply food to the growing population and should be considered in commercial terms due to its importance to the economy.
F020	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		2. alignment with the principles used for development of the Rural Urban Boundary and Pukekohe Area Plan. These include protection of elite soils and rural land uses, containment of growth and urban sprawl, use of existing infrastructure etc,
F021	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		3. retain greenbelt buffers between rural and residential areas. Rural greenbelts should be retained between each settlement as a buffer and also between the main Rural Urban Boundary and those settlements to avoid reverse sensitivity issues.
F022	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		The Franklin Local Board considers that future road linkages including an east-west linkage from State Highway 1 and an arterial route around Pukekohe, are key infrastructural requirements to support the Pukekohe Area Plan and the growth management outcomes sought for west Franklin. These linkages must be protected from inappropriate subdivision and development and the route secured through appropriate planning mechanisms.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
F023	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Treaty of Waitangi		The Franklin Local Board acknowledges the areas of support by Mana Whenua for the principles of the Unitary Plan. The concerns and commentary on Maori land development and Papakainga housing by Mana Whenua in their feedback to the draft Unitary Plan are also acknowledged. The board supports further discussions with Mana Whenua and Council on how Maori aspirations may be achieved without compromising the principles of protecting productive land and ensuring development is not ad-hoc.
F024	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Residential		The proposal for five residential (terraced housing and apartment building, mixed housing, single house, large lot, rural and coastal settlements) is supported to provide a mix of residential zones enabling the expansion of existing settlements in Franklin. However, there needs to be tools available to recognise a distinction between inner urban densities as opposed to suburban densities. These tools should be provided now to towns such as Waiuku that are some time away from area planning but require growth opportunities and protection of existing character (particularly main street character).
F025	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Residential		The concept of a mixed housing zone is supported as it provides for a mix of housing choice by encouraging the development of detached, semi detached and attached houses, town houses, terraced houses and low-rise apartments.
F026	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rezoning Requests		Mixed housing should also be applied to some smaller settlements to offer a variety of lifestyle choices.
F027	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Quality Design		Quality terraced housing and apartments are supported to enable increased building height and greater housing choice for people of different ages and lifestyles. However, the Local Board notes the potential impact of quality design on construction cost and housing affordability.
F028	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Quality Design		the Unitary Plan must provide clearer rules on key development standards such as setbacks and daylight angles to address the potential adverse impacts of terraced housing.
F029	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Residential		New minimum dwelling sizes for apartments and terraced houses are supported.
F030	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Residential		Apartment buildings of ten or more having a mix of unit sizes are supported.
F031	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Residential		The minimum size of large lots should be reduced to 1,500m ² and there should be a higher level of impermeable surface, 10% is too small.
F032	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Residential		1. The key factor in determining lot size should relate to servicing. If a site is not supported by reticulated services, then the lot size should be large enough to ensure onsite wastewater and stormwater management. 2. The Unitary Plan impervious surface rules should be reworked. The rules must exclude driveways or set a permitted activity development standard for stormwater management for driveways and potentially other paved surfaces to avoid resource consent. A perverse result of impervious surface limitations on large lots are houses erected on the road frontage resulting in ribbon development.
F033	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Residential		Zoning for small coastal and rural settlements such as Beachlands should be reviewed on an individual basis, with precinct plans and overlays implemented where appropriate.
F034	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Coastal		
F035	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		Serviced growth areas in rural and coastal settlements must be retained and supported.
F036	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Transport		The proposal to concentrate the areas of intensification around rapid or frequent public transport is supported in principle, noting that Pukekohe is a transformation project in the Auckland Plan and further detailed planning needs to be undertaken.
F037	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		As part of the work to establish the Rural Urban Boundary, land should be secured for infrastructure development and designated for such future use to support growth.
F038	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		Engagement with Waikato District Council should be undertaken to ensure planned development provides the right outcomes for communities which border the Waikato District, particularly Buckland and Waiuku.
F039	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		Residential development contained away from rural productive land and centred around existing settlements is supported.
F040	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		Within developed residential areas, the dominant activities should be residential and business, these should be able to be conducted without being impacted by reverse sensitivity issues from rural productive land in the vicinity.
F041	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Parks and Community		Access to public open space especially in high density areas is important, and should be funded through development levies e.g. development contributions.
F042	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Quality Design		Local boards have a role in setting the direction for local urban design guidelines, which should be flexible to respond to changes in building and design practices and to be appropriate for different localities to enable local character to be retained.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
F043	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Quality Design		The Franklin Local Board wishes to formally record its expectations regarding the ability of the Unitary Plan to deliver on Auckland Plan Strategic Direction 10, namely to “ <i>Create a stunning city centre, with well-connected quality towns, villages and neighbourhoods</i> ”. In particular is the expectation that the plan will follow a design-led and place-based approach that will address the character of an area. This will provide the step change necessary to deliver the following Auckland Plan priorities:
F044	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Quality Design		1. <i>Realise quality compact urban environments</i>
F045	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Quality Design		2. <i>Demand good design in all development</i>
F046	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Quality Design		3. <i>Create enduring neighbourhoods, centres and business areas.</i>
F047	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Quality Design		Urban design regulatory controls are to be included within the Unitary Plan, with the appropriate rule and assessment criteria structure to enable those rules to inform and influence development proposals and improve the quality of development in our neighbourhoods.
F048	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Quality Design		During the next stage of development of the Unitary Plan, the Local Board requests it be provided with updates on how the Unitary Plan provisions will deliver high quality urban environments that respond appropriately to their context (including topography, character and amenity values), particularly within those areas identified as being of moderate to significant change.
F049	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Business		The proposed building heights for the town and local centres are generally supported. However, within different settlements there needs to be variation through the area plan process as one size does not fit all.
F050	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Business		The existing footprint in Pukekohe town centre should be adjusted to reflect the Pukekohe Area Plan and increased building heights allowed to cater for growth, with building heights limited to four storeys.
F051	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Business		Flexibility is required in parts of Pukekohe town centre for apartment living above businesses, with appropriate mixed used zoning consistent with the Pukekohe Area Plan. The new zoning regime is required to be implemented as per the Pukekohe Area Plan in the notified version of the Unitary Plan.
F052	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Business		Pukekohe is included as a transformation project in the Auckland Plan, and further work needs to be done to develop the details to accommodate business growth consistent with the Pukekohe Area Plan.
F053	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Business		As with residential developments, business developments must be sustainable and good urban and building design outcomes should be a priority consideration.
F054	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Business		Out-of-centre retailing is supported in some locations as small businesses are needed in some small rural settlements to support the local economy and provide employment e.g. Patumahoe. However, controls are needed and businesses should not be allowed to establish on productive land.
F055	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Business		Service industries are needed to support major local industries e.g. horticulture and equine activities, and the development of industry hubs is required for some service industries to be economically viable.
F056	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Business		Consideration needs to be given to a commercial zone (or other planning mechanisms such as the Pukekohe Area Plan response to the Pukekohe Park Raceway) around areas such as Ardmore Airport to act as a buffer for the residential zone.
F057	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Business		The Local Board supports the development of an industrial zone around the Glenbrook Steel Mill with careful planning and appropriate road and rail infrastructure to support development.
F058	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Transport		Due to the lack of public transport and the dispersed nature of residents in Franklin, the new car parking standards that do not require businesses to provide on-site parking are not supported. There is an expectation that parking should be provided by businesses in Franklin. Local area plans will provide the detail on a particular area’s car parking needs.
F059	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Heritage and Historic Character		1. The pre-1940s buildings threshold is not supported, as many buildings built before the 1940s are not considered to be historic character buildings, with the local board making particular note of the many coastal settlements and aging baches. Furthermore, there are potential treaty negotiation issues with this method and concerns regarding the cost of compliance to retain or upgrade older buildings subject to earthquake hazard risk.
F060	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Heritage and Historic Character		The Waiuku central business area should be investigated for possible inclusion as a heritage town to enable building design and the role of buildings in ‘place-making’ to be taken into account when applying mixed use zoning.
F061	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Natural Environment		The significant numbers of additional Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) being mapped in the Unitary Plan is of concern to the Local Board due to the following:
F062	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Natural Environment		1. the large number of SEAs identified to date, and

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
F063	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Natural Environment		2. the impact that these may have on property rights and the ability of landowners to productively farm their land.
F064	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Natural Environment		The Unitary Plan should provide accuracy in defining boundaries for zones and overlays, including Significant Natural Areas and Outstanding Natural Features, on both public and private land to ensure consistent interpretation and administration of the plan.
F065	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Natural Environment		Incentives should be available to private landowners who are required to maintain their SEAs (e.g rates remission). An incentive-based approach gains the co-operation of the landowner and works alongside regulation.
F066	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Natural Environment		Water harvesting should be encouraged to reduce reliance on underground aquifers and store water for use in times of shortage, but the quantity taken should be managed through the Unitary Plan, with incentives preferred over regulation.
F067	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Natural Environment		Controls on activities that create sediment discharge issues (such as earthworks, forestry clearance) are supported. Any changes to this approach should be developed in collaboration with relevant industries.
F068	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Natural Environment		The board supports the recognition of Pukekohe Hill as a significant cultural and geographical feature for Franklin and as the recharge point for the groundwater aquifer upon which a significant sector of Franklin relies and that appropriate stormwater management techniques are implemented and maintained.
F069	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Natural Environment		The board considers that the native vegetation removal provisions are too onerous. There are areas of farming in Franklin that require ongoing scrub clearance to maintain and expand productive capabilities. A mechanism (such as a 20 year date trigger) should ensure low quality scrub can be cleared.
F070	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Coastal		The board endorses the Manukau Harbour Forum's resolutions a-h and j-q on the draft Unitary Plan, passed at its 19 July 2013 meeting.
F071	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Coastal		With regard to mangrove removal, the board supports the draft Unitary Plan's approach on the 1996 date reference as the performance standard for a permitted activity and requests that work is undertaken to develop further assessment criteria for mangrove removal.
F072	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		1. The proposed Rural Coastal zone is not supported and the restrictions on activities this imposes. The area is more appropriately zoned as Rural Production or Mixed Rural. The same activities should be permitted in a rural area on the coast as an inland rural area and overlays or precincts used to deal with any issues, including Significant Ecological Areas.
F073	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		2. The Countryside Living zone is supported as it provides a buffer between residential and rural zones. The board supports the minimum lot size approach and reduced lot sizes where transferable title subdivision is used.
F074	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		3. The Local Board requests that additional land be identified for countryside living purposes, particularly where land has been heavily fragmented by rural subdivision and is not productive.
F075	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		4. The principle of constraining subdivision in the Rural Production zone is supported but the use of a 150 hectare minimum subdivision lot size is redundant given there would be few qualifying properties.
F076	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		5. The minimum lot size in the Mixed Rural zone should reflect the requirements for a broad range of lot sizes to support a more diverse range of land use activities. Subdivision should be assessed as a Discretionary Activity to enable a broader assessment of activities in this zone
F077	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		6. The Mixed Rural zone should be expanded and deliver particular land use and subdivision outcomes that reflect this environment which is different than Rural Production and Countryside Living.
F078	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		7. There should be more flexibility for businesses to establish in rural settlements, and mixed use development should be allowed. The Unitary Plan should provide for and encourage innovation for business activity in these settlements.
F079	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		8. The local board considers that the rule package for the Rural Production zone must be more permissive to support rural production including activities relating to earthworks, impervious surfaces, fertiliser use, water harvesting and water use.
F080	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		9. There is potential for landscape restrictions to impact on productive rural farming activities and provision should be made in rural zones for accessory buildings associated with the landuse.
F081	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		10. Future potential quarry sites should be identified in the Unitary Plan, protected from inappropriate subdivision and land use and the quarrying activities provided for, while the rules for other areas should ensure that large quarries do not establish.
F082	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		11. The adverse effects of large cleanfill operations can be significant and in order to avoid and mitigate these effects, the Local Board considers that Council should be proactive in determining appropriate locations for cleanfill operations. Given the likely significant volumes of cleanfill to be generated from Auckland growth, cleanfill is a significant resource for land form modification to support productive use (e.g. gully fill).

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
F083	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		1. a growth strategy is needed for further rural productive land to be provided to supply food to the growing population.
F084	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		2. within areas of elite soils, pockets which are less productive should be recognized in the Unitary Plan and spot zoning should be allowed for industries complementing rural activities.
F085	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		3. it is expected that these issues will be considered through work undertaken to develop the Rural Urban Boundary.
F086	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Natural Environment		The Franklin Local Board supports consolidating industry best practice for livestock exclusion from streams and coastal marine areas, and supports the draft rules of the Rural Advisory Panel which state that on intensively grazed production land, livestock must be excluded from lakes, natural wetlands, the coastal marine area, rivers or streams.
F087	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		The local board supports transferrable development rights and a consistent approach throughout Auckland's rural areas. The receiving environment for transferrable rural lots should be in a countryside living area, not in a residential area, and should be within the Auckland Council boundary. The donating area should only be from within the Auckland Council area.
F088	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		Rural activities should be allowed to be conducted without being impacted by reverse sensitivity from new lifestyle development, and effects on smaller productive landholdings should also be recognised.
F089	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		The rules on reverse sensitivity for rural activities in the operative Franklin District Plan are too restrictive and should be made less restrictive in the Unitary Plan.
F090	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		Impervious surface rules in the rural environment are not workable – farm tracks should not be included. A perverse result of impervious surface limitations on rural sites are houses and other buildings erected on the road frontage resulting in ribbon development.
F091	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		The Unitary Plan should explicitly identify that equine stud and other commercial equestrian activities are 'farming' by definition.
F092	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rural		The local board considers that the Unitary Plan should explicitly provide for onsite workers accommodation to support rural production activities and particularly the equine sector.
F093	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rezoning Requests		Recognizing the parcel structure and current landuse, the land in the following areas should be rezoned Mixed Rural to enable a more diverse range of rural activities:
F094	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rezoning Requests		1. All land currently zoned Rural Production and Rural Coastal on the Awhitu Peninsula, being all land north of Karioitahi Road.
F095	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rezoning Requests		2. All land currently zoned Rural Production and Rural Coastal between the Manukau Harbour coastal marine area and Glenbrook-Waiuku Road, Kingseat Road and Linwood Road up to the Papakura Local Board boundary.
F096	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rezoning Requests		3. All land currently zoned Rural Production and Rural Coastal from Twilight Road north to Maraetai, being an extension of the Papakura-Clevedon Valley Mixed Rural zone.
F097	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rezoning Requests		The Drury Hills Countryside Living zone, adjacent to the Special Purpose zones, should be reduced to the boundaries of the legacy Papakura District Plan.
F098	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rezoning Requests		The proposed Countryside Living zone outside of the legacy Papakura District Plan boundaries in Drury Hills should be rezoned Mixed Rural.
F099	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rezoning Requests		The Rural and Coastal settlement zone at Kawakawa Bay should be rezoned to Single House as it is a serviced settlement.
F100	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rezoning Requests		To provide for town centre growth in Waiuku, the Local Centre zone should be extended to encompass a strip of land on the south side of Leonard Street and Court Street and on the east side of Constable Road.
F101	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rezoning Requests		The balance of the land zoned Light Industrial in the Waiuku town centre should be rezoned Mixed Use to provide for a more diverse range of activities.
F102	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rezoning Requests		The Kitchener Road Business Park in Waiuku should be rezoned to General Business as sufficient industrial land is available in the Fernleigh Business Park.
F103	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Precincts		A precinct to give effect to Plan Change 23 to the Franklin District Plan should be applied to the Fernleigh Business Park in Waiuku.
F104	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rezoning Requests		All land zoned Large Lot in Waiuku should be rezoned to Single House to provide capacity for residential growth in areas that are supported by reticulated services.
F105	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Rezoning Requests		The shop at Buckland should be rezoned from Single House to Neighbourhood Centre to be consistent with the decision from Plan Change 30 to the Franklin District Plan which zoned the site Business.
F106	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		That the Franklin Local Board provides the following feedback on development of the Rural Urban Boundary (RUB) for the draft Unitary Plan:

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
F107	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		It is essential for the planning and funding of appropriate infrastructure to be synchronised with growth i.e. water supply, wastewater treatment, stormwater management, roading projects, public transport and social and recreational infrastructure.
F108	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		Any future growth should be well planned and staged.
F109	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		The RUB should provide for business and industrial growth as well as accommodating residential growth.
F110	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		A RUB should be determined for all settlements and that these should accommodate growth whilst retaining the rural character of Franklin. Rural 'green belts' should be retained between each settlement and also between the main RUB and those settlements.
F111	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		Greenfield growth areas must avoid areas of elite and prime land to ensure the land and soil resource and its productive capabilities are not compromised.
F112	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		The RUB must be applied in a manner consistent with the Pukekohe Area Plan.
F113	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		A focus on the extension of the Mill Road Corridor to provide transport infrastructure to support growth is requested and the Local Board is opposed to the option of building a bridge to Weymouth.
F114	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		viii) The RUB boundary should be at Oira Road, Karaka, running east along Karaka Road to the eastern boundary but not including number 328 (New Zealand Hothouse Limited), then south to the Runciman Countryside living area (refer Attachment 19.1)
F115	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		ix) The RUB boundary should then extend east along the transmission power lines, across to Great South Road, then south to the Ararimu Road motorway interchange, encompassing land between Great South Road and State Highway 1 as outlined in Attachment 9.3).
F116	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		x) That the Runciman countryside living zone be extended north to meet the transmission power lines and the new RUB outlined in ix above.
F117	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		xi) That land south of Ararimu Road to the boundary of the Runciman countryside living zone and west of SH1 down to Mill Road, and then west to the Pukekohe RUB, be rezoned Mixed Rural (refer Attachment 19.1).
F118	Franklin (Resolution 19 - all provisions)	Growth		xii) The Unitary Plan should include the proposed location of the RUB at notification in late 2013.
GB001	Great Barrier			The Great Barrier Local Board supports the Auckland Council decision that the Draft Unitary Plan does not replace the Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan (HGIDP) at this time.
GB002	Great Barrier			The Board notes that a huge effort and resources including an extensive appeals process have resulted in the HGIDP being almost made operative and to change this situation would be counterproductive.
GB003	Great Barrier			Despite the Unitary Plan not replacing the HGIDP, the Unitary Plan's regional provisions must still legally apply to Great Barrier Island (and other areas covered by the HGIDP). It is these provisions that the Board is providing feedback on. Although the Board is interested in other aspects of the Unitary Plan, these do not specifically affect Great Barrier residents and therefore the Board is not providing feedback on them.
GB004	Great Barrier			The particular provisions feedback is being provided on are:
GB005	Great Barrier			• Regional Policy Statement objectives and policies
GB006	Great Barrier			• Coastal provisions - general marine zone
GB007	Great Barrier			• Significant Ecological Areas – Marine and Outstanding Natural Features overlays (is this covered below?)
GB008	Great Barrier			• Coastal Natural; Character Area overlay rules
GB009	Great Barrier			• Outstanding Natural landscapes overlay rules
GB010	Great Barrier			• Mooring Zones
GB011	Great Barrier			• Ferry Terminal zones
GB012	Great Barrier			• Sewage discharge from vessel rules
GB013	Great Barrier			• Genetically modified organisms
GB014	Great Barrier			• Large scale application of toxins and poisons
GB015	Great Barrier			The Board is not necessarily opposed to these provisions per se. It is however opposed to these provisions where they would result in additional resource consent costs for applicants which do not apply for the same applications under the current HGIDP and Regional Plan Where this is the case, the Board asks that Great Barrier be either exempt or be given a Great Barrier specific activity table status (and development controls) that is no more restrictive than is currently the case.
GB016	Great Barrier			The Board is seeking clear advice from officers as which of the above Unitary Plan provisions will result in additional costs for Great Barrier resource consent applicants, and the extent of these.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
GB017	Great Barrier			This information is needed to enable the Board to refine its position on this feedback and to be prepared should these provisions remain in the notified Unitary Plan.
GB018	Great Barrier			The context for this opposition is that Great Barrier is a remote community at the bottom of the Auckland region's socio-economic ladder and a place where the costs of daily life are in many cases significantly higher than on the mainland.
GB019	Great Barrier			Incomes are generally considerably lower and it is unacceptable to this community to have additional costs of resource consent imposed without good reason.
GB020	Great Barrier			It is also unacceptable to the Board which is working hard on a range of initiatives to reverse this situation and focusing on initiatives to encourage economic development and population growth.
GB021	Great Barrier			Mooring Zones. (Part 3.2.5.4)
GB022	Great Barrier			Boat moorings are an essential part of many Great Barrier residents' existence.
GB023	Great Barrier			Fishing is a central part of many islanders' lives, not just recreational, but fishing "for the table".
GB024	Great Barrier			In some cases moorings are used by landowners and residents who do not have a road to their property.
GB025	Great Barrier			In these cases moorings also provide the primary form of transport and access.
GB026	Great Barrier			In many cases existing moorings are not included in the mooring zones shown on the relevant mooring zone maps and the Board asks that these existing swing and pile moorings be included within the Unitary Plan mooring zones.
GB027	Great Barrier			The Board also asks that in these cases existing occupation and use by vessels be retained as a permitted activity. A schedule of such moorings and maps showing amendments to existing mooring zone maps are included at Attachment A.
GB028	Great Barrier			The Board wishes to have input into the amended mooring zones as it is well placed to advise on expectations and requirements
GB029	Great Barrier			4.3.6 Coastal Zones As noted above, the Board is opposed to any changes to activity status/development controls in the coastal zones that result in new restrictions which add additional costs for resource consent applicants.
GB030	Great Barrier			The Board asks that Great Barrier be either exempt from these provisions or be given a Great Barrier specific activity table status and associated development controls that is no more restrictive than currently applies under the Regional Coastal Plan
GB031	Great Barrier			4.3.6 (1.7) Discharge of untreated sewerage The Board supports the permitted activity status for sewage discharges from vessels being increased to more than 2km from MHWS where associated land based pump out facilities are in place.
GB032	Great Barrier			While Great Barrier is renowned for its beautiful and pristine harbours, these often provide shelter for recreational and commercial vessels from storms and cyclones. In such circumstances it would be clearly unsafe and dangerous to venture 2km offshore to discharge untreated sewage and in some cases the length of this required shelter stay may exceed onboard sewage storage.
GB033	Great Barrier			None of the island's wharves are provided with pump out facilities and as such it is not possible in these circumstances for vessel users to comply with this rule.
GB034	Great Barrier			The Board would ask that the following additional provision be considered in this section of the plan.
GB035	Great Barrier			Emergency sewerage discharges are permitted when wind conditions at the mouth of the harbour exceed 25 knots and the discharge takes place during the first 3 hours of an outgoing tide.
GB036	Great Barrier			The Board is prepared to work with authorities to address this situation while the Unitary Plan process proceeds to achieve early resolution.
GB037	Great Barrier			4.4.6.2 Outstanding Natural Landscapes and High Natural Character coastal overlay areas The Outstanding / High Natural Character Coastal areas are new to the Unitary Plan and not included in the operative Regional Coastal Plan.
GB038	Great Barrier			As noted above, the Board is opposed to any changes to activity status/development controls under these overlay provisions that result in new restrictions which add additional costs for resource consent applicants.
GB039	Great Barrier			The Board asks that Great Barrier be either exempt from these provisions or be given a Great Barrier specific activity table status and associated development controls that is no more restrictive than currently applies under existing Regional Plans should the rules that relate to these overlays apply to the HGI at this time.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
GB040	Great Barrier			Impact of Marine SEA overlay on Tryphena and Port Fitzroy Ferry Terminal Zones The Unitary Plan includes Marine Significant Ecological Area overlays that cover both the Tryphena and Port Fitzroy Ferry Terminal Zones. These wharves are functional passenger and freight hubs which are essential to the activities of the island and its economic viability.
GB041	Great Barrier			The Board is concerned that these overlays will result in unnecessary additional resource consent requirements and costs for future upgrades and maintenance.
GB042	Great Barrier			The Board asks that this Marine SEA overlay be amended so that it does not cover these Ferry Terminal Zones.
GB043	Great Barrier			Aquaculture zones / management areas The Board supports the Unitary Plan prohibition on new commercial marine aquaculture activities in Port Abercrombie.
GB044	Great Barrier			This area has special environmental, landscape and ecological values which must be maintained and the Board is opposed to any expansion of aquaculture zones into this area.
GB045	Great Barrier			Genetically modified organisms. (GMO's) The Board supports the precautionary approach and position taken by the Intercouncil Working Group (ICWP) in managing and controlling the risks from the use of GMO's.
GB046	Great Barrier			Large scale application and use of toxins and poisons. Issues surrounding the environmental, social and cultural effects of the application of large scale application of toxins do not appear to be addressed in the Unitary Plan and the Board considers they should.
GB047	Great Barrier			At very least, those living in the vicinity of such activity should be advised of the proposal and an appropriate resource consent activity status accorded to enable this.
GB048	Great Barrier			The Board's predecessor, the Great Barrier Community Board took a similar position on this matter although it was never followed through into either regional or district plans. A copy of the community board's resolutions is included at Attachment B.
GB049	Great Barrier			Attachment A – list of mooring zone amendments sought The Board wishes to have input into the amended mooring zones as it is well placed to advise on expectations and requirements.
GB050	Great Barrier			Amend the following mooring zone maps to include existing mooring areas currently in use as shown on the attached maps: • Tryphena Harbour Mooring Zone
GB051	Great Barrier			• Puriri Bay Mooring Zone
GB052	Great Barrier			• Whangaparapara Mooring Zone
GB053	Great Barrier			• Port Fitzroy – Forestry Bay Mooring Zone
GB054	Great Barrier			• Wairahi – Ghost Bay Mooring Zone
GB055	Great Barrier			• Nagles Cove – Port Abercrombie
GB056	Great Barrier			Add the following area to the mooring zone maps. • Schooner Bay. There are existing long term moorings that were established prior to the RMA located in Mariner Cove in the south eastern corner of schooner Bay.
GB057	Great Barrier			• Kaiaraara Bay. There are long term existing swing moorings, pole moorings and 2 jetty's located within this bay.
GB058	Great Barrier			• Medlands Beach. (Shark Ally). There are a number of existing long term moorings located in this sheltered bay in the eastern corner of Medlands Beach.
GB059	Great Barrier			• Rakutu Island. (Arid Cove.) There are moorings in existence in Arid Cove that have been used by the Rope family and visiting barges for decades.
GB060	Great Barrier			• Karaka Bay
GB061	Great Barrier			The Board has the following specific comments to make in relation to the following mooring areas: • Nagles Cove – Port Abercrombie. It is not clear from this map if the jetty and mooring in Owhitu Bay is included.
GB062	Great Barrier			The moorings and jetty serving the Orama Christian Camp and the Outdoor Pursuits Centre at the head of Karaka Bay are not shown on this map.
GB063	Great Barrier			They also need to be included in this mooring zone.
GB064	Great Barrier			Most of the properties covered by this map have no road access at all.
GB065	Great Barrier			The Board would ask for input into the development of a specific Nagles Cove – Port Abercrombie mooring zone map that covers all of the mooring areas within these bays.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
GB066	Great Barrier			• Katherine Bay. The Board is does not know if there are any moorings located within the area shown on the zone map or not and recommends that input be sought from the Ngati Rehua Ngati Wai ki Aotea Trust Board as to the accuracy of the area shown in this map.
GB067	Great Barrier			Attachment B. Large scale application and use of toxins and poisons. The Board asks that large scale use of poisons be subject to control and management in the Unitary Plan and accorded an activity status that results in a publicly notified process.
GB068	Great Barrier			Background Great Barrier island is free of many of the major mammalian pests which cause catastrophic environmental damage on the mainland. However, the island does have to deal with a small range of pests (eg. ship rats, mice, etc) which threaten the rare and endangered species for which the island is famous. A variety of methods of controlling these pests is used, but the current state of technology means that any major attempt at controlling these pests over a large physical area involves the use of large scale applications of poisons.
GB069	Great Barrier			This is a complex issue. Reflecting the need for caution the previous Community Board asked the ARC that any large-scale application of poisons be subject to limited notification, with at a minimum the Community Board being advised of any large scale application of pest control toxins. A copy of the community board's resolutions is included below for completeness.
GB070	Great Barrier			No response to this resolution and request was ever received from ARC.
GB071	Great Barrier			The board's intention is to reflect a wide level of community concern at the use of toxins.
GB072	Great Barrier			The following issues need to be considered (without restriction): residues and environmental build-up of toxins; • Toxic
GB073	Great Barrier			• By-kill of non-target species;
GB074	Great Barrier			• Build-up of toxins within the food chain, environment and water catchments;
GB075	Great Barrier			• Risk to humans, pets, and livestock.
GB076	Great Barrier			• Uncertainty as to long term cumulative effects
GB077	Great Barrier			• Associated health risks where households utilise water for household use from water catchments where the toxins are being applied.
GB078	Great Barrier			• General principles of risk management, good governance, and community consultation and involvement.
GB079	Great Barrier			It appears that the current regulatory structures do not require consents for such application of toxins.
GB080	Great Barrier			The general concerns in many respects are similar to the issues raised in Section 3.1.4.1 Agrichemicals, however, no equivalent model of management as outlined under appears to be immediately applicable.
GB081	Great Barrier			Similarly, the regulatory structure outlined under 3.1.4.8 NZS 8409: 2004 Hazardous substances does not appear to apply.
GB082	Great Barrier			Consequently, it would appear that either a new regulatory model should be included which deals with large scale application of pest control toxins or either of the above sections should be amended to include specific reference to management of the application of pest control toxins be considered under the RMA.
GB083	Great Barrier			It is clear that the application of such poisons as broadifocoum may have an effect on the environment which is more than minor.
GB084	Great Barrier			Minimally the effect of such application on neighbouring environments would need to be considered in any assessment of environmental effects.
GB085	Great Barrier			The previous community board took the view that there were substantial risks and that these reached the test as to whether the application should be subject to notification.
GB086	Great Barrier			That board's view was that first large scale application of toxins should trigger the need for a consent, and that the consent should be subject to at least limited notification.
GB087	Great Barrier			As it is now clear that some residual toxins may have entered the food chain through the vector of wild pigs, the joint need for both a consenting process and notification is made more important.
GB088	Great Barrier			The use of toxins is problematic.
GB089	Great Barrier			There is a substantial use of broadifocoum at domestic levels.
GB090	Great Barrier			This low grade use may have the same effects as noted above.
GB091	Great Barrier			However, the scale and intensity of application is a matter which the Board believes should trigger a consent requirement to ensure best practice and management in the large scale application of such toxins.
GB092	Great Barrier			A notification process would have the advantage of ensuring affected neighbours and interested parties were informed and were able to express an opinion on a matter which may have a direct environmental, or health and safety effect upon them.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
GB093	Great Barrier			That the Great Barrier Community Board affirms, as a point of planning policy, that it believes that all large-scale poison drops on Great Barrier and outlying islands which come within its area of responsibility should be subject to notification, or limited notification requirement, under the Resource Management Act.
GB094	Great Barrier			That Board Member Somerville-Ryan be delegated to write to the Auckland Regional Council requesting a report to the Board on poison drops on Great Barrier Island over the last three years, and to outline to the Board the steps to be taken to implement a plan change under section 4A of the Regional Plan.
GB095	Great Barrier			That the Auckland Regional Council and, where appropriate, the Auckland City Council, be requested to notify the board via a community board agenda, of any future applications for resource consents for large-scale poison drops on Great Barrier and outlying islands.
GB096	Great Barrier			That the Board refer its resolution of August 2008 to the City Development Committee and ask the committee to direct the relevant Council departments to report back on the necessary steps for an appropriate plan change to the Hauraki Gulf District Plan and the relevant rules and policies which are applied by Auckland Regional Council, namely: That the Board request that the Auckland Regional Council consider a plan change requiring any large scale poison drops on Great Barrier Island and outlying islands to at least be notified on a limited basis, and that the Great Barrier community board be registered as an interested party in drops of poisons and herbicides on Great Barrier and outlying islands.
GB097	Great Barrier			Background to Notice of Motion: At the time of the first Kaikoura broadfiscoum drop the Board decided to establish a policy position which would require all large scale poison drops on Great Barrier and neighbouring islands to be subject to notification under the District and Regional plans.
GB098	Great Barrier			The Board has not received any response from the ARC, and relevant planning officials are unaware of the Board's request.
GB099	Great Barrier			There is some debate as to whether the Board's request comes under the ARC's brief, or whether it requires both a plan change to the Hauraki Gulf District Plan and amendments to the ARC's rules and plan.
GB100	Great Barrier			The above resolutions establish the Board's policy statement and ask that City Development and the Council's officers establish the appropriate mechanism for implementing this policy within both the District Plan and the ARC's policy guidelines and rules.
HM001	Henderson Massey			Retain the non-complying activity status for LFR in the General Business Zone.
HM002	Henderson Massey			Amend the Mixed Use Zone so that LFR is a non-complying activity.
HM003	Henderson Massey			Retain the national grid power pylon rules of the draft Unitary Plan.
HM004	Henderson Massey			Require the undergrounding of power lines in areas that are to be intensified.
HM005	Henderson Massey			Apply the designations layers to the zoning planning maps of the Unitary Plan.
HM006	Henderson Massey			Develop methods to control land banking in parallel with the preparation of the Unitary Plan.
HM007	Henderson Massey			Split the Terrace House and Apartment Zone into two zones, one for terraces and one for apartments with graduated heights for each.
HM008	Henderson Massey			Ensure the District Plan rules provide for adequate onsite car parking within the higher density residential zones.
HM009	Henderson Massey			Amend the minimum apartment size standards to increase the size of apartments.
HM010	Henderson Massey			If the Terrace House and Apartment Zone proves to be too controversial, amend the Unitary Plan to adopt the Medium Density Housing Policy Areas from the District Plan (Waitakere Section) which only applied to land within walking distance of town centres and train stations.
HM011	Henderson Massey			Illustrate the park and ride facilities on the Unitary Plan.
HM012	Henderson Massey			Amend the LTP to ensure that development contributions remain in the area in which they are raised.
HM013	Henderson Massey			Undertake more in depth community consultation regarding the issues of growth.
HM014	Henderson Massey			Review the SEA rules to align with the equivalent rules of the District Plan (Waitakere Section) that were well understood by the community.
HM015	Henderson Massey			Review the location of SEAs to correct errors.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
HM016	Henderson Massey			Ensure that Early Childhood Education Centres are non complying activities in the Heavy Industry Zone.
HM017	Henderson Massey			Amend the Unitary Plan to insert the landscape front yard amenity rules from the District Plan (Waitakere Section) as they apply to the Working Environment.
HM018	Henderson Massey			Amend the Unitary Plan to ensure strong amenity buffer provisions at the interface between Industry Zones and Residential Zones to maintain amenity.
HM019	Henderson Massey			Include provisions to manage GMOs in the Unitary Plan.
HM020	Henderson Massey			Ensure that infrastructure (parks, community services, stormwater) is provided before or during development.
HM021	Henderson Massey			The Urban Design Guidelines (Auckland Design Manual) should be made part of the Unitary Plan.
HM022	Henderson Massey			Ensure universal design requirements are included in the Unitary Plan.
HM023	Henderson Massey			Review the car parking rules to ensure that disabled parking is provided with development.
HM024	Henderson Massey			Provide a flexible approach for residential land adjoining a local or neighbourhood centre to be used for the expansion of the centre's business and retail activities. This should be through a discretionary resource consent application instead of a plan change process.
HM025	Henderson Massey			The Board considers that it is urgent that an area plan be developed for Henderson and Lincoln Road.
HM026	Henderson Massey			Increase the area of land identified as Terrace House and Apartment Zone around Henderson to match a 10 to 15 minute ped shed.
HM027	Henderson Massey			Increase the availability of local parks in Henderson to support intensification and residential amenity.
HM028	Henderson Massey			Provide rules that ensure a variety of building heights in Henderson Metropolitan Centre, for example by using an FAR control to allow height to be in proportion to the size of the site.
HM029	Henderson Massey			Rezone Catherine Place as Public Open Space.
HM030	Henderson Massey			Concerns about the Mixed Use Zone on the opposite side of Bruce McLaren Road. This should be zoned Light Industry to reflect existing uses and avoid residential development in this important industry location.
HM031	Henderson Massey			Land in proximity to Woodruff and Hickory Avenues should be rezoned to Mixed Use Zone to provide separation between Metropolitan Centre Zone and Light Industry Zone.
HM032	Henderson Massey			Extend the Metropolitan Centre Zone to View Road as this is a more natural boundary than Cranwell Street.
HM033	Henderson Massey			Rezone RAILSIDE AVENUE as Mixed Use Zone to promote intensification opportunities and to provide a higher amenity buffer to residential areas on Millbrook Road.
HM034	Henderson Massey			The individual heritage buildings within the Corban Estate should be identified on the Planning Maps.
HM035	Henderson Massey			The individual protected trees within the Corban Estate should be identified on the Planning Maps.
HM036	Henderson Massey			The open spaces in Corban Estate should be zoned as Open Space – Civic and Community (or similar Precinct approach) to ensure this area is retained as open space as opposed to developed for commercial activities.
HM037	Henderson Massey			A precinct should apply to the Corban Estate based on the details of the District Plan (Waitakere Section) to ensure that the specific outcomes envisaged by the community are enshrined in the Unitary Plan.
HM038	Henderson Massey			The heritage classification over the Council site (Smythe Road) should only apply to the Council Chambers, not the entire site.
HM039	Henderson Massey			The heritage classification of the old Henderson Railway station (RAILSIDE AVENUE) is too long and should only apply to the existing structures.
HM040	Henderson Massey			Rezone land to Terrace House and Apartment Zone (THAA) to complement Wilsher Village (Keeling Road).
HM041	Henderson Massey			Rezone land Identified below as Terrace House and Apartment Zone - Henderson Ped Shed
HM042	Henderson Massey			Random areas of Single House Zone on View Road should be rezoned as Mixed Housing Zone. These areas include large sites capable of redevelopment.
HM043	Henderson Massey			Lincoln Road corridor should be zoned as General Business or Mixed Use to promote corridor intensification.
HM044	Henderson Massey			The area around the Waitakere Hospital Special Purpose Zone should be zoned General Business or Mixed Use to promote opportunities for the clustering of medical facilities and other business activities that choose to co-locate there.
HM045	Henderson Massey			Residential intensification opportunities along Lincoln Road should reflect the ped sheds to the bus opportunities on the road and proximity to services and employment. These areas include local centres that can support residential amenity and intensification opportunities (Universal Drive and Rathgar centres).
HM046	Henderson Massey			Rezone random areas of Single House Zone in the Lincoln Road area as Mixed Housing Zone.
HM047	Henderson Massey			Provide opportunities for pocket parks along Lincoln Road.
HM048	Henderson Massey			Investigate opportunities for a by-pass from the to Lincoln Road, allowing quicker movements between the Motorway and Henderson.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
HM049	Henderson Massey			Identify the Falls Hotel (Alderman Drive) as a heritage building.
HM050	Henderson Massey			The Terrace House and Apartment Zone at Sunnyvale should be extended to reflect the ped shed
HM051	Henderson Massey			The area to south of Swanson Road/Sturges Road intersection should be rezoned Terrace House and Apartment Zone because of its proximity to Henderson, public transport, the Sturges Road train station and commercial opportunities on Swanson Road.
HM052	Henderson Massey			The Terrace House and Apartment Zone needs to apply consistently around the Sturges Road train station. Areas of existing higher density housing have been excluded.
HM053	Henderson Massey			Review the extent of the Sturges Road Terraced House and Apartment Zone based on the land identified in the ped shed for the train station below.
HM054	Henderson Massey			There is an existing centre opposite the corner of Swanson Road and Larnoch Road which is not reflected by the Heavy Industry Zone.
HM055	Henderson Massey			There is also an existing residential development (terraces) along the stream which is not reflected by the Heavy Industry Zone.
HM056	Henderson Massey			Much of the proposed Heavy Industry Zone is occupied by Light Industry activities, and given its proximity to residential – the remaining land should be identified as Light Industry
HM057	Henderson Massey			Review the heritage classification of Coplands on Swanson Road
HM058	Henderson Massey			Correctly zone 594 Swanson Road as Public Open Space.
HM059	Henderson Massey			Rezone identified below land as Terrace House and Apartment Zone.
HM060	Henderson Massey			Land is already developed in housing, so should not be Light Industry Zone (Riverglade Parkway).
HM061	Henderson Massey			Intensive area of existing terrace houses should be identified as Terrace House and Apartment Zone as only part of the land has been correctly identified (Mcloed Road).
HM062	Henderson Massey			Rezone the Light Industrial Zone at Wharf Road Te Atatu as Business Park, and provide a permitted activity rule to provide for the existing light industry activities on the site.
HM063	Henderson Massey			Amend the Unitary Plan maps for Te Atatu to zone all random patches of Single House Zone as Mixed Housing Zone.
HM064	Henderson Massey			Review the height rules for the Te Atatu Town Centre to ensure that development opportunities are concentrated into the centre, with higher heights in this town centre than in the surrounding Terrace Housing and Apartment Zone. Implement the built form outcomes from draft Plan Change 38.
HM065	Henderson Massey			The Board considers that more extensive opportunities for intensification should be enabled at Te Atatu. This includes providing for a wider area of Terrace Housing and Apartment Zone to match with the ped shed for the town centre. This aligns with work undertaken by Waitakere City Council (2007-2010) on a plan change which was not notified (draft Plan Change 38), but underwent extensive community consultation as part of a town centre study.
HM066	Henderson Massey			The buildings and car park at Jack Pringle Green (595 Te Atatu Road) should be rezoned Town Centre.
HM067	Henderson Massey			Rezone NZTA surplus land on Titoki Street as Open Space Zone to provide buffer to residential areas.
HM068	Henderson Massey			Include the view shafts from the Orangihina Harbourview Park Management Plan in the Unitary Plan
HM069	Henderson Massey			Rezone the land identified below in the ped shed as Terrace House and Apartment Zone. Edmonton Road and Te Atatu Road (in the vicinity of the Te Atatu South shops)
HM070	Henderson Massey			The random patches of Single House Zone at Te Atatu South should be rezoned as Mixed Housing Zone.
HM071	Henderson Massey			Retain the draft zones in Glendene.
HM072	Henderson Massey			Vacant land to the south and east of the existing Westgate centre, where within a 10 to 15 minute walk of the Metropolitan Centre Zone, should be zoned as Terrace House and Apartment Zone. Residential intensification is key to the success of this centre.
HM073	Henderson Massey			The Unitary Plan's provisions for Westgate / Massey North should give effect to the settled details of Plan Change 15.
HM074	Henderson Massey			Identify Trig West as a Special Housing Area as illustrated below.
HM075	Henderson Massey			Identify land in Whenuapai/Trig area as a sports precinct (Public Open Space).
HM076	Henderson Massey			The land in Redhills, Fred Thomas Road and Trig should be identified as Future Urban as this land is already anticipated as part of the urban expansion of Auckland (refer Change 6 to the ARPS).
HM077	Henderson Massey			Expand the local centre to include additional sites to increase the size of the centre as illustrated below.
HM078	Henderson Massey			Rezone the land identified below that is within walking distance of the Triangle Road centre as Terrace House and Apartment Zone.
HM079	Henderson Massey			Rezone the land within the ped shed of Royal Heights as Mixed Housing.
HM080	Henderson Massey			Rezone 9 Culperry Road as Heavy Industry Zone.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
HB001	Hibiscus & Bays			This report provides Hibiscus and Bays Local Board feedback to the Auckland Plan Committee (A PC) on the draft Unitary Plan. The feedback will inform local board discussion with the APC at the end of July 2013 and decisions by the APC in August 2013.
HB002	Hibiscus & Bays			Hibiscus and Bays has a Council adopted Area Plan, aligned with the Auckland Plan, which accommodates projected growth and has a high degree of community support.
HB003	Hibiscus & Bays			Its urban and rural built form and land use requirements should be implemented, in the Unitary Plan
HB004	Hibiscus & Bays			Town Centres in Hibiscus and Bays should have a four storey maximum height limit
HB005	Hibiscus & Bays			The Area Plan 3 storey Terraced Housing and Apartment Building zone would make a suitable Mixed Housing A zone and we support this change.
HB006	Hibiscus & Bays			Terraced Housing should only be allowed to occur in this 'A' zone on sites larger than 2000m2 (Note - mixed housing A and B zones as presented at UP mapping workshop of 12 July 2013)
HB007	Hibiscus & Bays			Legacy structure plans should be used for precincts and overlays, particularly Long Bay, Okura and Weiti
HB008	Hibiscus & Bays			New dwellings should be no smaller than 40m2 floor area
HB009	Hibiscus & Bays			Maximum car park limits are not supported in the Hibiscus and Bays commercial centres, mixed use, and intensive residential dwelling areas.
HB010	Hibiscus & Bays			Smaller dwellings (40m2) should have a one car park minimum.
HB011	Hibiscus & Bays			Development and subdivision should be subject to the provision of adequate infrastructure, including social infrastructure i.e. schools, medical centres and infrastructure capacity should be monitored for its availability or delivery to support development
HB012	Hibiscus & Bays			Good design is essential for all development activity categories (including permitted activity) and requires more than just voluntary guidelines
HB013	Hibiscus & Bays			Business land needs to be protected, and the supply of future business land must be ensured through the RUB and structure plans
HB014	Hibiscus & Bays			Greenbelts should be protected, and provided and maintained between urban settlements as detailed in the Area Plan.
HB015	Hibiscus & Bays			E-plan needs to be supported by accessible printed information
HB016	Hibiscus & Bays			The Unitary Plan should only become effective following hearings and decisions on submissions
HB017	Hibiscus & Bays			Notification of the Unitary Plan should not occur until all feedback has been properly addressed and adequate research and modelling carried out to test feasibility.
HB018	Hibiscus & Bays			Area Plan Commitment - Hibiscus and Bays has a well considered Area Plan, adopted by the Local Board and by Auckland Council. It was prepared to be consistent with the directions and contents of the Auckland Plan. The Area Plan preparation included extensive community and interest group engagement.
HB019	Hibiscus & Bays			Projected growth from the Auckland Plan can be accommodated and will contribute to thriving communities through the Hibiscus and Bays area.
HB020	Hibiscus & Bays			The Area Plan provides a finer-grained geographic and contextual response to land use planning within Hibiscus and Bays.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
HB021	Hibiscus & Bays			Its contents, and particularly the proposed height limits (Town Centre, Mixed Use and TH&AB or Mixed Housing A) and minimum site areas for intensive residential development, have relatively strong support from the community. This can also be seen in much of the public feedback on the draft Unitary Plan.
HB022	Hibiscus & Bays			The Area Plan is fully aligned with the Auckland Plan and is built on the same foundations as the draft Unitary Plan, only being fine-tuned in respect of variances in the heights and site sizes.
HB023	Hibiscus & Bays			The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board welcomes the commitment to finergrained Area Plans and Precinct planning, and requests that the Council continue to give effect to the adopted Area Plan, including those parts requiring implementation through the Unitary Plan, by way of Precinct plans or design and development overlays.
HB024	Hibiscus & Bays			legacy Structure Plans - Recent legacy structure plans should be acknowledged in the Unitary Plan and used as the basis for the Unitary Plan precinct and overlay provisions.
HB025	Hibiscus & Bays			In particular, Long Bay, Weiti, Okura, Orewa (Kensington Park) and Silverdale North have recent and in some cases Environment Court determined planning frameworks, to the level of a Precinct plan, and these should be implemented fully through the Unitary Plan.
HB026	Hibiscus & Bays			There is some scope for simplification and consistency of planning, but the draft Unitary Plan has gone too far in its adaptation of the Comprehensive Precinct of Long Bay, and requires further detailed review to restore the value of the original structure plan.
HB027	Hibiscus & Bays			There are other recent plan changes, structure plans and precinct plans, within the Hibiscus and Bays area, including Gulf Harbour.
HB028	Hibiscus & Bays			Some parts of these legacy changes are amenable to the more simplified approach of the new Unitary Plan treatments, particularly where they involve relatively straight-forward zonings, but most will also have provisions designed to address site specific circumstances.
HB029	Hibiscus & Bays			Gulf Harbour may also be dependent on other decisions, such as timing of Pen link and the changes that could mean for the eastern part of the Whangaparaoa peninsula.
HB030	Hibiscus & Bays			Orewa West and the southwest of Silverdale have plan changes recently or currently being finalised, and their zonings need to be included in the Unitary Plan where they are not changed by the new RUB.
HB031	Hibiscus & Bays			Okura and Weiti Intensification - The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board is aware of landowner feedback seeking substantially increased development of the Okura and Weiti structure plan areas. This should not be done as a late-stage revision after public feedback has ended.
HB032	Hibiscus & Bays			It would be more appropriate to treat these as new privately-initiated structure plans, as both contain such substantial changes that they no longer maintain the original directions or outcomes sought for these areas.
HB033	Hibiscus & Bays			Height Density and Intensification Sites - Generally, the draft Unitary Plan approach to residential types, zones, densities and controls is supported, with the following refinements from the Area Plan requested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We support the Mixed Housing A and B proposals as presented at the UP mapping workshop of 12 July 2013

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
HB034	Hibiscus & Bays			• Mixed Housing A zone is to have a 10m height limit and 300m2 minimum site per dwelling for less than 5 units, with limited notification for infringements
HB035	Hibiscus & Bays			• Mixed Housing B zone should have an 8m height limit with 400m2 minimum site per dwelling for less than 5 units, with limited notification for infringements
HB036	Hibiscus & Bays			• With a split zone Mixed Housing A and B adopted, the Hibiscus and Bays Area Plan would apply the Mixed Housing A to areas around centres, rather than use the Terraced Housing and Apartment Building zone.
HB037	Hibiscus & Bays			The Mixed Housing B sub-zone would apply to all the remaining areas proposed as Mixed Housing in the draft Unitary Plan, subject to any mapping errors and identified flooding constraints
HB038	Hibiscus & Bays			• Intensive residential development (more than one dwelling per 300m2) should only occur on sites larger than 2000m2
HB039	Hibiscus & Bays			The relatively more spacious existing suburban and infill residential development of Hibiscus and Bays means larger sites will be required if they are to internalise effects of intensification and retain the character of the local area.
HB040	Hibiscus & Bays			Small Dwelling - The definition of a "dwelling" in the Unitary Plan includes a range from a 30m2 studio apartment up to a substantial multi-bedroom house. This introduces some considerable uncertainty in the type and scale and intensity of development that could occur on any site in a Mixed Housing residential zone.
HB041	Hibiscus & Bays			The minimum dwelling size should be set at 40m2.
HB042	Hibiscus & Bays			Smaller dwellings (40m2) should have a one car park minimum.
HB043	Hibiscus & Bays			The additional small unit able to be created within an existing dwelling also needs to be controlled, so that new intensive developments are not followed by a wave of additional units once they become 'existing',
HB044	Hibiscus & Bays			Infrastructure Planning - There is a general and a specific concern regarding the provision of infrastructure to new residential development.
HB045	Hibiscus & Bays			In general terms, infrastructure across Auckland will need to be augmented for the amount of additional development enabled by the Unitary Plan zone provisions over such a widespread area of Auckland.
HB046	Hibiscus & Bays			At the specific street and individual development level, there are already many infrastructure constraints exacerbated by the current incremental development.
HB047	Hibiscus & Bays			Both the large scale and the local constraints on infrastructure provision have been the subject of feedback from Auckland Transport and Watercare, and the Auckland Utility Operators Group (AUOG), particularly requiring coordination of development with infrastructure planning and investment.
HB048	Hibiscus & Bays			The Unitary Plan needs to allow development to respond to market conditions, but inadequate infrastructure will mean unusable development rights.
HB049	Hibiscus & Bays			The development and subdivision consenting processes need to include planning provisions that require early confirmation of timing and capacity of future infrastructure services. This may include staging of any substantial re-development in town and local centres.
HB050	Hibiscus & Bays			Development Assessment - Development design, building/public realm interface, car parking access and servicing, and dwelling design need stronger design assessment to advance the application of the guidelines in the Auckland Design Manual.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
HB051	Hibiscus & Bays			Mixed Housing and Terraced Housing and Apartment Building developments need to also be assessed for their effects on sunlight and shading of individual dwellings, local traffic and parking, and reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent parks, and may need further work on ambient noise levels and inter-tenancy noise attenuation.
HB052	Hibiscus & Bays			The human health benefit value of sunlight must not be compromised by shadow from buildings allowed under the Unitary Plan.
HB053	Hibiscus & Bays			Likewise the sustainability and well-being value of home gardens must not be compromised.
HB054	Hibiscus & Bays			Car parking maximum limits need to be re-assessed in the Terraced Housing and Apartment Building and the Mixed Housing A zones, which are extensive across Hibiscus and Bays.
HB055	Hibiscus & Bays			There should be a transitional arrangement, allowing more car-parking on-site until there is SUBstantial upgrading and uptake of public transport in these areas that are relatively distant from the central city.
HB056	Hibiscus & Bays			Note - The draft Auckland Public Transport Plan is proposing the removal of some wellused local neighbourhood routes, which could encourage more car use for some.
HB057	Hibiscus & Bays			Business Land Supply - A critical issue is the timely supply of additional business land, of appropriate size and type and location.
HB058	Hibiscus & Bays			It is essential that the RUB and structure planning, and other land supply processes such as the Special Housing Accord, ensure that the provision of residential land is accompanied by substantial concurrent business land supply.
HB059	Hibiscus & Bays			This applies particularly to feedback requests to convert business land to residential activities, to the Special Housing Areas designed to find only residential land, and to structure plans driven by suburban ising land uses with a dominant residential character.
HB060	Hibiscus & Bays			Area Plan Town Centres - The Hibiscus and Bays Area Plan will ensure strategic planning objectives for overall growth and density are met, and the projected share of growth accommodated, in conjunction with the development of RUB proposals for the adjacent Rodney area.
HB061	Hibiscus & Bays			The Area Plan applies a more refined approach to the height of buildings within the Town Centres business areas of Browns Bay and Orewa, rather than a blanket for larger town centres.
HB062	Hibiscus & Bays			The heights may vary within the centres, from 4 storey in the centre, stepping down to 3 storey for the Mixed Use and Terraced Housing and Apartment Building (or Mixed Housing A1 zones and then to two storey for the surrounding Mixed Housing B zone.
HB063	Hibiscus & Bays			This can be achieved by a design and development overlay or by classifying these as Town Centre (small) or Local Centres.
HB064	Hibiscus & Bays			The Area Plan drives overlays & precincts, and has been adopted except for these Browns Bay and Orewa town centre heights.
HB065	Hibiscus & Bays			There is a coastal lifestyle character to these two town centres, protective of the reserve & beach amenity and with the beachfront providing much of their identity.
HB066	Hibiscus & Bays			Browns Bay has a relatively recent Environment Court decision setting its appropriate height limits, and both centres have floodplain and coastal inundation risks, and consequential high water tables.
HB067	Hibiscus & Bays			The other two Town Centres in Hibiscus and Bays are Whangaparaoa and Silverdale, and both have a four storey height limit proposed for business areas.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
HB068	Hibiscus & Bays			For Area Plan Local Centres - The Hibiscus and Bays Area Plan will ensure strategic planning objectives for overall growth and density are met, and the projected share of growth accommodated with 3 storey in the local centre business areas and Mixed Housing 'A' (3 storey maximum) in the close surrounds to the centres.
HB069	Hibiscus & Bays			Infrastructure for Business - Infrastructure planning is required to support business development - for road and freight access, Penlink, motorway ramps at Wainui. busway extension and bus network improvements.
HB070	Hibiscus & Bays			The Unitary Plan does not specifically provide transport infrastructure for business, but it can set out the planning thresholds for such major infrastructure in relation to future land use change, establishing new uses or transformation of existing centres.
HB071	Hibiscus & Bays			Mixed Use Transition Zone - The Mixed Use zone in its current form appears as a predominantly residential zone, with some commercial uses at ground level.
HB072	Hibiscus & Bays			This will allow it to play a transitional role around town centres, but may result in a net loss of potential for business activity.
HB073	Hibiscus & Bays			Some of the activities allowed in this zone may have effects on adjacent land uses.
HB074	Hibiscus & Bays			For the Orewa and Browns Bay Mixed Use zones, there will be residential development nearby, and the entertainment, drive-through and commercial sex services activities may need more buffering guidance in the Unitary Plan, or the assistance of bylaws.
HB075	Hibiscus & Bays			Business Type Encouragement - Encouragement or enabling of particular business uses is supported, although effectiveness is unknown.
HB076	Hibiscus & Bays			The draft Unitary Plan proposal to allow large format retail in the General Business zone is supported, although it appears to largely reflect existing uses, and some landowner feedback appears to be seeking residential zonings.
HB077	Hibiscus & Bays			Innovative and high technology businesses have been sought for the Silverdale North business area, but statutory planning appears unable to achieve that outcome.
HB078	Hibiscus & Bays			Retail - The approach of ensuring that retail activities are primarily located in town and local centres to support revitalisation of those centres is supported.
HB079	Hibiscus & Bays			Area Plan Growth Support - Hibiscus and Bays has an Area Plan, adopted by the Local Board and by Auckland Council.
HB080	Hibiscus & Bays			Projected growth can be accommodated and contribute to thriving communities through the Hibiscus and Bays area. This "growth share", an additional 25,000 households (current capacity 10,600) and 18,000 jobs (current capacity 5,000) in Hibiscus and Bays by 2042. involves both ongoing greenfield opportunities and substantial intensification in and around centres .
HB081	Hibiscus & Bays			The level of public support for the Area Plan approach to growth management, while not universal, should not be underestimated and should certainly not be disregarded.
HB082	Hibiscus & Bays			RUB Greenbelts - Apart from edge confirmations of the interim RUB, the northern part of the new 30 year RUB will likely be almost wholly in the Rodney area.
HB083	Hibiscus & Bays			Expansion of rural and coastal settlements, and structure planning for greenfields development should include policy direction to consciously establish long-term greenbelts between settlements, comprised of public open space in combination with privately-owned land incentivised for environmental protection and improvement.
HB084	Hibiscus & Bays			Intensification Location - Concentrating the areas of intensification around transport hubs and town centres is supported, also Mixed Housing 'A' locations around some larger parks but subject to considerations stated in 9.1.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
HB085	Hibiscus & Bays			Protected Parks - More parks and reserves are required, as part of new greenfields development and in intensively developed urban areas.
HB086	Hibiscus & Bays			Adequate funding must be provided for reserves acquisition and development, whether through Unitary Plan mechanisms or other instruments.
HB087	Hibiscus & Bays			Amenity of parks and reserves should be protected, for sunlight access and against dominance by larger building development.
HB088	Hibiscus & Bays			If more intensive residential development is located at park edges, reverse sensitivity effects on park activities need to be avoided or mitigated.
HB089	Hibiscus & Bays			The development and use of these parks and reserves should not be constrained by adjacent residential activities.
HB090	Hibiscus & Bays			New Parks - Subdivision rules and assessment criteria should require new developments to enhance existing open space and support the provision of new areas of open space in the immediate vicinity of the development.
HB091	Hibiscus & Bays			The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area includes significant areas of new greenfields development and it is essential that the development of these areas include neighbourhood reserves and other areas of open space which support good urban design such as protecting and enhancing waterways and their riverbanks.
HB092	Hibiscus & Bays			Community Infrastructure - Community infrastructure such as schools needs to be integrated with land use changes, as with physical infrastructure.
HB093	Hibiscus & Bays			It is understood that residential intensification will involve some intensification of schools, but additional schools are also required.
HB094	Hibiscus & Bays			Rural Greenbelts - Structure planning for greenfields development should include policy direction to consciously establish long-term greenbelts between settlements, comprised of public open space in combination with privately owned land incentivised for environmental protection and improvement.
HB095	Hibiscus & Bays			Rural productive land use and/or countryside living are not sufficient for long-term maintenance of greenbelts.
HB096	Hibiscus & Bays			Transferable Development Rights - Transferable development rights (TOR) are proposed to continue to be available in Redvale, Wainui and Stillwater Countryside Living receiver areas.
HB097	Hibiscus & Bays			This is not supported in the Hibiscus and Bays parts of these areas as it is considered that this further intensification would compromise rural character, including the Northwest Wildlink area and the coastal surroundings of Hatfields Beach.
HB098	Hibiscus & Bays			Okura Lot Sizes - The proposed draft Unitary Plan lot sizes of 2ha across Okura in the Countryside living is not supported.
HB099	Hibiscus & Bays			Currently Okura West has a 2ha average minimum and 5000m2 minimum area, and Okura East has a 4ha minimum area. These site area controls, and supporting building site locations, resulted from Environment Court consideration of the marine receiving environment and visual landscape values.
HB100	Hibiscus & Bays			Water Quality - Controls on land disturbance activities that can create sediment discharge issues are supported, as are the interim water quality limits and targets.
HB101	Hibiscus & Bays			The proposal to require landowners to prevent grazing from watercourses where practicable is supported.
HB102	Hibiscus & Bays			Water Quantity - Protection of floodplains and overland flowpaths from the negative effects of development and infrastructure is supported, as is the provision of clear requirements for stormwater neutrality.
HB103	Hibiscus & Bays			long Bay Okura Environments - Specific natural environment protections were created within the Okura and Long Bay Structure Plans. These should be re-instated.
HB104	Hibiscus & Bays			Long Bay Environment Court case established ridgeline boundaries, specified viewpoints, earthworks limits and building height limits, which are partly referenced in the precinct plan rules, but do not rank as Outstanding Natural Landscapes, as do the adjoining headland cliffs.
HB105	Hibiscus & Bays			Wi/dlink Policy - The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board would support protection of the important ecological areas of the Northwest Wildlink, Long Bay Marine Reserve and Centennial Park
HB106	Hibiscus & Bays			The latter two have protection, but the Northwest Wildlink could be better supported by policies recognising its overlay function.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
HB107	Hibiscus & Bays			Infrastructure Timing - There is a need for policies to ensure that additional development potential provided by the Unitary Plan is not uplifted before provision is made for all necessary infrastructure to accommodate increased population, including transport, water, wastewater, stormwater and community and social infrastructure (including new schools and medical facilities).
HB108	Hibiscus & Bays			This is likely to require more detailed staging plans, for development and infrastructure, preferably integrated with Area Plans and Precinct planning (including structure plans).
HB109	Hibiscus & Bays			Infrastructure Funding - It is noted that feedback from major infrastructure providers also expresses some concern that the Unitary Plan is providing additional development opportunities on such an extensive scale that infrastructure may not be able to respond efficiently, and may not be adequately funded.
HB110	Hibiscus & Bays			Infrastructure planning needs to support proposed land uses and growth
HB111	Hibiscus & Bays			Much infrastructure planning and funding is not covered within the Unitary Plan, but the Unitary Plan can and should provide control of the physical extent and rate of land use change.
HB112	Hibiscus & Bays			Adequate funding needs to be provided for all public infrastructure, whether through the Unitary Plan or other instruments.
HB113	Hibiscus & Bays			Infrastructure asset capacity and performance needs to be known and monitored, to inform development and planning processes.
HB114	Hibiscus & Bays			Infrastructure Integration - Transport and other infrastructure needs to be integrated with land use, through the RUB location and programming, structure plans and Area Plans and detailed Precinct planning, and with subdivision and development.
HB115	Hibiscus & Bays			The draft Unitary Plan provides such a wide range of development opportunities that coordination of development with infrastructure services becomes very complex. There needs to be a process for aligning the timing of area development with planned and funded network upgrades.
HB116	Hibiscus & Bays			Subdivision policies and rules require services to be provided, but much development can occur without, or prior to, subdivision.
HB117	Hibiscus & Bays			The alternative would be unplanned and indeterminate delays, or non-complying (currently proposed as discretionary) activity status for development where services have insufficient capacity (as requested in Watercare feedback).
HB118	Hibiscus & Bays			Future Roads - 'Indicative roads' should be shown in the Unitary Plan as a preferred location for future roads. An example is Curley Avenue in Silverdale.
HB119	Hibiscus & Bays			Car-parking - The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board does not support the draft Unitary Plan approach to maximum car-parking limits in Centres, Mixed Use zones and the Terraced Housing and Apartment Building zone for the Hibiscus and Bays area.
HB120	Hibiscus & Bays			Intensive residential development with inadequate on-site car-parking will increase the use of local parks and reserves for car-parking as well as increase pressure on the street parking required for the functioning of the Town and Local Centres.
HB121	Hibiscus & Bays			These are not city centres or inner city suburbs, and will need a longer transition period before public transport can effectively reduce the need for private cars.
HB122	Hibiscus & Bays			Stormwater - The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board supports the protection of floodplains and overland flowpaths from the negative effects of development.
HB123	Hibiscus & Bays			Clear requirements for stormwater neutrality are supported, for control of stormwater flows, however anyon-site detention tanks should meet good design standards and be unobtrusive or placed underground.
HB124	Hibiscus & Bays			Sustainable Building - The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board supports the draft Unitary Plan initiatives around sustainable building, although would prefer the approach to be a national initiative rather than simply adopting a scheme that was prepared for voluntary use.
HB125	Hibiscus & Bays			Good Design - Urban design and good development design are essential to the creation of a high quality built environment.
HB126	Hibiscus & Bays			The draft Unitary Plan initiatives, in policy and assessment criteria, are supported, although the Auckland Design Manual should be adapted to give it greater statutory weight within the Unitary Plan.
HB127	Hibiscus & Bays			Historic Heritage - The proposal to make repair and maintenance of historic heritage buildings a permitted activity is supported.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
HB128	Hibiscus & Bays			Prohibition of the demolition of Council-owned Category A historic heritage buildings is not supported unless the Council is prepared to fund repairs and maintenance.
HB129	Hibiscus & Bays			The proposal that all other works require resource consent is supported.
HB130	Hibiscus & Bays			The blanket protection of pre-1940s buildings is not supported.
HB131	Hibiscus & Bays			The only area of Hibiscus and Bays affected by these provisions is an older area of Red Beach. If it is to be maintained, the supporting research should occur before the blanket control is applied.
HB132	Hibiscus & Bays			E-plan - The electronic version of the draft Unitary Plan was able to cope with the complex array of information it was required to hold. However, the accessibility of that information to the public was significantly constrained as many people in the Hibiscus and Bays area do not or cannot use the internet to access this type of information.
HB133	Hibiscus & Bays			The Unitary Plan, when it is notified, will need to be supported by better accessibility through printed documents, and better search ability in relation to areas as well as individual sites.
HB134	Hibiscus & Bays			Plan Timing & Effect - The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board is aware of a substantial community preference, expressed in the public feedback and directly to the Board, for the Unitary Plan preparation to slow down. There needs to be more time for adequate research, careful testing of policy proposals and more robust justification for changes.
HB135	Hibiscus & Bays			At the risk of some pre-emptive resource consents and certificates of compliance, this at least means the Unitary Plan should not have effect from the time it is notified. That should occur after the hearings and decision-making process. Due consideration should be had to the feedback received during the public engagement stage of the draft Unitary Plan, prior to notification occurring.
HB136	Hibiscus & Bays			Special Housing Areas - The likely impacts of the Special Housing Area legislation on the Unitary Plan are still not well understood.
HB137	Hibiscus & Bays			However, it must be seen as capable of overriding the structure planning and RUB processes, in enabling the development of land for housing where it can be serviced.
HB138	Hibiscus & Bays			One consequence of this could be the loss of land that is currently proposed for business activity.
HB139	Hibiscus & Bays			Another is the lack of time for the design of integration of new housing areas with existing communities and their infrastructure.
HB140	Hibiscus & Bays			SHAs could occur in locations not previously considered for intensification.
HB141	Hibiscus & Bays			The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board requests that they be included in the Council's decision-making processes for identifying and confirming Special Housing Areas.
HB142	Hibiscus & Bays			Hibiscus and Bays Local Board participated in the Mapping Workshop with the Auckland Plan Committee on 12 July. The discussions on detailed mapping changes proposed at that workshop are considered to have addressed known mapping errors and inconsistencies.
HB143	Hibiscus & Bays			The Area Plan will be implemented by the further changes to convert draft Mixed Housing zones to Mixed Housing B and the Terraced Housing and Apartment Building zones to Mixed Housing A.
H001	Howick	General		That the Howick Local Board: a) Provides the following feedback on the draft Unitary Plan to inform discussions with the Auckland Plan Committee in July 2013 and decision-making by the Auckland Plan Committee in August 2013.
H002	Howick	General		b) acknowledges the general approach to the development of one Unitary Plan for Auckland with a variable approach to zones, overlays and precincts to recognize the nature of physical characteristics of the local areas.
H003	Howick	Coastal		c) proposes growth that is in keeping with the suburban character of our area, biodiversity and sensitive coastal amenity and this should be reinforced in objectives set for the area and its precincts and rules for the protection of the coastal environment.
H004	Howick	Infrastructure		d) proposes that the planning and development of infrastructure must be aligned with intensification, particularly around development nodes eg: town and metropolitan centres, and where there is inadequate infrastructure in existing areas. This was a key issue raised by the community during the consultation process, in particular roading and stormwater.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
H005	Howick	Residential		e) Recommends that some of the residential zones, namely the Mixed Housing Zone (MHZ), Single House Zone (SHZ), be reassessed, including looking at the option to split the MHZ into two zones, inner (A) and outer (B) with the inner (A) being restricted to 200m from main arterial routes and the outer MHZ having the same rules that currently exist in the main residential zone in the legacy (Manukau) District Plan. However our preference would be for the MHZ as it is proposed to be restricted (as above) to within 200m of main arterial routes and for the left over area of MHZ and the SHZ to be zoned as Main Residential reflecting the rules of the current Manukau District Plan. (Note that these rules allow for a higher level of intensification (1:300 or 1:400) than what is proposed in the SHZ.)
H006	Howick	Rezoning requests		f) Supports the overall need for growth in line with the Auckland Plan direction, however the Howick Local Board recommend these re-zoning proposals for the Pakuranga Town Centre and surrounding area as set out on the attached map (Attachment B) as follows:
H007	Howick	Rezoning requests		(i) Mixed Housing Zone be applied to the whole of the Pakuranga peninsula coastal area, along the corridors and including the coastal edges; the inner MHZ (A) be applied along a 200m boundary either side of Pakuranga Road and Ti Rakau Drive with the remainder of the area to be zoned either a outer/ main residential zone [similar to Manukau legacy plan provisions].
H008	Howick	Rezoning requests		(ii) no Single House zone be applied to the area.
H009	Howick	Rezoning requests		(iii) THAB zone is concentrated along the corridors of Pakuranga Road, Ti Rakau Drive and Reeves Road up to and including Millen Avenue on Pakuranga Road on the south side and up to Williams Avenue on the north side and on Ti Rakau Drive, as far as Chevis Place and should extend to Lewis Road by Reeves Road, all of which are within 500m walking distance of the Town Centre.
H010	Howick	Rezoning requests		(vi) the height of THAB zone is supported as 4 storeys, regardless of the proximity to the Town Centre.
H011	Howick	Rezoning requests		(iv) Mixed Use Zone be applied to sites within 250m of the town centre, including those sites to the north of Pakuranga Road and to sites that front the Reeves Road flyover
H012	Howick	Rezoning requests		(v) Mixed Use zone around the Town Centre ranges in height from 3 storeys (Pakuranga Road) and 4 storeys (Ti Rakau and William Roberts Road). A precinct overlay to give the effect to these heights is essential.
H013	Howick	Rezoning requests		(vi) supports the expansion of the Town Centre Zone itself to balance and accommodate future "centre growth", with the zone expanded to include Cortina Place and the NW side of William Roberts Road, north of Reeves Road.
H014	Howick	Business		(vii) supports an increase in height of Pakuranga Town Centre up to 12 storeys.
H015	Howick	Residential		g) Recommends that the integration between residential zones needs further consideration and planning to ensure a gradual transition between zones. The draft Unitary Plan must provide for a good interface between residential and other zones to ensure good buffering occurs between zones.
H016	Howick	Quality Design		h) Recommends that there is an emphasis on building quality and design and sustainable design methods for all residential zones.
H017	Howick	Residential		i) Recommends that there is further investigation on minimum dwelling sizes in all residential zones with support to increase the minimum dwelling size in the inner MHZ (A).
H018	Howick	Business		j) Recommends that the height controls in business centres are generally supported with variations in heights suggested to take in account local considerations such as Pakuranga Town Centre and Howick Village.
H019	Howick	Quality Design		k) Recommends that as with residential developments, precinct planning in all business areas is required to ensure good urban design and sustainable outcomes.
H020	Howick	Heritage and Historic Character		l) Supports the preservation of significant historic heritage places and endorses the assessment of additional sites. A list of priority sites in the Howick Ward is attached to the report (Attachment D – Confidential) for nomination by the council to ensure the continuation and preservation of heritage features and buildings for our future generations.
H021	Howick	Natural Environment		m) Recommends that particular attention is given to storm water infrastructure to identify existing areas (streets) and in particular areas identified for intensification, which are affected and poorly serviced.
H022	Howick	Natural Environment		n) Urges that the Council adopts a robust, pragmatic and more Local Board focused approach when applying its recently proposed regional criteria for scheduling notable trees. The Howick Local Board requests that the list of significant trees and groups of trees located within the Howick Ward, nominated by various individuals and organisations attached to the report (Attachment F) be evaluated by Auckland Council for scheduling as Notable Trees of Auckland.
H023	Howick	Precincts		o) Recommends that Plan Change 20 relating to the Ormiston/Flatbush area be fully incorporated as a precinct to include all the provisions of that plan change into the draft Unitary Plan, as this plan change was only very recently adopted with great support and with no appeals to the Environment Court. In addition the subdivision is ready to go and a change would slow down the supply of housing.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
H024	Howick	Area Plans		p) Recommends that the resources required to develop the Howick Village Master Plan be identified and brought forward to ensure that further growth opportunities necessary for the area are evaluated, taking into account the heritage character areas in Howick.
H025	Howick	Area Plans		q) urges council to provide resources to complete other plans (masterplans, precinct plans and area plans), as consultation with the wider community on the draft Pakuranga Masterplan, has been of great assistance to the board to provide detail in this Unitary Plan process.
H026	Howick	Infrastructure		r) would like to be assured that all designations currently within the Manukau District Plan in regards to heritage and environmental sites, notable trees, viewshafts (additional to the volcanic viewshafts) etc. will be transferred in their entirety into the Unitary Plan.
K001	Kaipatiki	General		6. This is an area in which there is two schools of thought within the Board.
K002	Kaipatiki	Growth		7. The Board does support the careful management of all Auckland's growth and providing for a significant portion of this growth within the existing urban area rather than indiscriminate peripheral expansion of Auckland.
K003	Kaipatiki	Growth		8. There are two basic trains of thought within the Board on how best to manage this through the Unitary Plan.
K004	Kaipatiki	Growth		• Providing for 60-70% of Auckland's growth through intensification and 30-40% through peripheral expansion.
K005	Kaipatiki	Growth		• Providing for a 20-30 year horizon within the Unitary Plan for that growth.
K006	Kaipatiki	Growth		• Carefully focussing growth around town centres, major public transport corridors and employment areas.
K007	Kaipatiki	Growth		• Providing the largest concentration of growth around the CBD but providing for key growth nodes throughout the region.
K008	Kaipatiki	Growth		• Providing for growth in carefully focused zoned areas.
K009	Kaipatiki	Growth		10. The second train of thought proposes a different approach to growth management, namely:
K010	Kaipatiki	Growth		• That growth areas be staged and released on an "as needed" basis reflecting actual population growth.
K011	Kaipatiki	Growth		• That the first and initial focus of growth be the CBD and areas around the CBD.
K012	Kaipatiki	Growth		• That there be targeted areas for growth throughout the region reflecting local circumstance and community ownership.
K013	Kaipatiki	Growth		• That these growth areas provide only for the foreseeable required growth and that further growth areas be added over time as demand arises.
K014	Kaipatiki	General		11. The Board supports the principle that physical and social infrastructure needs to be aligned to growth areas. Clearly issues such as water, wastewater, transport, schools, parks and community facilities need to be in place concurrent with the provision of growth and able to service the new or expanded communities.
K015	Kaipatiki	General		12. The Council needs to ensure a partnership with central government over the provision of key central government services, particularly education and health.
K016	Kaipatiki	Growth		13. While new growth areas are subject to structure planning and the framework plan process set out in the Unitary Plan, there is less structure around how growth is managed in existing areas. The precinct plan approach put forward in the Unitary Plan is supported. This holistic planning approach is seen as an important component of providing for significant growth areas within established communities.
K017	Kaipatiki	Growth		14. A recognition that planning for growth and infrastructure needs to proceed as a single holistic approach.
K018	Kaipatiki	Growth		15. Quality is a key principle that should underpin the growth management strategy.
K019	Kaipatiki	Quality Design		16. Kaipatiki Local Board fully supports the urban design approach set out in the plan. We recognise that the Auckland Design Manual is a document to help promote high quality design in development. The Board's view is that the assessment criteria within the Unitary Plan should be strengthened to give greater emphasis to urban design and to incentivise developments undertaken in accordance with the Auckland Design Manual.
K020	Kaipatiki	Quality Design		17. The Board's requests that all developments of four or more units should be subject to urban design evaluation.
K021	Kaipatiki	Quality Design		18. The Board notes that the consequence of this is that the built environment team needs to be resourced to provide sufficient capacity to undertake these assessments.
K022	Kaipatiki	Residential		19. The Board supports the feedback which requests the splitting of the Terrace House and Apartment Building Zone (THAB) into two zones; one focused on apartment development and one focused on terrace housing.
K023	Kaipatiki	Residential		20. The two different housing typologies have different characteristics. In particular height for terrace housing is typically 2-3 levels with a maximum three storeys. Height for apartments is obviously more variable, but typically 4 or more levels.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
K024	Kaipatiki	Rezoning requests		21. There are significant parts of the THAB zone that have been applied in Kaipatiki which would not be suitable in the Board's view for apartment development but may be suitable for a range of typologies including terrace housing.
K025	Kaipatiki	Rezoning requests		22. Later in this submission the Board deals with the specific allocation of zones to particular properties.
K026	Kaipatiki	Residential		23. The Board supports the recent proposal that developments which exceed the permitted height of the new split zones should be subject to the normal RMA tests as relates to notification. The presumption that significant additional height can be achieved without an assessment of whether neighbours are affected is opposed by the Board. The provisions within the original draft unitary plan could end up with significant developments in residential areas which have a detrimental impact on the community.
K027	Kaipatiki	Residential		24. However, once the zones is split into two zones with different heights, then dealing with excess height through the normal RMA notification assessment process is appropriate and supported by the Board.
K028	Kaipatiki	Residential		25. The Board also supports the proposal to split the Mixed Housing Zone into two zones; one at two levels with fixed density controls and one at three levels which allows appropriate flexibility where quality design is achieved.
K029	Kaipatiki	Rezoning requests		26. The vast majority of Kaipatiki is zoned for mixed housing. The cumulative effect of this zone being able to go to three storeys as a restricted discretionary activity and to have density concessions on large sites would mean that over time the nature of the Kaipatiki residential areas would change.
K030	Kaipatiki	Residential		27. The current proposal to split the zone into two being a two level and a three level zones offers an appropriate balance between providing for growth within Auckland, and retaining the character and nature of current residential areas. It also gives people choice as to the areas they want to live in.
K031	Kaipatiki	Residential		28. The same comments around notification outlined under the terrace house notification outlined above for the THAB Zone equally applies in this Mixed Housing Zone, i.e. having split the Mixed Housing Zone into two zones with variable height and density controls, then proposals that exceed that the height controls should be subject to the normal notification tests under the RMA.
K032	Kaipatiki	Residential		29. There was a proposal to the Auckland Plan Committee that the splitting of the mixed housing zone would allow suitable areas of single dwelling housing to be rezoned mixed housing. The Board does not support further expansion of a split mixed housing zone into the single dwelling zone. The single dwelling zones in Kaipatiki are appropriate and should be retained.
K033	Kaipatiki	Residential		30. The Board supports the single family housing zone provisions.
K034	Kaipatiki	Heritage and Historic Character		31. Critical to the Kaipatiki area is the heritage overlay which applies to a significant number of heritage buildings particularly in the Birkenhead Point and Northcote Point areas.
K035	Kaipatiki	Heritage and Historic Character		32. These areas are already protected under the Residential 3 zoning of the North Shore District Plan.
K036	Kaipatiki	Heritage and Historic Character		33. The Board supports their continued protection through the overlay technique in the Draft Unitary Plan.
K037	Kaipatiki	Heritage and Historic Character		34. The Draft Unitary Plan makes it clear that the overlay has greater weight than the underlying zoning. The Board supports this as the overlay does provide the heritage protection the Board seeks for these areas. If for any reason through the Unitary Plan feedback process, the presumption of the overlay having dominant effect is reversed; then the Board would want a special heritage zone applied to these areas.
K038	Kaipatiki	Residential		35. Kaipatiki wants to highlight two additional development controls.
K039	Kaipatiki	Residential		36. The Board considers the 30m ² minimum apartment size to be too small. It seeks that the minimum apartment size be increased to 40m ² excluding any balcony.
K040	Kaipatiki	Residential		37. The Board believes 30m ² is too small a unit for permanent residential accommodation.
K041	Kaipatiki	Residential		38. The Board supports the notion of "height in relation to boundary" setbacks of THAB zoning against mixed housing zoning and of both all residential zones abutting public open space.
K042	Kaipatiki	Residential		39. These "height in relation to boundary" controls are an important technique to manage the amenity at the interface between parks and residential areas and between the medium and high intensity housing areas.
K043	Kaipatiki	Business		40. The Board supports a broad mix of activities within the town centre zones and the concept of town centres as community hubs. The mix of activities with a focus on retail business, community facilities and residential is supported subject to the urban design and quality controls mentioned elsewhere in this feedback.
K044	Kaipatiki	Business		41. The Board has concerns at the heights proposed for the various town centres.
K045	Kaipatiki	Business		• The Board opposes the eight storey height limit within the Northcote centre. The Board's view is that the height should be six storeys within the core of Northcote reducing to four storeys on the periphery of the town centre zone.
K046	Kaipatiki	Business		• This scale of development would still provide for mixed use development within Northcote and provide for reasonable growth. However it would remove the opportunity for excessive height and the impact 8 storey development could have on adjacent residential areas.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
K047	Kaipatiki	Business		• The Board opposes the blanket six level height of the Birkenhead town centre and rather supports a graded height control.
K048	Kaipatiki	Business		• Six levels in the core of the centre is workable but the maximum height east of Birkenhead Avenue and south-west of Mokoia Road should be four levels and the maximum height on the north-eastern side of Mokoia Road and the western side of Birkenhead Avenue should be four storeys for an appropriate setback to retain the character of these main streets.
K049	Kaipatiki	Business		• The maximum height of the Glenfield centre at six levels is appropriate on the mall site but the main street should have a four level height.
K050	Kaipatiki	Rezoning requests		42. The Board requests that the Link Drive area be zoned mixed use. Link Drive is zoned light industrial as is the whole of the Wairau Valley. However the reality is that Link Drive is a long-established mixed use precinct with significant retail activity. There is virtually no light industrial activity per se with retail, trade showrooms, entertainment and bulk retail being the dominant uses within the area.
K051	Kaipatiki	Rezoning requests		43. The zoning should reflect this reality.
K052	Kaipatiki	Rezoning requests		44. In addition, the area with its proximity to the bus way and the variety of uses, lends itself well to mixed use development with some residential activities.
K053	Kaipatiki	Rezoning requests		45. The Board supports the remainder of the Wairau Valley (apart from Link Drive) being zoned for light industry. That zone reflects the current broad range of general business and employment activities. Wairau Valley is the single biggest employment node within Kaipatiki and a critical element of the economic development strategy for the board area. An enabling zoning is critical.
K054	Kaipatiki	Natural Environment		46. There are a number of submissions to the Significant Ecological Areas (SEA) within Kaipatiki.
K055	Kaipatiki	Natural Environment		47. The Board fully supports the SEA approach. Part of the unique character of Kaipatiki is the bush clad valleys and the residential areas which back down into these important ecological and amenity areas.
K056	Kaipatiki	Natural Environment		48. These SEA bush areas are typically on the rear of private properties which adjoin reserve land. The additional bush area enhances the reserves and creates the important interface between the developed residential areas and the bush reserves.
K057	Kaipatiki	Natural Environment		49. The Board's position is therefore that the SEAs should be confirmed and retained.
K058	Kaipatiki	Natural Environment		50. However, the Board also believes the following principles should apply:
K059	Kaipatiki	Natural Environment		(a) A realistic house building platform must be left on each of the properties subject to an SEA together with reasonable space around the buildings.
K060	Kaipatiki	Natural Environment		(b) The protected SEA should be the important ecological areas. The suggestion in some of the feedback is that the boundaries are not sufficiently accurate to distinguish important ecological areas from general vegetation on the periphery of an SEA. This needs to be addressed.
K061	Kaipatiki	Natural Environment		(c) The SEA should allow the formation of tracks, weed management and other appropriate minor activities.
K062	Kaipatiki	Natural Environment		(d) If the SEA is a totally new requirement rather than a rolled over equivalent under the previous district plan, then these matters should be worked through with the relevant property owner.
K063	Kaipatiki	Natural Environment		(e) As property owners are essentially retaining the SEAs for public good reasons, they should not be charged for resource consents for works within the SEA.
K064	Kaipatiki	Natural Environment		51. The Board fully supports the concept of managing earthworks and stormwater run-off to assist in achieving good water quality within our streams and the harbour.
K065	Kaipatiki	Residential		52. The Board supports controlling noise through the Unitary Plan.
K066	Kaipatiki	Residential		53. The Board accepts the need to provide more extensively for night time construction noise. In the Board's view, the control should make it clear that this is limited to temporary short-term construction activities.
K067	Kaipatiki	Parks and Community		54. Provision is made for community facilities within the informal recreation zone.
K068	Kaipatiki	Parks and Community		55. The Board supports this in principle but is concerned at the breadth of activities which are provided for within the definition of community facilities.
K069	Kaipatiki	Parks and Community		56. Community houses, scout dens and low-scale, low- impact activities are normal and expected.
K070	Kaipatiki	Parks and Community		57. Libraries, places of assembly and some of the larger, more significant structures are inappropriate as of right within the information recreation zone.
K071	Kaipatiki	Parks and Community		58. The plan should distinguish between the small scale and large scale activities and provide for these as permitted and discretionary activities appropriately.
K072	Kaipatiki	Coastal		59. The Board fully supports the Unitary Plan provisions that enable removal of mangroves which have encroached into waterways and beach areas.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
K073	Kaipatiki	Coastal		60. The Board however does not support the benchmark for this removal being based on the 1996 mangrove forest. There has been significant encroachment of mangroves prior to the mid 1990's and very good aerial photography prior to that to enable accurate determination of what is encroachment and what isn't.
K074	Kaipatiki	Coastal		61. The Board believes a date based on appropriate photography in the 1970s would be more realistic.
K075	Kaipatiki	Coastal		62. The Board supports the proposal of controlling the location of moorings within the Kaipatiki area.
K076	Kaipatiki	Coastal		63. It also supports the proposition of free anchorage areas throughout the gulf. This is an important part of the recreational opportunities for Aucklanders.
K077	Kaipatiki	Coastal		64. Consequently there needs to be a clear demarcation of designated mooring areas and free anchorage areas. Allowing a small number of moorings in bays which prevents the free anchorage is an element which should be avoided.
K078	Kaipatiki	Heritage and Historic Character		65. The Board supports the overlay which requires resource consent to demolish any building older than 1944
K079	Kaipatiki	Heritage and Historic Character		66. The Board considers that this control should apply to all buildings and not just those in a group of three or more.
K080	Kaipatiki	Rezoning requests		67. The Wairau Road frontage should be zoned for the terrace house zoning in terms of the split THAB zone, The Wairau Road frontage should be zoned for the terrace house zoning in terms of the split THAB zone rather than apartments.
K081	Kaipatiki	Rezoning requests		68. The side streets and cul de sacs off this area should be zoned for mixed housing.
K082	Kaipatiki	Rezoning requests		69. Chatswood Estate is subject to covenants which limit development of these properties to one house per site. The zoning should reflect this fact.
K083	Kaipatiki	Rezoning requests		70. This area should be zoned for single dwellings.
K084	Kaipatiki	Rezoning requests		71. The Mokoia Road frontage should be zoned for the terrace house zoning in terms of the split THAB zone, rather than apartments.
K085	Kaipatiki	Rezoning requests		72. The THAB zone in Onewa Road should be confined to the new terrace house zone and not apartments.
M001	Manurewa	General		a) That the Manurewa Local Board expresses its concern and dissatisfaction about the unavailability of the public feedback provided on the draft Unitary Plan and the Board reserves the right to provide additional formal feedback as and when the public feedback is made available to Board Members.
M002	Manurewa	General		b) That the Manurewa Local Board provides the following feedback on the draft Unitary Plan to inform discussions with the Auckland Plan Committee in July 2013 and decision-making by the Auckland Plan Committee in August 2013.
M003	Manurewa	General		A. i) That the Manurewa Local Board endorses the general approach of one Unitary Plan for Auckland with a consistent approach to zones and overlays across the region.
M004	Manurewa	General		ii) However, the Board strongly opposes the speed in which the plan has been drafted and feels that a less rushed process would have enabled a better quality Unitary Plan.
M005	Manurewa	General		iii) The Manurewa Local Board believes that more work should be done before the Plan is ready for notification and the Board is looking forward to a constructive dialogue with the Auckland Plan Committee on this.
M006	Manurewa	Growth		B. i) The Board acknowledges that the Unitary Plan will give effect to the growth and development requirements of the Auckland Plan. However, the Board questions the overall assumptions that are underpinning the growth scenarios.
M007	Manurewa	Growth		ii) The Manurewa Local Board strongly feels that regional Brownfield development should be prioritized and encouraged where possible, to ensure effective use of land.
M008	Manurewa	Growth		iii) The Board would like to emphasize that Greenfield developments should be master planned in order to ensure that comprehensive development occurs.
M009	Manurewa	Growth		iv) The Board feels that the Unitary Plan should have a number of triggers in place before additional development potential by the Plan is unlocked, including:
M010	Manurewa	Infrastructure		a. all necessary infrastructure to handle an increase in population (including transport, water, wastewater and social infrastructure) is in place before new development is permitted;
M011	Manurewa	Precincts		b. undertaking of good area and precinct planning to ensure development does not occur in an ad hoc manner.
M012	Manurewa	Infrastructure		C. i) The Board has a general concern linked to the lack of infrastructure provision, for example ageing of infrastructure and its capacity, such as stormwater, schools and the provision of open space. Moreover, the planned housing developments in both the Weymouth area and the Manukau Golf Club will put extra pressure on the existing infrastructure.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
M013	Manurewa	Transport		ii) The Board is concerned about transport issues in general and feels that Auckland Council should have worked more closely with Auckland Transport to address those issues while developing the draft Unitary Plan.
M014	Manurewa	Quality Design		iv) The Manurewa Local Board strongly supports a design led and place based approach. The Board therefore feels that the urban design guidelines should be an integral part of the criteria for design assessment for all developments including 1 to 4 units.
M015	Manurewa	Area Plans		v) The development of area plans must be given a high priority to ensure that planning provisions are appropriate and well planned at the local level. Until area plans are completed, the Unitary Plan should adopt an interim approach designed to avoid unintended outcomes.
M016	Manurewa	Area Plans		vi) The Manurewa Local Board feels that the area plans for the Papakura-Manurewa Ward should be developed at the same time and as soon as possible.
M017	Manurewa	All zones		D. i) The proposal for six residential zones is generally supported. However, the Board feels that the integration between zones needs further consideration and planning to ensure a gradual transition between the different zones. The Board welcomes the inclusion of the mixed housing zones 1 and 2.
M018	Manurewa	Residential		ii) The Manurewa Local Board does not support the proposed height limits for the Terraced Housing and Apartment Building Zone (THABZ). The Board feels that 4 stories would be more appropriate for the Manurewa area instead of the 6 stories in the draft plan.
M019	Manurewa	Residential		iii) The proposed height limits for the Mixed Housing Zones is supported by the Board.
M020	Manurewa	Residential		iv) The removal of density controls for mixed housing developments with four units or more is supported, provided that a high quality of design and level of amenity is met.
M021	Manurewa	Residential		v) The Manurewa Local Board is of the view that accessory units should be provided for as a permitted activity, noting that good design outcomes will still be required for these buildings.
M022	Manurewa	Business		E. i) The Manurewa Local Board strongly supports the restrictions on out-of-zone retailing.
M023	Manurewa	Business		ii) The Board requests that officers ensure sufficient buffering is provided between business and residential interfaces.
M024	Manurewa	Business		iii) The aim should be that all heavy industry should be at least 500 metres away from residential properties.
M025	Manurewa	Business		iv) The Board is concerned about the proposed heights of the town centre for Manurewa and feels that 8 storeys is too high and not consistent with other town centres alongside the Great South Road. The Board is of the view that 6 storeys would be a better fit for the Manurewa town centre.
M026	Manurewa	Area Plans		v) The Board believes that a Ward area plan is required to ensure good urban design outcomes.
M027	Manurewa	Heritage and Historic Character		F. i) The Manurewa Local Board supports heritage protection, but signals the lack of clarity as to how heritage buildings will marry with intensified development.
M028	Manurewa	Heritage and Historic Character		ii) The Board would like to see an audit of all heritage sites in the Manurewa area and the retention of all heritage items protected under the current operative district plan to be carried forward into the Unitary Plan.
M029	Manurewa	Heritage and Historic Character		iii) Create suitable development controls to adjoining areas to protect views to Hillpark including a transition zone around the Hillpark footprint.
M030	Manurewa	Heritage and Historic Character		iv) The Board generally supports the 1944 provisions however an approach to post-1944 buildings seems to be missing.
M031	Manurewa	Heritage and Historic Character		v) The approach of requiring Restricted Discretionary Activity resource consent for demolition, additions and alterations, new buildings and subdivisions is supported by the Board. The Board is of the view that resource consent applications should be fully notified.
M032	Manurewa	Heritage and Historic Character		vi) The Board supports the proposal to make repair and maintenance of historic heritage buildings a permitted activity.
M033	Manurewa	Heritage and Historic Character		vii) The proposal to prohibit demolition of Category A historic heritage buildings is supported.
M034	Manurewa	Heritage and Historic Character		viii) That the Manurewa Local Board protect the overall character of Hillpark by supporting the creation of a character overlay that protects the original pattern of subdivision and acknowledges the significance of both the built heritage and the abundance of native trees and wildlife.
M035	Manurewa	Viewshafts		ix) The Manurewa Local Board strongly supports the protection of volcanic viewshafts with any applications for infringement of the controls subject to full notification. The Board would therefore like to see Matukutureia (or McLaughlin's Mountain) included in the list of protected volcanic view shafts as volcanoes play an important role in the heritage and history of Manurewa.
M036	Manurewa	Parks and Community		G. i) The Board supports controls that encourage the preservation and enhanced provision of green corridors and open space.
M037	Manurewa	Heritage and Historic Character		ii) That the Manurewa Local Board advocate for the protection and enhancement of the ecological corridor through Hillpark to Mill Road.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
M038	Manurewa	Natural Environment		iii) That the Manurewa Local Board recommends that the Significant Ecological Area designation (S.E.A.), proposed for many individual sites in Hillpark, be designated for the entire Hillpark area in recognition of, and to protect, the significant remaining natural environment.
M039	Manurewa	Coastal		iv) a. The need for the Unitary Plan policy and methods to be more directive on the cultural, social and economic wellbeing benefits attributed to the Manukau Harbour including its role in supporting live, work and play concepts;
M040	Manurewa	Natural Environment		b. The requirement for strong outcomes about improving water quality;
M041	Manurewa	Coastal		c. Appropriate management frameworks for pacific oyster and mangrove removal and harbour channel and port dredging requirements;
M042	Manurewa	Coastal		d. Protection of wharf and port facilities and ensure future cross harbour transport linkages are not compromised.
M043	Manurewa	Natural Environment		v) The Manurewa Local Board supports the separate submission of the Waitakere Ranges Local Board in regard to genetically modified organisms (GMO). In particular the Board supports a precautionary policy being added to the Unitary Plan controlling the trial and release of GMO.
M044	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		H. a. The Board rejects the up-zoning of both Wiri and the Ratavine area from Mixed Housing Zone to THAB zone. The Ratavine area has natural springs crossing it making it prone to flooding, which with other factors, like the proximity of both areas to SH1 and SH20, makes these areas unhealthy and unsuitable locations for future residential development. The Board would therefore like to see both areas zoned as mixed housing.
M045	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		b. Zoning Wattle Downs, Weymouth and Clendon residential area – part of the area is currently zoned as mixed housing. The Board would like to see a down zoning of this area to single housing. Rationale behind this is that the Weymouth/Clendon area is currently dealing with a lot of social issues. The Board feels that intensification of these areas will lead to more social issues and therefore opposes the proposed mixed housing zone.
M046	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		c. Zoning around Te Mahia train station – Te Mahia station is currently underutilised and Auckland Transport is proposing to close down the station. However, the Board feels that with the new developments going in at the Manukau Golf Course, Weymouth and Wattle Downs it will become more popular and attract more passengers. The Board sees a potential to develop the area around Te Mahia station. The Board therefore would like to re-zone the area to a mixed use zone that would attract more businesses.
M047	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		d. Zoning around Homai train station – The Boards wants the housing zones changed to incorporate THABs, mixed housing and mixed use development.
M048	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		e. Land next to the Vodafone events centre – The Board is aware that the land is zoned business 5 and is extremely interested in its future use. The Board must be involved in the future development of the site from the beginning due it its significant impact on the area. Any rezoning of this land must be in consultation with the Board as part of the local place shape making delegation.
M049	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		f. THAB zone around the Clendon shopping centre – The area around the Clendon shopping centre is in the draft Plan zoned as THAB. The Manurewa Local Board feels that the THAB zone does no justice to the surrounding residential area and would like to see it down zoned.
M050	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		g. Balfour Road Reserve – Roading should be informal recreation. This reserve is a listed Parks asset and maintained by Parks.
M051	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		h. Beihlers Road Esplanade – Heritage zone should be changed to Informal Recreation. Beihlers Road Esplanade is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M052	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		i. Beihlers Road Foreshore - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. Beihlers Road Foreshore is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M053	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		j. Blackgate Reserve - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. Blackgate Reserve stream is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting with the possibility of concrete channel removal. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M054	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		k. Bluewater Place - Heritage should be Informal Recreation. Bluewater Place Reserve is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values as well as walkway links where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M055	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		l. Burundi Ave Foreshore - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. Burundi Ave Foreshore is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
M056	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		m. Carnoustie Drive Foreshore - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. Carnoustie Drive Foreshore is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M057	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		n. Clendon Community Centre Reserve - Civic and Community zone should be Sport and Active Recreation. This large open space has previously been zoned for community buildings that has prevented it being used for open space & developed. The Manurewa Local Board are looking to develop this site for community use as open space for sport & recreation to cater for the high amount of use and the demand for flat open space areas for youth programming here. The site currently has no playground due to lack of open space & zoning issues but given the amount of use by local youth the need is there.
M058	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		o. Dalgety Drive Reserve - Sport and Active Recreation zone should be Civic and Community. This site is a carpark used to service public transport commuters. Non sporting.
M059	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		p. De Havilland Drive Drainage Reserve - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. Havilland Drainage Reserve is likely to be enhanced in future years enabling an accessway, planting & furniture installation. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M060	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		q. De Havilland Park - Informal Recreation should be Heritage. Bush corridor should be preserved as Heritage.
M061	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		r. Everglade Park - Informal Recreation should be Heritage. Bush corridor should be preserved as Heritage.
M062	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		s. Fairchild Park - Informal Recreation should be Heritage. Bush corridor should be preserved as Heritage.
M063	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		t. Frangipani Ave Reserve - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. Frangipani Ave is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values as well as walkway links where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M064	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		u. Glenross Drive Foreshore - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. Glenross Drive Foreshore is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values as well as walkway links where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M065	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		v. Glenveagh Park Drive Reserve - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. Glenveagh Park Drive Stream is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting to improve ecology of the waterway as well as dry foot access throughout the reserve. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts these activities.
M066	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		w. Greers Road Foreshore - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. Greers Road Foreshore is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values as well as walkway links where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M067	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		x. Hanford Place Reserve - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. Hanford Place Reserve is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M068	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		y. Hazards Road Foreshore - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. Hazards Road Foreshore is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values as well as walkway links where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M069	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		z. Heron Point Reserve - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. Heron Point is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values as well as walkway links along the esplanade strip. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M070	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		aa. Holmes Road - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. Holmes Road is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values as well as walkway links where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M071	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		bb. Kauri Point Reserve - Heritage should be Informal Recreation. Kauri Point Reserve is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values as well as walkway links where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M072	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		cc. Keith Park - MCC District Plan Public Open Space Zone 5 (Esplanade). Keith Park is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M073	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		dd. Laurie Gibbons Park - Informal Recreation zone should be Sport and Active Recreation. Current use is for active sport purposes alongside neighbouring parcels.
M074	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		ee. Mountfort Park - Sports and Active Recreation should be Civic and Community. Manukau City Council District Plan Public Open Space Zone 4. This space needs to represent the community buildings currently in place.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
M075	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		ff. Peretao Rise Reserve - Heritage should be Informal Recreation. Heritage Reserve isn't a good representation of this site. It is divided between native bush and grassed open space & this needs to be reflected on the unitary plan mapping of this site. This open space area has been identified as an ideal location for a neighbourhood playground & there is some great potential to continue the bush corridor linkages.
M076	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		gg. Pitt Ave Foreshore - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. MCC District Plan Public Open Space Zone 5 (Esplanade). Pitt Ave is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for erosion protection. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M077	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		hh. Ratavine stream reserve - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. MCC District Plan Public Open Space Zone 5 (Esplanade). Rata Vine Stream is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting with the possibility of concrete channel removal. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M078	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		ii. St Annes Foreshore - Heritage should be Informal Recreation. MCC District Plan Public Open Space Zone 5 (Esplanade). St Annes Foreshore is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values as well as walkway links where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M079	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		jj. Totara Park - Informal Recreation zone should be Heritage. Additional bush corridor has been planted in the last few years. The portions outlined on the map need to be included within the main bush heritage zone at the southern end of the park.
M080	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		kk. Trimdon Street Reserve - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. MCC District Plan Public Open Space Zone 5 (Esplanade). Papakura Stream is likely to be enhanced in future years enabling an accessway & planting to enhance the stream quality. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M081	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		ll. Volante Park - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. MCC District Plan Public Open Space Zone 5 (Esplanade). Volante Park is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting as well as walkway links where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M082	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		mm. Wattle Downs Esplanade Reserve - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. MCC District Plan Public Open Space Zone 5 (Esplanade). Wattle Downs Esplanade is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values as well as walkway links where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M083	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		nn. Wattle Farm Pond Reserve - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. MCC District Plan Public Open Space Zone 5 (Esplanade). Wattle Farm Ponds Reserve is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting as well as walkway links where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M084	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		oo. Weymouth Foreshore - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. MCC District Plan Public Open Space Zone 5 (Esplanade). Weymouth Foreshore is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting for both erosion and amenity values as well as walkway links where required. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M085	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		pp. Wiri Stream Reserve - Heritage zone should be Informal Recreation. MCC District Plan Public Open Space Zone 5 (Esplanade). Wiri Stream is likely to be enhanced in future years with planting with the possibility of concrete channel removal. Heritage is not appropriate as it greatly restricts this type of activity.
M086	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		qq. Zoning Maich Road area - From Local Centre should be changed to Town Centre.
M087	Manurewa	Rezoning requests		rr. Zoning Randwick area - Mixed Housing Zone should be Single House Zone.
MO001	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	General		a) On the general approach to the development of the Unitary Plan: i) That the Local Board endorses the general approach to the development of the Unitary Plan
MO002	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	General		b) i) The Local Board supports the interim directions set by the resolutions of the Auckland Plan Committee on 2 July 2013, relating to the Unitary Plan
MO003	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	Quality Design		c) i) That strong urban design controls are established and monitored along-side the planned growth and intensification.
MO004	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	Quality Design		ii) That processes be developed to reduce non-compliance with the requirements of the Auckland Design Manual. The board recommends a "design prescriptors" approach to reduce non-compliance.
MO005	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	General		d) i) The board supports the interim directions for the Unitary Plan adopted by the APC at its meeting on 02 July 2013
MO006	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	Quality Design		ii) That quality urban design is as important as increasing availability of a range of housing options
MO007	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	Parks and Community		iii) That green spaces need to be maintained and enhanced in areas marked for growth.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
MO008	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	Residential		iv) That planning and resource consent requirements for boarding houses in the local board area need to limit proliferation and concentration. The proximity of boarding houses have a negative environmental and social impact that require better management through the Unitary Plan regulations.
MO009	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	Precincts		b) i) That there is a priority on precinct plan development for the Town Centres in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu.
MO010	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	Parks and Community		ii) That the distinct and unique characters of the area be enhanced and leveraged for its tourism potential and that plans be developed to establish distinct themes for the centres and unique Pacific character of the area.
MO011	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	Heritage and Historic Character		c) i) That the historic character study currently being undertaken be included in the publically notified version of the draft Unitary Plan;
MO012	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	Heritage and Historic Character		ii) That the recommendations from the historic character study be formally submitted as part of the local board's formal feedback to the Special Consultative Procedure following the formal notification of the draft Unitary Plan
MO013	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	Heritage and Historic Character		iii) That a further study is undertaken to identify, assess and protect built and natural heritage features for those areas outside the scope and area of the current heritage study for Māngere-Ōtāhuhu
MO014	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	Transport		d) i) That all harbours in Auckland should be afforded the same status. The issues across different harbours should be managed consistently.
MO015	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	Growth		e) i) That productive land be protected and growing areas maintained.
MO016	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	General		f) i) That site specific feedback (See section 18) from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board be considered and changes made as part of the proposed Unitary Plan consultation next phase
MT001	Maungakiekie Tamaki	General		b) The Board notes that in addition to the Unitary Plan there are several other strategic documents involved in the delivery of a compact city and supporting the future growth this entails. These include the Long Term Plan, Open Space Acquisition Policy, various asset management policies and strategies, and many others. Importantly these plans involve the delivery of social and physical infrastructure required to support the additional development envisaged in the Unitary Plan. The Council is also in regular ongoing discussions with Central Government in order to ensure sufficient education, health care and social housing is planned for as the region grows. It is important that central government's investment in these areas aligns with future growth.
MT002	Maungakiekie Tamaki	General		c) As the Unitary Plan process progresses to the publicly notified Proposed Unitary Plan stage, the Board is of the view that this phase requires comprehensive and robust engagement with and involvement of the communities of Maungakiekie-Tamaki to ensure further improvement of the Unitary Plan before it becomes operative.
MT003	Maungakiekie Tamaki	Area Plans		d) The Board is of the strong view that the outcomes of the area planning process need to be incorporated into the Unitary Plan before it is made operative. The Board does not support a subsequent plan change to the Unitary Plan to facilitate this. As a result, the Board strongly supports speeding up the area plan process for Maungakiekie-Tamaki.
MT004	Maungakiekie Tamaki	General		e) i) The Local Board endorses the general approach to the development of the Unitary Plan and in particular is supportive of the compact city approach whereby higher densities around town centres, public transport routes, transport nodes and local nodes is promoted. However, in supporting this, the Board considers that strong consideration needs to be given to maintaining amenity values and achieving high quality urban design.
MT005	Maungakiekie Tamaki	Growth		ii) The compact city approach also needs to be balanced against character and heritage outcomes.
MT006	Maungakiekie Tamaki	Quality Design		iii) The Council should also utilise non-regulatory measures to achieve high quality design outcomes along with the Unitary Plan design assessment criteria. These could include, amongst other tools, the use of the Urban Design Panel, the Auckland Design Manual and Auckland Council Property Limited as a catalyst developer, of brown field sites for example.
MT007	Maungakiekie Tamaki	Quality Design		f) i) The Board notes the design controls and criteria within the Unitary Plan that apply to all developments within Town Centres and larger developments in residential zones. The criteria broadly address a number of key concerns that communities have with existing, poorly designed developments, and will be and will be supported by the Auckland Design manual, which the Board recommends be completed and released with urgency. The design assessment criteria address critical design factors, such as:
MT008	Maungakiekie Tamaki	Quality Design		• <input type="checkbox"/> Historic heritage interfaces and relationships;
MT009	Maungakiekie Tamaki	Quality Design		• <input type="checkbox"/> Topography & orientation;
MT010	Maungakiekie Tamaki	Quality Design		• <input type="checkbox"/> Variety of building form;
MT011	Maungakiekie Tamaki	Quality Design		• <input type="checkbox"/> Shading & sunlight;
MT012	Maungakiekie Tamaki	Quality Design		• <input type="checkbox"/> Neighbourhood character; and
MT013	Maungakiekie Tamaki	Quality Design		• <input type="checkbox"/> Parking/servicing design.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
MT014	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Quality Design		ii) The restricted discretionary activity design criteria require the provision of a design statement. The design statement will be important in assessing the design merits of a particular development and its relationship to adjoining buildings and character elements. There is a high level of design detail and scrutiny required in the proposed Unitary Plan provisions and these are supported.
MT015	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Quality Design		There is a high level of design detail and scrutiny existing in the draft Unitary Plan provisions. In particular, the requirement for a design statement that is required to take into account existing neighbourhood context and the requirement to avoid contrasting significantly with the established urban pattern of development, is supported.
MT016	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Quality Design		iii) The Board notes that the restricted activity design criteria and the provision of the design statement far exceeds current provisions for assessment of design and function, and will respond to public concerns regarding design quality of more intensive housing types allowed for under the current district plan rules.
MT017	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Quality Design		iv) The Board also considers that the success of the design based criteria will depend significantly on how Council officers process consent applications and apply the design criteria. This needs to be managed carefully, in order to ensure the high quality design outcomes sought, are achieved.
MT018	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Quality Design		v) The Board supports the establishment of permitted activity design performance standards to require quality design outcomes to for 1-4 unit developments, which are currently not subject to design assessment. The performance standards require certainty in order to make it clear to the public and developers, the design outcomes that need to be achieved.
MT019	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Quality Design		vi) The Board seeks to ensure high quality urban design outcomes are achieved through the assessment criteria within the Unitary Plan. The proposed design controls and criteria within the Unitary Plan that apply to all developments within Town Centres and larger developments in residential zones address all levels of design.
MT020	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Residential		g) i) The Board has received significant feedback on the Mixed Housing Zone and the potential 8m - 10m height allowance. The Board has considered the stepped height proposal from the Council, which suggests splitting the housing zone in two (i.e. A & B). It is suggested that the Mixed Housing A zone be located adjacent to Town Centres and Terraced Housing and Apartment Building (THAB) zones, or areas with good quality public transport access, with a 10m height limit and Mixed Housing B for the remainder of the zone with an 8m height limit. The Board supports this fine grained approach for the zone.
MT021	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Residential		ii) With regard to development control infringements, the Board is of the view that infringements to the maximum height control, height in relation to boundary control and building coverage control should at least require written approvals of potentially affected persons or a limited notified process. For significant infringements of these controls, the Board is of the view that the full public notification option should be open to the Council.
MT022	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Residential		iii) The Board supports the 2.5m front yard control in the Mixed Housing and THAB zones but considers this could be further reduced subject to traffic safety considerations. The rationale for this recommendation is to achieve high quality design outcomes through buildings built closer to the street frontage, thereby achieving quality streetscapes and maximisation of site amenity to the rear.
MT023	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Residential		iv) The Board is of the view that the maximum height of the THAB zone should be five storeys adjacent to town centres which are six storeys (or above), as opposed to the currently proposed six storeys. Further, where adjacent town centre heights are four of five stories, the adjacent THAB zone height should be no more than four stories.
MT024	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Residential		v) The Board notes that demand for single occupant dwellings is rising demonstrably and this demographic is not opposed to higher intensity living. Therefore the 70% ratio for single bedroom units is acceptable in Town Centres, but questions whether this ratio be reduced in the THAB zone. Therefore the Board recommends that the 70% threshold is reduced to 60% 250m from Town Centre. There is more diversity in housing type demand the further one gets away from Town Centres to support this approach. The Board is supportive of provisions that enable a broad range of people to live within society.
MT025	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Residential		vi) Inclusionary zoning - The Board notes there are numerous overseas examples of successful zoning models that require a proportion of affordable housing. The Board supports the selection of one of these and its application to Auckland. To achieve this there needs to be a link with developers of social housing. The Board notes that the ratio of inclusionary zoning needs to be carefully assessed as someone always pays. A balance needs to be struck to ensure it remains an attractive proposition to undertake. When a working group is established the Board would like to have an opportunity to have a representative on this group, as the issue is particularly relevant to Maungakiekie-Tamaki.
MT026	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Rezoning requests		h) i) The Board acknowledges that many submitters have requested minor changes in zoning, and whilst they are not described here, the Board has advocated to officers during mapping workshops on these and that the notified plan process will provide another opportunity to further refine zoning.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
MT027	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Rezoning requests		ii) Grotto Street: Given the heritage character of Grotto St, and the current residential amenity of the surrounding area, the board feels that the Terraced House and Apartment Building zoning is not appropriate in this area and should be realigned so that it is only one block deep along Church Street. The rezoned area should become Mixed Housing A zone as a result of the heritage and character elements around Grotto Street, which is a unique residential enclave of the Local Board area.
MT028	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Heritage and Historic Character		iii) Grey Street North: In terms of the Grey Street North area around Normans Hill Road and Quadrant Road, the Board is of the view that it is important to protect and acknowledge the heritage character of this area and provide a suitable interface between this area and the adjoining residential zones. The heritage overlay work currently being undertaken will determine an appropriate heritage status for this area and this needs to be considered and incorporated within the Unitary Plan.
MT029	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Rezoning requests		iv) State Avenue: In terms of the State Avenue area, the Board considers that the Roosevelt Avenue area is more appropriate for the single house zone because it has a good quality stock of housing, whereas State Avenue between Waitangi Road and Rockfield Road could be zoned Mixed Housing A. Part of the State Avenue area is worthy of a more focused approach in terms of zoning, with the result that only part of that area be kept single housing.
MT030	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Rezoning requests		v) Coral Crescent: The Coral Crescent area is a former Housing NZ area which has been refurbished and is now a reasonable quality, insulated residential location. The Board considers it may be appropriate to change this to Mixed House from Single Housing zone, subject to the Council confirming that there are no particular heritage/character elements that have been the basis for the single house zone in the draft Unitary Plan.
MT031	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Residential		vi) Buffer area - Felix Street, Rockfield Road and Church Street and other similar interfaces. In this area, there do not appear to be sufficient buffer controls in place to manage the amenities of the residents. Complaints of heavy traffic noise (at all hours) and dust have been received. Provisions needs to be made for a suitable separation between residential zones and industrial zones and protection of residential amenities without significantly comprising the viability of industrial activities. The Board is supportive of strong rules that provide this protection.
MT032	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Rezoning requests		vii) Corridor adjacent to Great South Road, One Tree Hill: The Board is of the view that given the considerable traffic issues that exist in this corridor and the potential additional traffic that could result from the THAB zoning that is more appropriate to rezone this area to Mixed Housing.
MT033	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Rezoning requests		viii) Campbell Road, One Tree Hill: The Board is of the view that the north eastern end of Campbell Road is constrained by traffic congestion issues along this part of the corridor. The potential additional traffic that could result from the THAB zoning could possibly exacerbate this issue and therefore it is more appropriate to rezone this area to Mixed Housing.
MT034	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Business		i) i) The Board is of the view that a more sophisticated approach to height within the Town Centres is required. The stepped height approach suggested at Council workshops is supported as this will allow for a more fine grained approach to redevelopment and enable more appropriate height and scale for sensitive parts of each town centre.
MT035	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Quality Design		ii) Town Centre Design Quality - There are design quality rules and thresholds set out in the UP that control design quality. The design assessment criteria require consideration of existing neighbourhood context and the avoidance of contrasting significantly with the established urban pattern of development. The Board supports this approach to design control.
MT036	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Business		iii) Onehunga - The Board is of the view that the resulting height limits for Onehunga need to be consistent with Historic Character rule 4.4.3.3.1 and Figure 2 which restrict height to 12.5m, the height of adjoining buildings and the 6m setback control. Heights must also align with any Volcanic Cone viewshaft height, such that the Unitary Plan shows the most restrictive height limit is each instance. This will provide public confidence in the planning controls and will result in clear consistent rules for both the public and developers. The Board strongly supports a maximum height of six levels for the Onehunga Town Centre, noting that the viewshaft and historic character rules further constrain this height within the centre.
MT037	Maugnakiekie Tamaki	Business		iv) Royal Oak - Royal Oak is currently noted as a large town centre. The Board is of the view that this categorisation overstates the size and importance in the Town Centre hierarchy. The Board strongly supports the reduction in height of this town centre to 6 storeys in consideration of the volcanic cone viewshaft restrictions. As a result the associated THAB height is too high and conflicts with the Height Sensitive areas of the Unitary Plan and should reduced to a maximum height of 5 storeys around the town centre reducing to four storeys on the periphery. Royal Oak has congestion issues, no railway service and is only serviced by buses in terms of public transport. However, the Board notes that Royal Oak most likely has the demand for housing owing to its locational benefits. In achieving a balance between these two drivers, the Board supports the above height limits.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
MT038	Magnakiekie Tamaki	Residential		v) Panmure - The Board is acutely aware of the significant impositions that the Blanket Height Sensitive Area imposes on the Panmure Town Centre and therefore considers that height should be restricted to the Volcanic Cone heights. This centre should be a maximum of six storeys, noting that the blanket height sensitive area will require a finer grain approach.
MT039	Magnakiekie Tamaki	Transport		vi) Parking: The Unitary Plan approach to parking proposes a more sensible approach to parking provision by enabling parking where the market demands it, while also encouraging public transport provision and usage by imposing a maximum parking ratio. The general approach to reduced parking requirements in the Town Centres and THAB zone is supported. The Board further supports the use of non-regulatory tools to better manage parking in town centres and more intensive neighbourhoods, such as resident parking schemes and other tools.
MT040	Magnakiekie Tamaki	Heritage and Historic Character		j) i) The Board is of the view that a more informed approach to historic heritage protection and character protection is required. The heritage elements of Onehunga require specific acknowledgement and protection. At present the Unitary Plan indicates there is an Onehunga Historic Character Area Overlay and Onehunga Historic Business Character Overlay although these have not yet been finalised. The Board is of the view that the outcomes of these assessments need to be incorporated into the Unitary Plan, and that they should result in a corresponding reduction in intensification of those areas identified as having historic character values.
MT041	Magnakiekie Tamaki	Heritage and Historic Character		ii) 1944 Control - The Board notes that the 1944 threshold is blunt tool and a more informed approach to heritage preservation is required. The Board notes that the Onehunga Area is noted as a Historic Character Area and an Historic Character area subject to investigation. It is fundamentally important that the findings of this analysis is adopting into the Proposed Unitary Plan.
MT042	Magnakiekie Tamaki	Viewshafts		k) i) The Board believes that any infringements to the Volcanic Cone Viewshaft control should be assessed as a non-complying activity.
MT043	Magnakiekie Tamaki	Business		ii) The Board strongly supports a single maximum permitted height, whereby the Town Centre height and the blanket height sensitive area height are the same, and this value is developed by applying a fine grain approach. The Board further believes that any infringements of the blanket height sensitive area control around volcanic cones should be a non-complying activity. The Board is concerned that in areas such as Panmure the allowable height can be increased from 8m to 32.5m as a restricted discretionary activity. This approach is also at odds with the Town Centre height. The Board is very concerned that the 8m permitted height may have little bearing on the actual building height that results.
MT044	Magnakiekie Tamaki	Coastal		l) i) Mangroves: The Board is supportive of an approach that allows removal of recently mangroves as a permitted activity. Furthermore the Board remains of the view that only specifically protected areas of mangroves should require resource consent for removal. In support of this it should be a permitted activity to remove mangroves in the General Management Area and restricted discretionary activity in Significant Ecological Area. The Board is also of the view that, in addition to hand held tools, mechanical and electrical tools should also be able to be utilised in mangrove removal. The Board supports an earlier date than 1996 be set provided that good photographic records exist.
MT045	Magnakiekie Tamaki	Coastal		ii) Foreshore Protection - The Board supports the foreshore protection controls within the draft UP and specifically the controls that restrict development in proximity to the foreshore. To this end the yard rules should be clarified to ensure that coastal margins are also included in the lake and riparian yards controls.
MT046	Magnakiekie Tamaki	Business		m) i) Out of Centre Retail: The Board does not support the proliferation of Large Format Retail in the Light Industry or Mixed Use zones as this has the potential to create significant traffic issues and can undermine the role of established town centres and general business zones. In this Mixed Use zone it is a discretionary activity to develop more than 450m ² of retail and the Board is supportive of this increased threshold to deal with these issues. The Board supports Large Format Retail in the General Business zone as is currently provided for in the Draft Unitary Plan.
MT047	Magnakiekie Tamaki	Infrastructure		ii) High Voltage Transmission Lines: The Boards position on High Voltage Transmission Lines is that they should be required to be placed underground, and support an objective being added to the Unitary Plan along these lines. Further, the Board supports the approach to the Corridor Management Strategy and the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission (NPSET) with regard to setbacks from with above ground high voltage transmission lines to make sensitive activities within 12 metres of transmissions lines a restricted discretionary activity, with reasons for objection limited to issues of safety and reasonable access requirements. The Board does not support the additional plan provisions for the outer 20m zone. This approach will satisfy the need for public safety and security of supply whilst recognising and not unduly impinging on private property rights and allowing development to occur.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
O001	Orakei	General		Orakei Local Board – UP Resolutions Process a) That the Orakei Local Board accepts that the plan to consult on a draft, draft Unitary Plan was well intentioned, however the process has proved to be extremely concerning for the Board noting that:
O002	Orakei	general		i. The absence of genuine bottom-up consultation lies at the heart of many of the issues that have been raised in the areas where wide-spread support is not present.
O003	Orakei	general		ii. Examples of best practice consultation around the world, such as Vancouver and Seattle, have been successful because of a more effective consultation approach.
O004	Orakei	General		b) i. Information on the draft Unitary Plan was lacking.
O005	Orakei	General		ii. Information relating to proposed zones or to property details was inaccurate.
O006	Orakei	General		iii. Information was often complex and difficult to understand.
O007	Orakei	General		iv. Information was not comprehensively presented at the public meetings.
O008	Orakei	General		v. Very limited information of the design rules was made available and yet these are proposed as an essential element of the proposed plan and the Board requests that a consultation process be initiated to explain these.
O009	Orakei	General		vi. The unitary plan information was hard to access, being available in a physical form only in the board's two libraries and the local board office.
O010	Orakei	e-plan		vii. The online map version of the plan was difficult to manipulate and confusing to interpret.
O011	Orakei	General		viii. The time-frame for consultation and the approach used did not provide people with a real opportunity to understand the implications of existing district plan provisions and the proposed changes.
O012	Orakei	General		ix. Officers have not been able to provide board members with a detailed overview of all the feedback received within the local board area.
O013	Orakei	General		x. Local board members have not been able to locate and read each submission received by Orakei residents as a result of the inadequate response/tracking process used as part of the plan's consultation.
O014	Orakei	General		xi. As a result, local board members are not able to reflect all the feedback received as part of the consultation or verify that this has been considered as part of the new changes being proposed.
O015	Orakei	General		xii. Despite a full analysis of submissions not being available, significant changes to the draft unitary plan have been proposed by the Auckland Plan Committee following consideration of submissions.
O016	Orakei	General		xiii. The Board is concerned that full information is unknown and therefore unavailable on the detail of these changes including how the proposed new Mixed-Housing sub zones will impact properties.
O017	Orakei	Residential		xiv. A consequence of the new Mixed-Housing zones appears likely to be an increase in height compared to that proposed in the draft plan.
O018	Orakei	Residential		xv. This height increase may well be appropriate in some parts of the Orakei local board area but the information is not currently available to evaluate that and there is no plan to allow property owners an opportunity to provide feedback on this significant change.
O019	Orakei	Residential		xvi. This represents a very poor way of developing policy on such a major policy tool.
O020	Orakei	General		xvii. No further public consultation is proposed on draft Unitary Plan changes prior to notification.
O021	Orakei	General		xviii. Auckland has growth challenges and housing pressures that it is urgent Auckland Council addresses.
O022	Orakei	General		xix. The Board has done its best within the confines of its material and resources made available to express the thoughts of its community.
O023	Orakei	General		c) i. Requests the Auckland Plan Committee only notify the unitary plan in the areas around Auckland where there is good support for the draft unitary plan proposals.
O024	Orakei	General		ii. Requests a further round of public consultation be initiated on the changes proposed in the Unitary Plan in the areas of Auckland agreed with local boards.
O025	Orakei	General		iii. Notes that such an approach would allow council to make progress in the areas where there is agreement and a pressing need for new housing, but allow more time for consideration where this is justified by public concern.
O026	Orakei	General		d) i. Thanks the community and stakeholders for taking the time to feedback on the draft Unitary Plan public feedback process.
O027	Orakei	General		ii. Notes that the Orakei Local Board received 12.5 percent of the total submissions, and provided the highest number of individual submissions out of all 21 local boards throughout Auckland.
O028	Orakei	General		iii. Notes that the Board has hosted a range of local community engagement events on the draft Unitary Plan to raises awareness of the plan and encouraged public and community stakeholders input through a structured feedback process.
O029	Orakei	General		iv. Notes that Local Boards have the opportunity to provide formal feedback on the draft Unitary Plan for discussion with the Auckland Plan Committee at the end of July 2013, and to help inform decisions by the Auckland Plan Committee in August 2013.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
O030	Orakei	General		v. Notes that local boards will also meet with the Auckland Plan Committee and specialist planners in early August to address specific zoning and planning controls issues raised by the community through the draft Unitary Plan public feedback process.
O031	Orakei	General		vi. Notes that, in addition to the public feedback process on the draft Unitary Plan, this feedback includes further responses from key stakeholders and associations in response to the Auckland Plan Committee's 'interim directions' to officers on 2 July 2013.
O032	Orakei	General		e) i. Notes that the Board has received mixed feedback on the issue of managing Auckland's growth, with some residents questioning the growth projections, while others acknowledge the need to provide for and plan for growth.
O033	Orakei	General		ii. Notes that nearly everyone acknowledges some need for intensification, the debate is on the where and how, many question the extra one million projection.
O034	Orakei	Growth		iii. Endorses the general approach to growth outlined in the Auckland Plan, provided intensification is managed in a way that does not detrimentally impact on the character of existing areas.
O035	Orakei	Growth		iv. Is strongly of the view that intensification should only occur following the development of a comprehensive, local board led, Orakei Area Plan, to ensure that physical and social services and infrastructure are in place first to accommodate intensification.
O036	Orakei	Infrastructure		f) i. Notes that there was considerable feedback on the need to relate infrastructure capacity to planned growth.
O037	Orakei	Growth		ii. Supports a staged approach to intensification and enabling intensification in areas where it can be supported by appropriate physical and social infrastructure such as stormwater, drainage, transport, waste management, open space, education providers and community centres.
O038	Orakei	Residential		iii. Requires that areas should not be subject to new Terrace Housing and Apartment Building or Mixed-Housing structures unless infrastructure providers confirm services can be delivered.
O039	Orakei	Infrastructure		iv. Requests that the community be provided with better information (e.g. the use of technology like 3D animation) on the nature of future development in their area and the alignment of infrastructure, to give the community confidence that intensification will occur in a managed way.
O040	Orakei	Heritage and Historic Character		v. Considers that developer levies for new development should be equitable across the region; and that, in areas of historic under investment, that new developers should not be expected to contribute more to make up for the shortfall.
O041	Orakei	Residential		vi. Request that where possible all services on private property be undergrounded for new development, particularly in residential areas.
O042	Orakei	Residential		g) i. Notes the mechanisms to achieve housing diversity in the Unitary Plan.
O043	Orakei	Residential		ii. Suggests that the concept of affordable housing be widened to acknowledge the comparatively high level of rates that Orakei residents pay which can make it difficult for elderly people in particular to stay in their homes and remain part of the community.
O044	Orakei	Growth		iii. Notes that there is insufficient information and analysis at present as to the likely scale, effects, efficacy and fairness of a value-uplift levy for rezoning land from rural to urban and that the Board supports further investigation.
O045	Orakei	Quality design		h) i. Notes that there was significant feedback from the community on the importance of design issues and controls.
O046	Orakei	Quality design		ii. Supports the development of the Auckland Design Manual as a document to help promote high-quality design, but expresses concern that it is non-mandatory and questions how effective it can be given that status.
O047	Orakei	Quality design		iii. Supports the urban design approach set out in the plan that requires a design assessment for development of five units and above and five storeys and above, but is concerned that this does not provide assurance of good quality design for buildings below 5 storeys or 5 units.
O048	Orakei	Quality design		iv. Requests that all new buildings below 5 storeys or 5 units also be required to complete a design assessment/statement.
O049	Orakei	Quality design		v. Supports making design statements mandatory for all applications requiring resource consent or infringing on planning controls.
O050	Orakei	Quality design		vi. Supports the provision of better examples and illustrations of good built outcomes drawn from the local board area where possible.
O051	Orakei	Area Plans		i) i. Notes that Area Plans are being prepared for local boards across the region and that Orakei is scheduled to be developed during stage six of seven, and will be number fifteen of the twenty-one local boards.
O052	Orakei	Area Plans		ii. Notes that Orakei is an area of high market attractiveness and as such is likely to see a faster rate of intensification than other parts of Auckland.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
O053	Orakei	Area Plans		iii. Requests that the Orakei Area Plan be brought forward to the 2014/15 year in light of the area's attractiveness to developers.
O054	Orakei	Area Plans		iv. Requests that Area Plans be local board led to enable local boards, with their communities, to define the appropriate nature and location of future intensification in a bottom-up manner e.g. determine the exact areas where the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building and Mixed-Housing 2 and 3 zones should apply, and requests that this happens before the Unitary Plan is made operative.
O055	Orakei	Area Plans		v. Request that Area Plans be supported by additional character assessments for established suburbs (such as Remuera and Ellerslie), to provide a finer grain analysis and protections for Orakei's unique character suburbs.
O056	Orakei	Area Plans		vi. Requests that the aspiration and principles of existing place-based plans be reflected in the Unitary Plan objectives, policies, assessment criteria and overlay provisions, including:
O057	Orakei	Area Plans		1. The Tamaki Drive Masterplan.
O058	Orakei	Area Plans		2. The Crossfield Reserve, Glover Park and Madills Farm Masterplan.
O059	Orakei	Area Plans		3. The revised St Heliers Village Plan .
O060	Orakei	Area Plans		4. The Landing Concept Plan.
O061	Orakei	Area Plans		5. Hobson Bay Action Plan.
O062	Orakei	Area Plans		6. Eastern Corridor/AMETI.
O063	Orakei	Area Plans		7. Hauraki Gulf Marine Protections Legislation.
O064	Orakei	Area Plans		vii. Supports the on-going improvements to the townscape within the Tamaki Drive precinct (including St Heliers), consistent with the Tamaki Drive Masterplan, particularly:
O065	Orakei	Area Plans		1. The provision of bonuses for public art;
O066	Orakei	Area Plans		2. Landscaping on the interface between new development and public land;
O067	Orakei	Area Plans		3. Emphasis on the linkage to the seafront and seaside relations with the beach and sea;
O068	Orakei	Area Plans		4. The provision of adequate parking.
O069	Orakei	Area Plans		viii. Supports a planned approach to out-of-centre retailing that supports the vitality of existing town and local centres, including provisions that acknowledge and support a mixture of local services that cater to local needs (e.g. local fruit and vegetable market or butcher etc).
O070	Orakei	Residential		Notification j) That the Orakei Local Board: i. Notes that there was a strong desire that neighbours or other directly affected parties have an opportunity to input into developments taking place next door or that threaten the overall character of their area (particularly in relation to height).
O071	Orakei	Residential		ii. Notes that many people support mandatory notification for all development that infringe on height and height to boundary controls.
O072	Orakei	Residential		iii. Acknowledges the community's desire to be more engaged and involved in development within their neighbourhood, and suggests that this is best achieved through a comprehensive, local board led, area planning process, supported by local character assessments.
O073	Orakei	Residential		iv. Considers that the plan should allow Council to exercise some discretion in relation to notification for any infringement of height, density or height in relation to boundary, to enable developments to be assessed for notification on an individual case by case basis, subject to mandatory design assessment being applied and local board input.
O074	Orakei	Residential		v. Considers that where an area has an existing area plan, precinct plan or character statement (e.g. the St Heliers character statement), that automatic public notification be required for all developments that require resource consent or infringe on development controls within the Local Centre or Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zones.
O075	Orakei	Residential		vi. Is strongly of the view that there should not be a presumption of non-notification as currently proposed in the Draft Unitary Plan.
O076	Orakei	Residential		vii. Strongly supports the notion that developments which exceed the height limit (or other controls), should at least be required to:
O077	Orakei	Residential		1. Undertake a mandatory design assessments
O078	Orakei	Residential		2. Received the written approval of potentially affected persons; or,
				3. Undergo a limited notification process.
O079	Orakei	Residential		viii. Notes that the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) does not currently provide for the inclusion of limited notification in the plan and recommends that the Council advocate that amendments to the RMA make provision for this.
O080	Orakei	Residential		k) i. Notes that a significant amount of feedback was received in relation to zoning in residential areas, particularly the Terrace House and Apartment Building and Mixed-Housing zones.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
O081	Orakei	Residential		ii. Notes that, in general, the feedback sought development that: provides for appropriate sized residential dwellings; protects historic character; results in good quality built outcomes; and, retains the seaside and village character of St Heliers.
O082	Orakei	Residential		iii. Notes there is significant opposition to the controls (e.g. height and density) and location of the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone in the Ellerslie, St Heliers, Kohimarama and Mission Bay areas.
O083	Orakei	Residential		iv. Considers that the small number of generic residential zones results in areas of the ward being zoned in a manner that does not respond appropriately to the diversity of local character and results in difficult zone interface and transition issues.
O084	Orakei	Residential		v. Notes that the 'one size fits all' approach to zoning across the region is too broad and does not provide the community with a sufficient degree confidence that their local character, amenities and values will be appropriately maintained.
O085	Orakei	Residential		vi. Supports in principle the separation of the Mixed-Housing zone into two subzones, Mixed-Housing 2 (which allows for 2 storeys) and Mixed-Housing 3 (which allows for 3 storeys) which, if applied correctly and within the context of a comprehensive Area Plan, has the potential to better manage transitional issues between and within zones, particularly with respect to the location of the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone (e.g. heights, privacy issues, sunlight access and character concerns).
O086	Orakei	Residential		vii. Notes however that the signalled changes to the Mixed-Housing zone were only suggested post consultation, and that the board wishes to review the full package of changes proposed, consult with the community and see how the revised zone will be applied to the local board area before providing further feedback.
O087	Orakei	Residential		viii. Supports an increase in the minimum dwelling size from 30m2 to 40m2 (plus balcony) for the Town, Local and Neighbourhood centres, Terrace Housing and Apartment Building and Mixed-Housing zones, however, the Board considers that the 30m2 minimum may well be appropriate for the City Centre and Metropolitan zones.
O088	Orakei	Residential		l) i. Notes that a large number of submissions related to the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone, including the specific location of the zone, its proposed height limits and the transition and interface between zones.
O089	Orakei	Residential		ii. Notes that feedback generally opposed four-storey height limits and sought a reduced height limit in the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone from 4 storeys to 3 storeys, particularly in small centres, coastal areas/centres and special character areas such as St Heliers.
O090	Orakei	Residential		iii. Acknowledges that height is a key issue in the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone and is concerned about transition of height from one zone to another.
O091	Orakei	Residential		iv. Supports graduated heights in coastal areas with lower heights at the coastal edge to minimise the loss of views and protect the special character of coastal areas and centres.
O092	Orakei	Residential		v. Supports the location of the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone where the topography allows (e.g. in line with cliff lines), to minimise the loss of views but maintaining special natural character.
O093	Orakei	Residential		vi. Supports graduated heights between zones (particularly the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building and Mixed-housing Zone) to maintain privacy, access to sunlight and overall character for residents.
O094	Orakei	Residential		m) i. Notes that the proposal to split the Mixed-Housing zones into a 2 storey and 3 story zone has the potential to address many of the transitional issues between zones, particularly with respect to heights, privacy issues, sunlight access and character and visual dominance concerns however the board requires further information to have confidence that these adjustments to the Mixed-Housing zone can adequately address the concerns raised by submitters.
O095	Orakei	Residential		ii. Requests that further consideration also be given to the interface provisions between the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building, Mixed-Housing and Single House zones.
O096	Orakei	Residential		iii. Supports height in relation to boundary controls for all Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone boundaries adjoining Mixed-Housing and Single House zones to protect sunlight and reduce overshadowing, and reduce visual dominance.
O097	Orakei	Residential		iv. Notes that Council planning staff are also currently investigating some differentiation in the density requirements for the Mixed-Housing zones, which is yet to be provided to local boards.
O098	Orakei	Residential		v. Supports the further investigation of differentiated density provisions within the Mixed-Housing Zone, to enable a more fine-grained approach to zoning within the Orakei area.
O099	Orakei	Residential		vi. Looks forward to providing further comment on these matters once the zone provisions are finalised and the Board have consulted with the community.
O100	Orakei	Residential		n) i. Notes that significant feedback was received relating to zonings of local and town centres, particularly concerning the scale of development in these centres, the expansion of centres, proposed height limits and the potential for business land to overtake existing residential land.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
O101	Orakei	Residential		ii. Considers that precinct planning in business areas is required to ensure good design outcomes (except in industrial areas) and effectively manage interface and zone transition with surrounding residential areas.
O102	Orakei	Residential		iii. Supports economic development and the growth of business centre activity within existing boundaries and seeks finer-grained controls that take into account local context and character.
O103	Orakei	Residential		iv. Notes that St Heliers' residents are very engaged with their village centre and supports community involvement in centre development.
O104	Orakei	Residential		o) i. Notes that a large amount of feedback received opposed the proposed height limits for Town Centres including Remuera (southern slopes), Ellerslie, Local Centres of St Heliers and Mission Bay and the Neighbourhood Centres including Kohimarama.
O105	Orakei	Residential		ii. Notes that based on the number of submissions received, the Board supports St Heliers residents in their desire to have the height in the Town Centre reduced from 12.5 metres to 9 metres.
O106	Orakei	Residential		iii. Agrees with St Heliers residents that a 12.5 metre height limit would contradict the St Heliers character statement included within the draft Unitary Plan by: creating a barrier between people and the sea; contributing to a canyoning effect; and by providing an incentive to demolish buildings which contribute to the area's unique character.
O107	Orakei	Residential		iv. Notes community concern that a 12.5 metre height limit is likely to incentivise rapid development within the St Heliers Town Centre which may displace the existing mix of services (e.g. butcher, hardware and grocery shops) that currently meet the needs of locals.
O108	Orakei	Residential		v. Requests that the general principle for height limits set out by the Auckland Plan Committee in its 2 July 2013 'interim direction to officers' be widened to include "character statements" as well as "historic heritage".
O109	Orakei	Transport		Parking p) That the Orakei Local Board: i. Notes that there was general feedback expressing a concern that existing parking issues will be exacerbated as a result of intensification (e.g. Ellerslie and St Heliers).
O110	Orakei	Transport		ii. Notes that intensification also has the potential to place excess pressure on local on-street parking.
O111	Orakei	Transport		iii. Supports the retention of parking minimums in business areas and supports a parking assessment for new developments to ascertain whether the provision of on-site parking for every additional dwelling is required within the business area.
O112	Orakei	Transport		iv. Requests that existing parking requirements be retained and that all new developments be required to demonstrate how they will manage parking requirements.
O113	Orakei	Transport		q) i. Notes that there was a large body of feedback concerned with the potential impact of intensification on transport matters such as parking, public transport road congestion (e.g. along Tamaki Drive and Kepa Road), particularly in local centres.
O114	Orakei	Transport		ii. Notes that some feedback expressed a degree of scepticism that people would chose public transport over private motor vehicles if intensification was located near transport nodes, which is an underlying assumption of the Auckland Plan (which is informs the draft Unitary Plan).
O115	Orakei	Transport		iii. Supports appropriate and well-designed transit oriented development and intensification along major transport routes, as well as proposed future nodes such as Selwyn Station, subject to:
O116	Orakei	Transport		1. Appropriate infrastructure upgrades
O117	Orakei	Transport		2. Improved, reliable and frequent public transport services that support these; and;
O118	Orakei	Transport		3. Provisions that stipulate that prior to all new major developments being granted resource consent (whether residential or business), that developers be required to produce comprehensive transport plans that demonstrate how the development will manage additional congestion, parking shortfalls and protect the overall character of the area.
O119	Orakei	Transport		iv. Supports public transport services that maintain connectivity between land and sea (e.g. in and around Hobson bay and along Tamaki Drive) and that provides for integrated walking and cycling networks.
O120	Orakei	Transport		r) i. Notes that a few submitters (e.g. Ellerslie Business Association) questioned how the Unitary Plan will address additional noise and waste management issues (e.g. space for waste bins on private property) resulting from increased intensification.
O121	Orakei	Infrastructure		ii. Requests that officers provide further information as to how the Unitary Plan will manage noise and waste management issues and any other service related issues that may arise as a result of future intensification of Local Centres and Town Centres and their surrounding suburbs.
O122	Orakei	Heritage and Historic Character		s) i. Notes that general support was expressed in favour of overlays for the retention of historic heritage.
O123	Orakei	Heritage and Historic Character		ii. Notes that Ellerslie Residents Association questions how 4 storey development can be consistent with the character of an area which consists mostly of 2 storey heritage buildings.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
O124	Orakei	Heritage and Historic Character		iii. Welcomes the additional heritage items suggested by the Ellerslie Residents Association for consideration as scheduled items of historic heritage.
O125	Orakei	Heritage and Historic Character		iv. Supports protecting significant historic heritage and welcomes the assessment of additional items via consultation.
O126	Orakei	Heritage and Historic Character		t) i. Notes that there was mixed feedback on the pre-1944 demolition overlay, with some supporting its retention while others consider that it has been applied too widely.
O127	Orakei	Heritage and Historic Character		ii. Considers that the 1944 demolition overlay does not provide the level of protection needed in the Local Board area.
O128	Orakei	Heritage and Historic Character		iii. Supports the completion of character investigations for established suburbs in the area as a matter of priority, ideally as part of a comprehensive, board led, bottom-up area planning exercise conducted with community involvement.
O129	Orakei	Viewshafts		u) i. Notes that there was general feedback in favor of protecting and preserving volcanic viewshafts.
O130	Orakei	Viewshafts		ii. Supports the retention of volcanic view shafts and supports any breach being automatically assessed as a non-complying activity on a notified basis.
O131	Orakei	Heritage and Historic Character		v) i. Notes its concern that the historic character overlay does not meet the needs of the Orakei area given its focus on pre 1944 buildings which does not address the special character of regionally significant suburbs such as Remuera and St Heliers.
O132	Orakei	Heritage and Historic Character		ii. Requests character investigations/assessments be carried out within established Orakei's suburbs as a matter of priority, ideally as part of a comprehensive, board led, bottom-up area planning exercise.
O133	Orakei	Heritage and Historic Character		iii. Request that where an area's character has been defined and a character statement is in place (as with the St Heliers character statement) that planning provisions allow sufficient flexibility to adjust controls such as height, bulk and density to preserve the underlying character of the area.
O134	Orakei	Heritage and Historic Character		iv. Notes that the Orakei area contains significant post 1944 historic character areas (eg 1960's architecture in Kohimarama) that will not be protected by the pre 1944 overlay.
O135	Orakei	Natural Environment		w) i. Notes that there was general opposition to Special Ecological Areas and their application to individual properties.
O136	Orakei	Natural Environment		ii. Notes that there was general support for tree protection controls and the protection of coastal trees.
O137	Orakei	Natural Environment		iii. Notes that a significant volume of feedback expressed a concern that greater intensification in coastal areas may threaten water quality by increasing storm water run-off and sewage contamination.
O138	Orakei	Natural Environment		iv) Supports: 1. The protection of cliff lines (Tamaki Drive), maunga, waterways, streams, beaches and bird migration paths.
O139	Orakei	Natural Environment		2. Protecting floodplains and overland flow paths from the negative effects of development and infrastructure.
O140	Orakei	Natural Environment		3. Restoring and enhancing natural freshwater systems, such as rivers, creeks, and aquifers.
O141	Orakei	Natural Environment		4. Providing clear standards around permeability of surfaces and requests that the plan encourage investment in low impact stormwater solutions such as rain gardens, swales and wetland treatments (particularly in coastal areas) which slow and treat stormwater before it enters fragile receiving environments, noting cultural significance.
O142	Orakei	Natural Environment		5. Provisions that require the Unitary Plan to take account of the cumulative effects on water courses and streams resulting from intensification (due to the loss of permeable surface area upstream), which can negatively affect downstream properties that abut water courses.
O143	Orakei	Natural Environment		6. The retention, enhancement and further development of wetlands in the area.
O144	Orakei	Natural Environment		7. Provisions to encourage the uptake of low impact design – e.g. solar power, rainwater tanks, park and ride facilities etc.
O145	Orakei	Natural Environment		8. Provisions to address poor air quality due to an increase in congestion resulting from intensification of centres, particularly those centres already suffering from congestion or that are near to motorways (e.g. Ellerslie).
O146	Orakei	Coastal		x) i. Notes the relationship between the accumulation of sediment resulting from past intensification and the spread of mangroves beyond their natural range.
O147	Orakei	Coastal		ii. Supports controls in relation to earthworks that helps minimise erosion and land disturbance to reduce the downstream effects of sedimentation on estuaries, waterways and beaches.
O148	Orakei	Coastal		y) i. Notes that there was mixed feedback around the protection of mangroves, with some feedback supporting their removal and others noting their contribution to eco-system functioning.
O149	Orakei	Coastal		ii. Notes that mangroves have expanded as a result of human occupation but also provide a habitat to bird life.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
O150	Orakei	Coastal		iii. Does not support the removal of mangroves to pre 1996 levels as a 'permitted activity' noting that the Board is of the view that sedimentation is the underlying issue and that this needs to be adequately addressed in the Unitary Plan and accompanying stormwater standards.
O151	Orakei	Coastal		iv. Supports a site-by-site approach to mangrove removal that draws on a set of agreed criteria, including community input, in order to assess whether consent should be granted.
O152	Orakei	Coastal		z) That the Orakei Local Board requests more discussion on how the swing moorings from Okahu Bay impact on ecological issues and social concerns as part of upgrading the bay and making it a more usable recreational space.
O153	Orakei	Coastal		aa) That the Orakei Local Board requests that in designated areas of intensification and development, the Unitary Plan must take into account the possibility of substrata failure including liquefaction and that the Unitary Plan should focus growth on areas not prone to liquefaction or provide limits and restrictions.
O154	Orakei	Coastal		bb) That the Orakei Local Board notes that the coastal development proposed around Tamaki Drive seems to be inconstant with provisions of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Protections Legislation in that if implemented it may adversely affect both the view to the sea, views from the sea, and add to run off and pollution of the Gulf.
O155	Orakei	Coastal		cc) i. Notes that, as a coastal ward, many Orakei properties have riparian rights that extend down to the waters edge.
O156	Orakei	Coastal		ii. Seeks further advice from officers as to the potential impact that intensification may have on riparian rights and seeks clarification on the status of riparian rights under the draft Unitary Plan.
O157	Orakei	Coastal		dd) i. Considers that with greater intensification that there is a corresponding need to provide for more open space within the ward (both in residential areas and town centres (e.g. Remuera and Ellerslie) to meet the needs of a growing community.
O158	Orakei	Parks and Community		ii) Supports:
O159	Orakei	Parks and Community		1. No loss of current open space/ green space for intensification.
O160	Orakei	Parks and Community		2. The provision of more sports fields.
O161	Orakei	Parks and Community		3. The provision of enhanced community facilities that provide for places for the community to meet.
O162	Orakei	Parks and Community		4. The retention of a special purpose zone for schools, rather than an underlying zoning and school overlay.
O163	Orakei	Parks and Community		5. Adequate outdoor space for organised recreation.
O164	Orakei	Parks and Community		6. Rezoning Shore Road Reserve /Thomas Bloodworth as open space to allow for active recreation.
O165	Orakei	Parks and Community		7. Open space zoning at Koraha Reserve to allow for active recreation.
O166	Orakei	Parks and Community		8. Including the Landing Concept Plan as a separate precinct plan in the Unitary Plan.
O167	Orakei	Parks and Community		9. The retention of an open space zone (rather than a marine zone) for the Outdoor Boating club owned land and the Council owned land on Tamaki Drive to retain local governance over the Marina.
O168	Orakei	Parks and Community		10. The development of 'greenways' to connect parks.
O169	Orakei	Parks and Community		11. Further acquisitions of land to complement existing pocket parks.
O170	Orakei	Parks and Community		12. Green spaces for town busy centres that are likely to grow as a result of intensification to meet the needs of shoppers and residents.
O171	Orakei	Parks and Community		Colin Maiden Park ee) That the Orakei Local Board: i. Notes that the largest number of submissions were received in relation to the draft Unitary Plan zoning of Colin Maiden Park, with feedback seeking that the Park remain as open space.
O172	Orakei	Parks and Community		ii. Strongly supports the retention of the 'special purpose' education zoning for Colin Maiden Park and does not support the proposed Terrace Housing and Apartment Building or Mixed-Use zoning.
O173	Orakei	Parks and Community		iii. Notes that should Council purchase Colin Maiden Park the zoning should be changed to open space.
O174	Orakei	Parks and Community		ff) i. Notes that the Orakei area has 19 schools, most of which are already at capacity, and it is critical to ensure that Auckland Council works with the Ministry of Education to plan for schools to support future intensification.
O175	Orakei	Mapping		ii. Supports the retention of special purpose zoning for schools (rather than an underlying zoning and school overlay) to safeguard against incremental divestment of school land.
O176	Orakei	Mapping		gg) i. Notes that the Board attended the first of two special mapping workshops on 12 July 2013 with Auckland Council planners and members of the Auckland Plan Committee to work through detailed zoning requested coming though from the community's feedback.
O176	Orakei	Mapping		ii. Notes that an additional workshop is scheduled with planners and the Auckland Plan Committee for 2 August 2013, which will give the Board another opportunity to validate zoning requests discussed at the July workshop as well as consider any subsequent zoning requests that have since come to the Board's attention.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
O177	Orakei	Mapping		hh) i. Notes that the following zoning changes raised by the community received initial or partial support from staff subject to confirmation:
O178	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		1. That the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone along Tamaki Drive be retained in front of cliff lines only.
O179	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		2. That both sides of Speight Road be zoned as 3 storey Mixed Housing.
O180	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		3. That lower Melanesia, Kohimarama and Taranaki Roads be zoned as 2 storey Mixed Housing – noting that while council planners agree with this suggestion, the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone along Kohimarama Road is still being reviewed.
O181	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		4. Notes that the full parameters around the split Mixed-Housing zone is yet to be confirmed.
O182	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		ii. Will continue to support all the above changes.
O183	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		iii. Notes that the following zoning changes raised by the community have so far not received initial support by staff, but the board will seek that the following requested changes be made:
O184	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		1. That the height limit across the remainder of Tamaki drive be set at 10m in order to retain access and connection to the sea; protect sea views, and preserve sunlight access to the beach in late summer evenings – noting with concern that council planners suggest retaining Terrace Housing and Apartment Building along Tamaki Drive at 14.5 metres.
O185	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		2. That a height limit of 10 metres allows greater amenity to the greatest number of both residents and general public in terms of connectedness to the sea.
O186	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		3. That an increase to 14.5 metres would result in the creation of an extra 28 dwellings, at the expense of hundreds of existing residents and thousands of members of the public who would lose a connection to the sea when coming over the hill, on approach to the beach, and when walking or driving around Kohimarama.
O187	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		4. That the 10 metre height limit be set for Neighbourhood Centres – noting with concern that council planners suggest retaining the 12.5 metre height limit in neighbourhood centres.
O188	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		5. A 10 metres height limit would be in proportion to the Mixed-Housing 2 zoning, which forms the majority of the surrounding area.
O189	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		ii) i. Notes that following requests or concerns relating to the Kepa Road, Eastridge and Orakei area will be raised at the workshop on 2 August:
O190	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		1. That Kepa Road is already congested and lacks appropriate infrastructure (e.g. schools, transport) to support intensification at the rate and scale outlined in the draft Unitary Plan.
O191	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		2. That the seaward side of Kepa Road (opposite Eastridge) be retained as residential.
O192	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		3. That future commercial development be concentrated within the existing Eastridge Shopping centre footprint.
O193	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		4. That growth opportunities are limited along Kepa Road due to land instability on the hillside by the horse paddocks.
O194	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		5. That the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone be concentrated in close proximity to rail connections such as Orakei Point, and the proposed Selwyn Train Station (and proposed Pourewa Valley cycle and walkway area).
O195	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		jj) i. Notes its support for the following zoning changes that have so far received initial or partial support from staff subject to confirmation:
O196	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		1. That Michael's Ave Reserve be rezoned to Open Space (currently under investigation by Council Planning staff).
O197	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		2. That any extension to the commercial activities on Ladies Mile be limited to below 180 Ladies Mile.
O198	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		3. That the Mixed Use zoning around Tecoma and Robert Streets should be changed to Mixed Housing zone.
O199	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		4. That Findlay Street should be zoned Single House.
O200	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		5. That the Cawley Street commercial zone be re-zoned for residential high rise (up to 4 storeys) so that in the future only residential housing will be located on both sides of Cawley Street.
O201	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		6. That the northern part of Cawley Street be rezoned to a Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone.
O202	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		7. That the southern part of Cawley Street remain Light Industry zoning.
O203	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		8. That the eastern side of Ladies Mile north of the town centre be zoned Mixed Housing with a maximum height of two storeys (a partial Mixed Housing zone is suggested).
O204	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		9. That the area surrounding Hurst and Robert Streets be zoned Town Centre.
O204	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		10. That the elevated areas of Ladies Mile, Arthur St, Amy St and Arron St are not appropriate for Terrace Housing and Apartment Building - noting that while staff agree with the suggestion around Arron Street and suggest Mixed Housing zone, staff suggest retaining the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone around Ladies Mile, Arthur Street and Amy Street.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
O205	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		ii. Notes that the following zoning changes raised by the Board have not received initial support by planning staff and that the board will seek that the following requested changes be made (at the upcoming workshop on 2 August 2013 with the Auckland Plan Committee and Council Planning officers):
O206	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		1. That the northern side of Main Highway (between Amy and Arthur Streets) be zoned Mixed Use and not Terrace Housing and Apartment Building.
O207	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		2. That the Light Industry zoning given to the land on the northern side of Main Highway between Hudson St and Main Highway be rezoned to Terrace Housing and Apartment Building noting that staff support Mixed Use zoning.
O208	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		iii. Notes that the following additional requests will be raised at 2 August 2013 mapping workshop:
O209	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		1. That the Board confirm that the Findlay Street / heritage issue has been addressed in the updated maps.
O210	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		2. That additional buildings in Ellerslie be considered for scheduling as historic character.
O211	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		3. That the Ellerslie Racecourse zoning be revised to prevent high-rise apartments in this area.
O212	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		4. That the maximum height in the Ellerslie Town Centre has been reduced from 12.5m to 10m (3 storeys).
O213	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		5. That resource consent applicants for commercial activities be required to demonstrate that they have been unable to find in-centre sites first before they can occupy surrounding Mixed-Use areas (to address cumulative effects on the centre).
O214	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		6. That there to be no net loss of residential units in areas zoned for Mixed-Use.
O215	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		kk) That the Orakei Local Board notes that submissions from St Heliers were higher than from any other suburb within the Orakei Ward.
O216	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		ll) That the Orakei Local Board notes that the following zoning changes raised by the community received initial or partial support from staff subject to confirmation:
O217	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		i. That the strict application of the 250m rule for location of Terrace Housing and Apartment Building around centres is not appropriate in St Heliers.
O218	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		ii. That the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone should only be located behind the St Heliers Village – noting that staff support this with Terrace Housing and Apartment Building behind the commercial centre and some 3 storey Mixed Housing zones.
O219	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		iii. That the St Heliers commercial centre should not be extended to the blocks on Goldie and Lombard Streets, as Goldie Street borders a local neighbourhood park (Vellenoweth Green), which is a defining feature of the area, and Lombard Street is a residential street and should not be split.
O220	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		mm) That the Orakei Local Board notes that although the following zoning changes raised by the St Heliers community have not received initial support by Council Planning staff, the board seeks the following requested changes be made:
O221	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		i. That 12.5m height limit be reduced to 9m in the St Heliers commercial centre, noting with great concern that council planners suggest retaining the 12.5 metres.
O222	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		ii. That the Goldie and Lombard Streets blocks be zoned as a 8m Mixed-Housing zone, noting with concern that Council Planners suggest a Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone at 12.5 metres (included within St Heliers commercial centre overlay).
O223	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		iii. That the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone in Cliff and Clarendon Roads (and nearby Kohimarama) should be 10m/3 storey Mixed-Housing zone, noting with concern that council planners suggest a Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone.
O224	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		nn) That the Orakei Local Board notes that the following zoning changes raised by the community received initial or partial support from staff subject to confirmation:
O225	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		i. That a 10 metres Mixed Housing zone could be applied to blocks either side of Tagalad Road and the strip along western edge of Atkin Avenue, north of Nihill Crescent.
O226	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		oo) That the Orakei Local Board notes that although the following zoning changes raised by the St Heliers community have not received initial support by Council Planning staff, the board seeks the following requested changes be made:
O227	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		i. That the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone in Marau Crescent be 12 metres height – noting that planning officers recommend retaining the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone at 14.5 metres.
O228	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		i. Notes that the following requests have been raised at the mapping workshop on 12 July and will be further validated at the next mapping workshop on 2 August 2013:
O229	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		1. That the Rawhiti Bowling Club land from southern Ara St- western Rakau St - northern Rangitoto Ave, is inappropriately zoned as Mixed-Housing and should be zoned Single House to match the operative zoning.
O230	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		2. That the area zoned Terrace Housing and Apartment Building on the north side of Elmstone Ave and beside Orakei Road is an inappropriate north side intensification and should be zoned Single House.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
O231	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		3. That the east side of Lucerne Road from around number 29 back to number 5 is inappropriately zoned Mixed-Housing and should be zoned Single House.
O232	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		4. That the west side of Ngapuhi Road from around number 16 back to number 4 is zoned Mixed-Housing and should be zoned Single House.
O233	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		5. That the block of land between Manawa and Hirihi to the east of Victoria Avenue is zoned Mixed-Housing and should be zoned Single House.
O234	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		6. That the north side of Ormonde road between Grand View Road and Ladies Mile is zoned Mixed-Housing and should be zoned Single House.
O235	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		7. That the blocks of land on the west side of Victoria Avenue between Glenbrook and Walton, and between Walton and Ingram and on the north side of Ingram are zoned Mixed-Housing and should be zoned Single House.
O236	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		8. That the Mixed-Housing zoned land on both sides of the north of the intersection of Omaha Road and Dromorne Road should be zoned Single House.
O237	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		9. That the stretch of Orakei Road on the west side between Benson and Dell Ave is zoned Mixed-Housing and should be zoned Single House.
O238	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		10. That the area along Remuera Road between St Marks Road and Dilworth Ave and along either side of MacMurray Road should be Mixed-Use reflecting home based business, residential town house development and various medical uses.
O239	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		11. That the west side of St Johns Road between the College Road and St Johns intersection along to Gowing Drive is inappropriately zoned Terrace Housing and Apartment Building and should be zoned Mixed-Housing.
O240	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		12. That the west side of St Johns Road north past Gowing Drive is inappropriately zoned Town Centre and should be rezoned as Public Open Space Conservation.
O241	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		13. That the area further north along St Johns Road north past Gowing Drive road on the west side before St Heliers Road intersection also zones a small pocket of property as either a local or town centre which should be Mixed-Use.
O242	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		14. That the north side of Gowing Drive nearest St Johns Road is inappropriately zoned Terrace Housing and Apartment Building and should be zoned Mixed-Housing.
O243	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		15. That the east side of Howard Hunter Avenue between Felton Mathew and Merton Road is all zoned as mixed use or light / heavy industry and this entire area should be Mixed-Housing.
O244	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		16. That the northern side of Fancourt Street from the Purewa cemetery end to the intersection with Temple Street is zoned Mixed-Housing and should be Single House.
O245	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		17. That the southern side of Keith Ave and the east side of Waiatarua Road between Keith Ave and Seascape Road should be Single House not Mixed-Housing.
O246	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		18. That the stretch of the west side of Waiatarua Road from around number 6 down past the school to Dover place should be Single House and not Mixed-Housing.
O247	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		19. That the west side of Meadowbank Road from around number 14 to number 48 is zoned Mixed-Housing and should be Single House.
O248	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		20. That the west side of Meadowbank Road to the north of Corinth Street should be Single House.
O249	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		21. That the north side of Corinth Street closest to Meadowbank Road should also be zoned Single House.
O250	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		22. That Remuera Town Centre should be 3 storey, given the area's history and heritage, physical geography (e.g. proximity to the coast and volcanic views), and unique and longstanding cultural character that distinguishes it from other parts of the city.
O251	Orakei	Rezoning Requests		qq) That the Orakei Local Board notes that the Glendowie comments (not covered under St Heliers) and Stonefields comments have been included in the mapping exercise on 12 July 2013, further opportunity will be given to add to these on 2 August 2013.
OP001	Otara Papatoetoe			1. The board supports the general approach to intensification across Auckland and within the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board area, subject to some detail changes set out below.
OP002	Otara Papatoetoe			2. Centres – The centres most suitable for immediate intensification are the Manukau Metropolitan Centre and Old Papatoetoe Town Centre, both of which include railway stations. The board supports the draft provisions for Manukau Centre, but suggests some zone and overlay changes for Old Papatoetoe, described below.
OP003	Otara Papatoetoe			3. Design – The board supports in principle the need for good urban design as part of the city's intensification, in accordance with a design manual. The board notes that the design manual is still under development and the board would like to see a final draft of the design manual before the plan is notified.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
OP004	Otara Papatoetoe			4. Schools – The board is concerned about the pressure that intensification will have on the local schools including Papatoetoe West and Papatoetoe South. The board considers that Auckland Council needs to accept a share of the burden of planning for this growth along with school boards and the Ministry of Education. Council needs to support schools by locating and timing the new land use zones to provide for suburban intensification in predictable stages.
OP005	Otara Papatoetoe			5. Parking – The board supports maximum and minimum approaches to parking in different parts of the city, as what works in the city centre may not work locally. In suburban areas away from public transport, a minimum off-street parking requirement is desirable, to avoid overloading the streets with parked vehicles. In these areas, no maximum carpark provision should apply.
OP006	Otara Papatoetoe			6. The board generally supports the 9 Interim Directions adopted by the Auckland Plan Committee on 2 July 2013. While the various principles and approaches in the Interim Directions are individually reasonable, collectively they may detract from the intensification goal of the Unitary Plan. The board suggests that the Interim Directions should include an additional section to acknowledge the need for an overall package of planning controls in each area that still enables intensification to proceed, and ensure the commercial viability of development.
OP007	Otara Papatoetoe			7. Area Plan – The board is keen for an Area Plan to be developed for its area, to augment the Unitary Plan. The Area Plan could, in particular, provide detailed precinct planning for Old Papatoetoe and Ōtara town centres. The Auckland Plan provides for area plans to be completed for all 4 Southern Initiative local boards by 2015. However, lack of resources within the Planning Department has prevented commencement of an area plan for the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board area to date. The Board requests Auckland Council to provide resources to carry out detailed area planning and precinct plans for both areas, using external consultants if necessary.
OP008	Otara Papatoetoe			8. Electricity Transmission Corridors: The Board is concerned about the impact of the major power lines, especially at Ōtara. A 32m inner transmission corridor, plus a 64m outer transmission corridor, will have a major impact on the property rights / opportunities of hundreds of properties. The board would like the plan or section 32 report to include the rationale for restrictions on land use in these corridors. At Ōtara, the 3 more northern power lines are so close together that the 64m wide outer transmission corridors almost touch each other. Market demand for intensified properties within the transmission corridor is likely to be restrained, relative to property opportunities outside the corridor, and the board suggests that there is little point in zoning land for intensified development within the corridors. Design guidelines to manage development in the transmission corridors are desirable.
OP009	Otara Papatoetoe			9. Airport approach path at Papatoetoe – The board is supportive of the mixed housing zone in the flight path locations, but advocates for the plan to require noise insulation in areas under the noise / flight path overlays, as well as other development design guidelines. The board considers that there is no reason why early childhood education centres cannot be placed in this area.
OP010	Otara Papatoetoe			10. The Local Board is supportive in principle of the papakainga proposal on 10ha of land at 50 Alexander Crescent, Ōtara. This land is zoned Special Purpose, which the board understands would anticipate a specific zoning / resource consent applied for the proposed activity. The board would the unitary plan to make clear that the proposed papakainga proposals would fit these “special purpose” criteria.
OP011	Otara Papatoetoe			11. Terrace Housing and Apartment Building Zone heights – The board generally supports the height limits shown for the THABZ in the draft Unitary Plan, coupled with the principles mentioned in the Interim Directions, section 2. Additional height up to 6 storeys should be allowed in the THABZ adjoining the Old Papatoetoe Town Centre, shown cross hatched in the draft plan. (Changes to the cross-hatched area are proposed in Attachment B, areas “J” and “M”.) The board suggests that a 6 storey height limit is appropriate according to several criteria in the Interim Directions: it fits the scale of the adjacent town centre; it is near a train station and bus routes; the surrounding THABZ has sufficient size and depth to allow heights to step down to 4 storeys at the edge of the THABZ. The board considers that the effects of the bulk of 6 storeys can be mitigated because it will enable higher quality developments though increased economies of scale.
OP012	Otara Papatoetoe			12. Industry zone height limits – The board supports the 20m maximum height in industrial zones, coupled with the 10m height limit near residential land, and the protective height to boundary controls near residential land. (The board supports the change from the operative district plan, where the maximum height is 15m in Business 5 and unlimited in Business 6.)
OP013	Otara Papatoetoe			13. Ōtara Town Centre – The board sees the possibility for growth of Ōtara town centre as a “student village” based on the MIT campus. The board suggests that the Auckland Council and the Local Board initiate a Campus Master-Plan, as part of an Area Plan, providing for substantial on-site student accommodation.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
OP014	Otara Papatoetoe			14. Town Centre heights – Ōtara: the board agrees with the proposed 4 storeys height limit at Ōtara, but notes that existing MIT buildings are already higher than 4 storeys and the board would support a continuation of existing heights at MIT within the town centre zone, subject to review under the Campus Master-Plan process described above.
OP015	Otara Papatoetoe			15. Town Centre heights – Hunters Corner: the board agrees with the proposed 4 storeys height limit at Hunters Corner.
OP016	Otara Papatoetoe			16. Town Centre heights – Manukau Metro Centre – 18 storeys: the board agrees with the proposed height limit at Manukau Metro Centre.
OP017	Otara Papatoetoe			17. Town Centre heights – Old Papatoetoe – 6 storeys: the board agrees with the proposed 6 storeys height limit in the Old Papatoetoe town centre, subject to buffering and setbacks to the THAB zoning adjacent, and further buffering and setbacks to the mixed housing zone adjacent to that. The board suggests that a 6 storey height limit is appropriate according to several criteria in the Interim Directions: it is near a train station and bus routes, it has sufficient size and depth to support 6 storeys, and this height can decrease from the centre out through the surrounding residential zones. However, the board is concerned about the possible effects of shading across St George St from buildings on the north side of the street, and would like to see these effects mitigated by suitable height to boundary angles or setbacks at higher levels.
OP018	Otara Papatoetoe			18. Town Centre Zone at Old Papatoetoe – the town centre should be expanded, into area “1” shown on Attachment B. A Precinct Plan should be completed for the Old Papatoetoe Town Centre and the area between the Town Centre to Hunters Corner, as part of an Area Plan. Further zone changes in the town centre might be considered in the Area Plan.
OP019	Otara Papatoetoe			19. The board wishes to see the retention of all heritage items protected in the operative district plan, to be carried forward into the unitary plan. In addition, the board also supports the listing of additional heritage buildings into the unitary plan list, as detailed in the separate submission of the Papatoetoe Historical Society (Attachment A).
OP020	Otara Papatoetoe			20. Railway Houses: The board supports the heritage listing of all the “railway houses” on Station Road, Papatoetoe, as identified by the Papatoetoe Historical Society in its separate submission referred to in the previous paragraph. In addition, the board supports the heritage listing of the “modified” Railway Houses that were noted by the Papatoetoe Historical Society in its paper. The society did not recommend these modified railway houses be listed in the Unitary Plan. The board considers that the modified railway houses should be listed also, as they still contain significant heritage value, and could readily be restored.
OP021	Otara Papatoetoe			21. Old Papatoetoe character: The Board seeks to retain character of the Old Papatoetoe mainstreet façade, through a set-back approach for higher storeys constructed in places where there is strong character. The board suggests incorporating specific design guidelines for the character area to accentuate the character facades. A heritage expert should be engaged by Auckland Council to help the board develop these heritage-new building interface design issues, as well as identifying any additional heritage items.
OP022	Otara Papatoetoe			22. Ōtara Lake – the board advocates for remediation of Ōtara Lake, and the development of a master plan for development of the lake margins, as part of an Area Plan.
OP023	Otara Papatoetoe			23. Genetically Modified Organisms – the board supports the separate submission of the Waitakere Ranges Local Board in regard to genetically modified organisms (GMO.) In particular the board supports a precautionary policy on the trial and release of GMO, and rules as proposed by the ICWP. (The rules provide: Permitted Activities – Research, Medical Applications, Vaccines; Discretionary Activities – Field Trials; Prohibited Activities - General outdoor GMO releases.)
OP024	Otara Papatoetoe			24. Manukau Harbour Forum comments – the board supports the comments made by the Manukau Harbour Forum. In particular the board supports:
OP025	Otara Papatoetoe			a. The need for the Unitary Plan policy and methods to be more directive on the cultural, social and economic wellbeing benefits attributed to the Manukau Harbour including its role in supporting live, work, play concepts.
OP026	Otara Papatoetoe			b. The requirement for strong outcomes about improving water quality.
OP027	Otara Papatoetoe			c. Appropriate management frameworks for pacific oyster and mangrove removal and harbour channel and port dredging requirements.
OP028	Otara Papatoetoe			d. Protection of wharf and port facilities and ensure future cross harbour transport linkages are not compromised.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
OP029	Otara Papatoetoe			25. Public open space – Colin Dale Park (Puhinui). Colin Dale Park has been given a Countryside Living zoning. The Board considers this a mistake, and suggests that public open space zones should be applied. A large area has been allocated to motorsports and BMX. There is also some community use envisaged, including Marae use, and possibly some conservation zoning near the coast. A detailed review of the zonings would be appropriate, in conjunction with the Parks Department and the local board. (Attachment B, area “O”.)
OP030	Otara Papatoetoe			26. Public open space – Aorere Park (Papatoetoe/Mangere). Aorere Park has been given 2 POS zonings – partly civic and community, and partly sport and active. In fact the park is to be developed primarily as a sports park and the board suggests that giving the whole park a POS Sport and Active zoning would be appropriate. The area of the park that currently contains early childhood centres could reasonably be included under POS civic and community, or the sports and active zoning, subject to existing use rights. The board would raise no objection if either POS zone were to be considered for the ECE area. (Attachment B, area “Q”.)
OP031	Otara Papatoetoe			27. Early childhood centres on public open space zones – the board notes that all four open space zones require resource consent to be obtained to establish new early childhood centres. The board supports this and asks for these rules to be retained, to ensure that open space is not converted to other purposes without careful consideration.
OP032	Otara Papatoetoe			28. Puhinui Gateway: Proposed Plan Change 35 to the Operative District Plan (Manukau Section) – This proposed plan change would rezone a block of rural land west of State Highway 20 and south of Puhinui Road to new business zonings. The board supports plan change 35 in principle, as it will enable more business activity and create jobs. However, the board would like a sizeable area of public open space reserved along the Puhinui Road frontage, as shown on Attachment B, area “G”. The reasons are to preserve amenity and landscape values along Puhinui Road, and to provide additional POS land for sports use and community use, of which there is a shortage in the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Area. Part of this strip should also be preserved as a future corridor for a rail connection between Auckland International Airport and Manukau City Centre.
OP033	Otara Papatoetoe			29. The board does not support the housing affordability options in the Addendum to the draft Unitary Plan, and asks that other options be developed to promote affordable housing. The option of financing affordable housing from taking a share of the “windfall” obtained by landowners when green fields land is rezoned for urban uses is considered by the board to be unfair to the landowners. The board opposes the option of providing development bonuses (such as additional building height) to developers who voluntarily include affordable housing in new developments because the additional building bulk will have adverse effects on the neighbourhood.
OP034	Otara Papatoetoe			30. This section proposes zoning changes, and including those referred to in other sections of this paper. Attachment B is a copy of the zoning map showing the zoning changes proposed by the board (marked as areas “A”, “B” etc.)
OP035	Otara Papatoetoe			Area A. The local board suggests further intensification/terrace housing around Middlemore Cres and Eden St areas, in the areas “A” and “B”. Middlemore Hospital is a huge source of employment and having medium density housing immediately adjacent would provide an excellent match of live-work. The Eden St and Middlemore Cres areas are also approximately 800m from the Middlemore Station, just within the accepted range for transport accessibility.
OP036	Otara Papatoetoe			Area B. Same as Area A.
OP037	Otara Papatoetoe			Area C. Wymondley Rd (area “C”) should not be single house zone. This area has large sections and low site improvement value, so is suited to intensification. This area is not well supported by public transport or town centre amenities, but has reason access to the road network, including the motorway and therefore the board suggests this area should all be zoned THABZ.
OP038	Otara Papatoetoe			Area D. The Harwood-Gilbert-Franklyn Rd area at Ōtara (area “D”) would be better zoned Mixed Housing Zone. This zoning would not include areas under the transmission line overlay. There are larger sections in this area, and the improvements are generally of lower value – attributes that will encourage mixed housing intensification.
OP039	Otara Papatoetoe			Area E. Boundary Rd and Israel Ave (area “E”) – This area is suitable for Mixed Housing Zone. There are some larger sections in this area, and the improvements are generally of lower value – attributes that will encourage mixed housing intensification.
OP040	Otara Papatoetoe			Area F. Clendon Ave/ Ranfurly Rd (area “F”) – this area could support intensification, because of its proximity to the Puhinui Rail station, and the lower value of current improvements. Mixed Housing Zone is suggested.
OP041	Otara Papatoetoe			Area G. Open Space zone – Puhinui Rd (area “G”) – see para 30 below.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
OP042	Otara Papatoetoe			Area H. Kenderdine Rd / Cambridge Tce (area "H") – this area could support intensification, because of its proximity to the Puhinui Rail station. THAB Zone is suggested.
OP043	Otara Papatoetoe			Area I. Old Papatoetoe Town Centre (area "I") – these fringe areas of the town centre should be added to the Town Centre Zone – see para 18.
OP044	Otara Papatoetoe			Area J. Woolfield Rd (area "J") - this area should be THAB Zone with a 5 storey height overlay – see para 11 above.
OP045	Otara Papatoetoe			Area K. Omana Rd (area "K") – the Single House Zone in this street should be extended to the properties shown, which have similar amenity to those already zoned SHZ, and adjoining the golf course.
OP046	Otara Papatoetoe			Area L. St George St / Kolmar Rd (area "L") – This residential area between Old Papatoetoe and Hunters Corner should be Single House Zone to preserve the older high quality larger houses, and their community character.
OP047	Otara Papatoetoe			Area M. Fairview – Paton Ave (area "M"). A Mixed Housing Zone is proposed in this area to provide a transition between the town centre, THABZ, and the single house zone further out. The area could be split into mixed housing sub-zones, as described in the Interim Directions, with a 2 storey sub zone immediately adjoining the Single House Zone.
OP048	Otara Papatoetoe			Area N. THAB Hospital Rd – The Terrace Housing and Apartment Building Zone on Hospital Rd near Auckland Golf Course is supported. The area is adjacent to the train station and a major employment node. Kings College may also have future accommodation needs that could be accommodated within this zone.
OP049	Otara Papatoetoe			Area O. Colin Dale Park (Puhinui, area "O") – see para 28. Public open space zonings are suggested, following a review.
OP050	Otara Papatoetoe			Area P. Manukau Institute of Technology (MIT) north campus (area "P") – The North MIT Campus is proposed as "Single House Zone", which the board believes is an error. The board recommends that the Northern MIT Campus zoning be amended to a Mixed Use Zoning as shown in area "P". This would continue to allow the Education use, but also allow and encourage residential (especially student village) intensification. The MIT South Campus is zoned Town Centre, which should be retained.
OP051	Otara Papatoetoe			Area Q. Aorere Park (area "Q") – The public open space zones given to different should be reviewed. (See para 29).
P001	Papakura	General		a) That Papakura Local Board provides the following feedback on the Draft Unitary Plan, to inform discussions with the Auckland Plan Committee in July 2013 and decision-making by the Auckland Plan Committee in August 2013.
P002	Papakura	General		b) That the Papakura Local Board endorses the recommendations from Studio D4 at Attachment A to the agenda report.
P003	Papakura	General		c) That the detailed comments contained in Attachment 25A to the Minutes dated 17 July 2013, which are to be signed off by the Chair and Deputy Chair, form part of Papakura Local Board's formal submission on the Draft Unitary Plan.
P004	Papakura	General		d) That the Papakura Local Board expresses concern that the development of the Unitary Plan has been at too fast a pace to allow for adequate consideration of all the potential impacts on local communities.
P005	Papakura	Growth		e) i. A central principle of planned growth should be that infrastructure and jobs are provided alongside development;
P006	Papakura	Business		ii. To ensure that the growth of the Metropolitan Centre can fully deliver Auckland Plan outcomes and support the increase in population, adequate public transport and roading improvements must be provided;
P007	Papakura	Area Plans		iii. The Papakura Area Plan should be commenced to ensure that the transition to a Metropolitan Centre is managed in a locally distinctive manner, with physical and character constraints fully recognised;
P008	Papakura	Precincts		iv. The requirement for a Precinct Plan for the metropolitan centre and key adjoining areas of change should be addressed urgently and Council resources provided to investigate catalyst projects, in partnership with the private sector;
P009	Papakura	Growth		v. The Takanini Structure Planned area should be incorporated within the Rural Urban Boundary that is defined within the notified Unitary Plan;
P010	Papakura	Growth		vi. The manner and timing of Greenfield land release should be clarified in order to reduce the potential for unsustainable development and ensure that future urban land is not blighted;
P011	Papakura	Quality Design		vii. Urban Design controls should be able to be enforced and not relegated to "guidance";
P012	Papakura	Coastal		viii. The national and international importance of the Manukau Harbour should be recognised as equal to Auckland's other Harbours, and merit the same attention at a regional level;
P013	Papakura	Coastal		ix. Policies and rules on Mangrove removal and Pacific Oyster removal should be clearer and less restrictive;

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
P014	Papakura	Precincts		x. A Precinct Plan should be prepared for the Manukau Harbour, introducing a control regime based on the earliest reference date that can be supported by local photographic evidence. no later than 1985.
P015	Papakura	Rezoning requests		f) i. The area between Trentham Road and Waterview West should be zoned Mixed Housing;
P016	Papakura	Residential		ii. The Single House zone should be restricted to subdivision areas completed since 1980 with the remaining areas zoned Mixed Housing (unless edge of centre Terrace Housing and Apartments zone applies);
P017	Papakura	Rezoning requests		iii. A Special Zone should be identified around the Hawkins Theatre, RSA and adjoining community and educational facilities;
P018	Papakura	Rezoning requests		iv. A Special Zone should be identified at the Karaka Bloodstock Centre.
PT001	Puketapapa	General		Recommendation/s a) That the Local Board provides the following feedback on the draft Unitary Plan to inform discussions with the Auckland Plan Committee in July 2013 and decision-making by the Auckland Plan Committee in August 2013.
PT002	Puketapapa	General		b) As the Unitary Plan process progresses to the publicly notified Proposed Unitary Plan stage, the Board is of the view that this phase requires comprehensive and robust engagement particularly with the communities of Puketapapa to ensure further improvement of the Unitary Plan before it becomes operative.
PT003	Puketapapa	General		c) i) The Local Board is aware that it needs to accommodate growth, however outcomes that will achieve this have not been delivered in Puketapapa to date. The Board members were encouraged with the mapping workshop and is supportive of the changes recommended being incorporated into the second mapping workshop on 2 August. The Board is also keen to see how the precincts and overlay plans will be developed in the future.
PT004	Puketapapa	General		ii) In principle, the Board supports the compact city model whereby higher densities around town centres, public transport routes, transport nodes and local nodes are promoted. However, it is of the view that the zoning amendments, height changes, precinct and overlay amendments need to be incorporated prior to implementation of the compact city model. The Board is also of the view that strong consideration needs to be given to maintaining amenity values, achieving high quality urban design, and preservation of character and heritage elements.
PT005	Puketapapa	General		iii) The Council should also utilise non regulatory measures to achieve high quality design outcomes along with the Unitary Plan design assessment criteria. These include the use of the Urban Design Panel, the Auckland Design Manual and Auckland Council Property Limited as a catalyst developer.
PT006	Puketapapa	General		d) i) The Board seeks intensification that is supported by appropriate levels of infrastructure which ensures a high quality environment for existing and new residents, for example, the area east of Keith Hay Park. However, this concern is area-wide and not restricted to this location. There has been significant public feedback on this issue.
PT007	Puketapapa	General		ii) The Board notes that in recommending the above and that in addition to the Unitary Plan there are several other strategic documents involved in the delivery of a compact city and the Council's intensification goals. Importantly these plans involve the delivery of social and physical infrastructure required to support the additional development envisaged in the Unitary Plan. The Board also notes that Council is also in regular ongoing discussions with Central Government in order to ensure sufficient education, healthcare and social housing is planned for as the Region grows.
PT008	Puketapapa	Infrastructure		iii) High Voltage Transmission Lines: The Board's position on High Voltage Transmission Lines is that they should be required to be placed underground. Further, the Board supports the approach to the Corridor Management Strategy and NPSET with regard to setbacks from with above ground high voltage transmission lines to make sensitive activities within 12 metres of transmissions lines a restricted discretionary activity, with reasons for objection limited to issues of safety and reasonable access requirements. The Board does not support the additional plan provisions for the outer 20m zone. This approach will satisfy the need for public safety and security of supply whilst recognising and not unduly impinging on private property rights and allowing development to occur.
PT009	Puketapapa	Infrastructure		iv) The Puketapapa Local Board notes that in a recent meeting with Watercare and Auckland Council Stormwater that Watercare said they wanted to be able to work with Council and other infrastructure providers like Auckland Transport to make sure that growth occurs in the most appropriate locations with full consideration given to all factors including infrastructure. Watercare will look to Council to take the lead on growth and up-zoning and are looking at opportunities to work more closely with Council to avoid difficult problems such as overflows.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
PT010	Puketapapa	Growth		e) i) Subject to amendments made at the mapping workshop, the Board is generally supportive of the approach that sees growth focussed around town centres, public transport routes, transport nodes and local nodes. The Board supports high quality interfaces between business, residential zones, heritage/character elements and volcanic view shafts.
PT011	Puketapapa	General		ii) The Board seeks to ensure that a wide variety of housing types are able to be accommodated within its area and the zoning and development rules do not result in a single type of housing being developed as this will not meet the needs of the mixed population of Puketapapa.
PT012	Puketapapa	Quality Design		iii) The Board seeks to ensure high quality urban design outcomes are achieved through the assessment criteria within the Unitary Plan. The proposed design controls and criteria within the Unitary Plan that apply to all developments within Town Centres and larger developments in residential zones should address all levels of design. The Board supports expanding the proposed design controls and criteria to apply to all developments.
PT013	Puketapapa	Quality Design		f) i) The Board acknowledges the design controls and criteria within the Unitary Plan that apply to all developments within Town Centres and larger developments in residential zones. The criteria broadly address a number of key concerns that communities have with existing, poorly designed developments, and will be supported by the Auckland Design manual, which the Board recommends be completed and released with urgency.
PT014	Puketapapa	Quality Design		The design assessment criteria address critical design factors, such as:
PT015	Puketapapa	Quality Design		• Historic heritage interfaces and relationships;
PT016	Puketapapa	Quality Design		• Topography & orientation;
PT017	Puketapapa	Quality Design		• Variety of building form;
PT018	Puketapapa	Quality Design		• Shading & sunlight;
PT019	Puketapapa	Quality Design		• Neighbourhood character; and
				• Parking/servicing design.
PT020	Puketapapa	Quality Design		ii) The restricted discretionary activity design criteria require the provision of a design statement. The design statement will be important in assessing the design merits of a particular development and its relationship to adjoining buildings and character elements. There is a high level of design detail and scrutiny required in the proposed Unitary Plan provisions and these are supported.
PT021	Puketapapa	Quality Design		In particular, the requirement for a design statement that is required to take into account existing neighbourhood context and the requirement to avoid contrasting significantly with the established urban pattern of development, is supported. The Board also supports incentives for good quality design, rather than imposing barriers to achieve this.
PT022	Puketapapa	Quality Design		iii) The Board also considers that the success of the design based criteria will depend significantly on how Council officers process consent applications and apply the design criteria. This needs to be managed carefully, in order to ensure the high quality design outcomes sought, are achieved.
PT023	Puketapapa	Precinct		g) On Three Kings Precinct Plan and re-development of the Three Kings Quarry: i) The Board notes the complexity of the situation in terms of re-development and the potential for re-development of the Three Kings Quarry (the Quarry) to support or detract from Three Kings centre. How development is undertaken is the most important consideration and can produce widely varied outcomes for the surrounding area.
PT024	Puketapapa	Precinct		ii) The Board supports the use of a precinct overlay, covering the area of the existing quarry, the adjacent land owned by the Auckland Council and the Three Kings Town Centre, to guide any re-development of the Quarry. This is due to the removal of the Comprehensive Development Zone since the November submission made by the Board. This Precinct will require detailed framework plans to be undertaken before development takes place.
PT025	Puketapapa	Precinct		iii) A precinct overlay with statutory status should address a number of site specific and strategic issues that have not been addressed in detail to date, including but not limited to:
PT026	Puketapapa	Precinct		- final contours
PT027	Puketapapa	Precinct		- urban structure
PT028	Puketapapa	Precinct		- development Height and density
PT029	Puketapapa	Precinct		- connections
PT030	Puketapapa	Precinct		- quality of built form
PT031	Puketapapa	Precinct		- integration With The town centre and community facilities
PT032	Puketapapa	Precinct		- proposed land swaps and acquisitions including A process for undertaking These
PT033	Puketapapa	Precinct		- integration With existing and new open space
				- remedy of contamination or hazards

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
PT034	Puketapapa	Precinct		- ecology and natural heritage
PT035	Puketapapa	Precinct		- wastewater / stormwater provision
PT036	Puketapapa	Precinct		- transportation (including provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities)
PT037	Puketapapa	Precinct		- volcanic heritage and views
PT038	Puketapapa	Precinct		- cultural and built heritage
PT039	Puketapapa	Infrastructure		iv) The Board does not support the application of a new zone on the Quarry site. It supports the retention of the Special Purpose Quarry zone in conjunction with a framework plan and the precinct overlay to guide development of the site in the future. There is a high degree of uncertainty currently around the exact nature of re-development and lack of clarity around strategic issues. These include and are not limited to infrastructure provision and other issues listed above, and how the principle identified within the spatial Precinct Plan for the area will be achieved.
PT040	Puketapapa	Residential		v) Supports the transition to a new underlying residential zone and Open Space zone when the issues identified above have been dealt with and the broad nature of re-development has been established.
PT041	Puketapapa	Parks and Community		vi) Advocates for additional resources from the Governing Body to acquire new Open Space in and around the Three Kings area.
PT042	Puketapapa	Precinct		vii) Supports the use of a Framework Plan to be developed for sites where re-development might take place, e.g. quarry and town centre sites, after objectives and policies have been agreed for the precinct overlay. This would guide the detailed design of the area included within the overlay, and ensure certainty over outcomes including stormwater and wastewater infrastructure and traffic management.
PT043	Puketapapa	Precinct		viii) The Board supports the use of the principles in the Puketapapa Local Board's Three Kings Precinct Plan, a process undertaken with the community and endorsed by the Board in February 2013, to guide redevelopment of the Quarry. These principles should inform the objectives and policies of any precinct overlay controls.
PT044	Puketapapa	Infrastructure		ix) In addition to the guidance given by the endorsed Principles from the Three Kings Precinct Plan, the Board gives support for the following to be addressed before rezoning of the quarry site occurs: Connections - Any re-development of The Quarry should ensure that logical and clear connections are made through The re-development. This includes The placement of A north south connection to The town Centre.
PT045	Puketapapa	Infrastructure		- Any development should connect well With The town centre if The configuration of open space allows for this. land swaps and acquisitions should be explored and sufficient time and resource given for This to be undertaken.
PT046	Puketapapa	Infrastructure		- The area of Council open space to The north of Graham Breed Drive should be filled as soon as possible to connect With The final level of The Quarry development to ensure that east-west connections can be achieved. The Board will advocate to The Governing Body to ensure This occurs.
PT047	Puketapapa	Infrastructure		Big King (Te Tatua a Riukiuta) and Views - Major Road connections should be aligned to protect view corridors wherever possible.
PT048	Puketapapa	Viewshafts		- The application of Height limits, viewshafts or Height Sensitive Areas should be investigated to ensure that Big King is respected and is A central aspect of re-development
PT049	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		- The ecological restoration and enhancement of Big King (Te Tatua A Riukiuta) should be priority for re-development of The quarry.
PT050	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		- Planning for final contour levels should be undertaken early as they are essential information on which to make decisions about The suitability of re-development.
PT051	Puketapapa	Business		- Minimum levels across the re developed site are required. Levels of 70m had been discussed previously, but other options such as 75m should be explored as these will provide greater integration with the Town Centre and surrounding development.
PT052	Puketapapa	Parks and Community		- there is A great opportunity to create A Major open space facility in The re developed Quarry that supports redevelopment, by using new and existing open space that has been reconfigured.
PT053	Puketapapa	Parks and Community		- integration With existing open space and reconfiguration through land swaps or acquisition of new open space is important to achieving A high quality outcome. sufficient time and commitment should be allowed to explore These options.
PT054	Puketapapa	Parks and Community		- acquisition of Additional open space in and around The re-developed Quarry should be A priority for The Governing Body.
PT055	Puketapapa	Infrastructure		- Infrastructure for re development should be evaluated on an area wide basis to ensure that an integrated approach is achieved for The surrounding area.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
PT056	Puketapapa	Infrastructure		- Major wastewater and stormwater constraints have been identified. The wider Three Kings area and The Upper Meola Catchment is at capacity. Prior to Any re-development of The land within The precinct taking Place, details of how This will be remedied and funding arrangements (including costs to ratepayers) to ensure This will occur need to be provided.
PT057	Puketapapa	Transport		- Impacts of re-development on The wider transportation network should be considered and how re-development will provide for integrated transport and land use.
PT058	Puketapapa	Transport		- Additional connections should be planned for to Limit The impact of only one access to Mount Eden Road.
PT059	Puketapapa	Residential		h) i) The Board has received significant feedback on the Mixed Housing Zone and the potential 8m-10m height allowance. The Board has considered the stepped height proposal which suggests splitting the housing zone in two (i.e. A & B). It is suggested that the Mixed Housing A zone be located adjacent to Town Centres and Terraced Housing and Apartment Building (THAB) zones, or areas with good quality public transport access, with a 10m height limit and Mixed Housing B for the remainder of the zone with an 8m height limit. The Board supports this fine grained approach for the zone and is generally supportive of the 150m threshold from Town Centres or THAB zones as being suitable to define the Mixed Housing A zone.
PT060	Puketapapa	Residential		ii) With regard to development control infringements, the Board is of the view that infringements to the maximum height control, height in relation to boundary control and building coverage control should at least require written approvals of potentially affected persons or a limited notified process. For significant infringements of these controls, the Board is of the view that the full public notification option should be open to the Council.
PT061	Puketapapa	Residential		iii) The majority of the Board strongly supports the front yard fence control which requires solid fences to be no higher than 1.2m and the portion between 1.2m and 1.8 being 75% transparent. The Board also supports the street front garage control, whereby the garage can be no more than 50% of the building frontage.
PT062	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		iv) The Board supports the following amendments: Lynfield - Orcades Place: THAB removed – specific properties changed to single house/ and Mixed Housing B zone on workshop map.
PT063	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- 23-27 Commodore Drive – THAB removed, changed to Mixed Housing B zone.
PT064	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Additional THAB zone added on Commodore Drive (near The Avenue), Caronia Crescent/ Oriana Avenue block (near The Avenue).
PT065	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- The sites at 11 Commodore Drive, 21-23 Tropicana Drive, 8 Lynfield Place and 202A-202B White Swan Road, Lynfield: changed portion of the site to Mixed Housing A zone and another portion to Single House.
PT066	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Change 610 Hillsborough Road to Mixed Housing B zone
PT067	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		Mixed Housing A zone introduced to: <input type="checkbox"/> north-side of White Swan Road
PT068	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		<input type="checkbox"/> South of Griffen Park Road (of White Swan Road)
PT069	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		<input type="checkbox"/> specific properties along Orsova Place, Rangitiki Crescent, Commodore Drive, Halsey Drive, Caronia Crescent, Oriana Avenue, Maripesa Avenue and Hillsborough Road changed from MHB to MHA.
PT070	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Amend all Single House zoned properties on Tropicana Drive, to Mixed Housing B zone.
PT071	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Amend the block of houses 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15 Halsey Drive properties from Single house to Mixed Housing B zone.
PT072	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Specific properties on Orcades Place, Orsova Place, and Rangitiki Crescent, amended from Single House to Mixed Housing B zone as shown on workshop map.
PT073	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		v) - Hillsborough Coast zones to remain as A mix of Single and Mixed Housing B.
PT074	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Specific properties subject to flood plain changed zone from Mixed Housing B zone to Single House as shown on workshop map.
PT075	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Hillsborough Heights Village, based at 1381 Dominion Road Extension changed zone from Mixed Housing to Special Purpose: Retirement Village
PT076	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- THAB on Stanford Park Road, Raven Ave, Richardson Road and Molley Green Place changed to Mixed Housing B zone.
PT077	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		vi) - Blanket Height Sensitive Areas (Dominion Road, Richardson Road and May Road area)
PT078	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		<input type="checkbox"/> The Board proposed to rezone properties further away from the Mount Roskill mountain (i.e. south of Freeland Avenue) from THAB to Mixed Housing A zone.
PT079	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		<input type="checkbox"/> Changed all THAB zone to Mixed Housing B that surrounds the mountain between May Road, Dominion Road and Richardson block.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
PT080	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		<input type="checkbox"/> Keep all single house properties as it is – surrounding the maunga (around Roseman Avenue and Youth Street)
PT081	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		<input type="checkbox"/> For 2nd August, investigate if MH A zone can be introduced. As this area is under the Blanket HSA.
PT082	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Did not support the requested deletion of THAB from the strip of land to the north-east of the site at 260-288 Richardson Road, Mount Roskill. The whole site and block has been identified as THAB (250m from centre).
PT083	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Additional THAB introduced for The block between Richardson Road, Ernie Pinches Street as shown on workshop map.
PT084	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Rezone the area above town centre, Farrelly Avenue up to O'Donnell Avenue from Mixed Housing/ Single House to THAB zone.
PT085	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Rezone The area above town centre, Denny Avenue from Single House to THAB zone.
PT086	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- With regard to The greater Wesley area, The Board is concerned about The potential for poor quality development in Areas where there is A large proportion of social Housing and The Board reinforces its strong support for high quality design outcomes in all developments.
PT087	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Mixed Housing A proposed for Richardson Road/ May Road, Marion Avenue block (west) and block north of Aurora Avenue up to Mount Albert Road
PT088	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		vii) Maungakiekie Golf Course The Board is of the view that there is an opportunity to undertake a comprehensive and integrated development of the Maungakiekie golf course which facilitates some higher density redevelopment of the Hillsborough Road frontage and the remainder of the site vested as public open space for use as a combination of passive recreation and sportsfields. This could be undertaken via a precinct plan approach.
PT089	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		viii) Mount Roskill - Mixed Housing A zone to be applied to Specific blocks, in particular south of Mount Albert Road towards Gifford Avenue and around Dominion Road, Mount Albert Road, May Road and Mount Roskill Road.
PT090	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Rezone Single House properties south of Gifford Ave, adjacent to The Park to THAB zone.
PT091	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Rezone 3 Keystone Avenue site from local centre to THAB zone.
PT092	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Specific blocks south of Mount Albert Road/ Dominion Road area were changed from Mixed Housing B zone to THAB, Mixed Housing A and Single House zone. This is based on up principles, floodplain issues and SEA.
PT093	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Mixed Use remained along Dominion Road (however, adjusted to only one property depth out from The main Road) all other properties changed from Mixed Use to Mixed Housing A zone.
PT094	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- proposed Mixed Housing A zone from Mixed Use on both sides along Dominion Road as shown on workshop map.
PT095	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Any sites subject to floodplain constraints in Hardley Avenue, Haig Avenue and Louvain Avenue changed from Single House to Mixed Housing B zone.
PT096	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Mixed Housing A zone introduced for the Keystone Avenue, Akarana Avenue and Mount Albert Road block (east, adjacent to centre).
PT097	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- THAB zone introduced for Jasper Avenue, Mons Avenue, and Mount Albert Road block (west adjacent to centre).
PT098	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		ix) Three Kings - Rezone The area adjacent to Mount Eden Road, eastern side from THAB to Mixed Housing (A)
PT099	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Rezone 21 Hunters Park Drive from THAB to Mixed Housing (A).
PT100	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Rezone 955 Mount Eden Road to Mixed Housing to reflect the current use.
PT101	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Limit the THAB to the south of Mount Albert Road to 4 storeys to reduce shading and interface issues.
PT102	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- south facing THAB zone south of Mount Albert Road
PT103	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		<input type="checkbox"/> Rezone the area of Mixed Housing along Hayr Road to THAB.
PT104	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		<input type="checkbox"/> Sites lower down the slope (below Britton Avenue) should be down zoned to Mixed Housing A.
PT105	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		<input type="checkbox"/> Rezone properties south of Warren Avenue (Frequent Network), near areas of THAB and Marie Avenue to Mixed Housing A as shown on workshop map.
PT106	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- 76 and 78 Duke Street - Retain current zoning as this fits well with the intention of the Future Planning Framework. Any change should be pending outcome of Heritage process for wider Upper Wesley heritage area.
PT107	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- THAB near Hillsborough Road - Rezone Mixed Housing (A) to retain consistency With approach across whole of Mount Albert Road corridor (see maps)
PT108	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Specific properties along Hillsborough Road and Mount Albert Road, adjacent to The neighbourhood centre changed from Mixed Housing B to Mixed Housing A zone

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
PT109	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Further away, Specific properties are to be zoned Mixed Housing (B) on Mount Albert Road.
PT110	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		x) Royal Oak - Rezoned THAB properties south of Greenwoods Corner on Greenfield Road, Goodland Street, Epworth Avenue to Mixed Housing A zone
PT111	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Rezone Acorn Street, Oak Street, Ambury Avenue, and Beckenham Ave properties from Mixed Housing B to THAB zone
PT112	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Rezone The properties from Pah Road to Royal Oak centre (east direction), both north and south sides of Mount Albert Road from Mixed Use to THAB zone
PT113	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Rezone The properties from Pah Road to Hillsborough Road (west direction), both north and south sides of Mount Albert Road from Mixed Use to Mixed Housing A zone.
PT114	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		i) The Board is of the view that a more sophisticated approach to height within town centres is required. The stepped height approach suggested at Council workshops is supported as this will allow for a more fine grained approach to redevelopment and enable more appropriate height and scale for sensitive parts of each town centre.
PT115	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		ii) There are design quality rules and thresholds set out in the Unitary Plan that control design quality. The design assessment criteria require consideration of existing neighbourhood context and the avoidance of contrasting significantly with the established urban pattern of development. The Board supports this approach to design control.
PT116	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		iii) In regard to specific business mapping changes, the Board supports the following amendments:
PT117	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		Lynfield - town centre zone and Mixed Use to remain as it is.
PT118	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- town centre zone Height remains as it is.
PT119	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		Hillsborough - 1213 and 1215 Dominion Road properties amended to Neighbourhood Centre.
PT120	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Rezone 569 Richardson Road property from THAB to Neighbourhood Centre
PT121	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Rezone and include the whole property of 1388 Dominion Road as Public Open Space - Sport and Active Recreation (there should be no mixed housing zone on this site).
PT122	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		Stoddard Rd - Does not support a blanket up-zoning of this town centre, but could be supportive of 4 storeys at the road frontage increasing to 6 storeys at a distance of 5m from the road frontage (i.e. 5m setback).
PT123	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- The extent and coverage of light industry zone to be reviewed as follows:
PT124	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		<input type="checkbox"/> Rezone 53 May Road site from Light Industry to General Business
PT125	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		<input type="checkbox"/> Include the whole site on 60 Roma Road/ May Road into the zone.
PT126	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		<input type="checkbox"/> Amend some properties fronting Stoddard Road from Services/Light Industry to Mixed Use as shown on workshop map.
PT127	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- The Local Board also supports A new precinct overlay for The Stoddard Road area as shown on The workshop map.
PT128	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		Mount Roskill - No Change to centre and Mixed Use zone extent and height.
PT129	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		Three Kings - Rezone part of 937-939 Mount Eden Road to Neighbourhood Centre to reflected the resource consent and established use on this site.
PT130	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- Remove Neighbourhood Centre zone from 1A Roskill Way.
PT131	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- The Local Board is of the view that Three Kings be considered a 6 storey Town Centre north of Mount Albert Road and a 4 storey centre south of Mount Albert Road.
PT132	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		- The Board supports A precinct overlay for The town centre as shown on The workshop maps.
PT133	Puketapapa	Rezoning Requests		Carr Rd - No change. zone remains as it is.
PT134	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		iv) Parking: The general approach to reduced parking requirements in the Town Centres and THAB zone is supported as this encourages public transport usage. The Unitary Plan approach to parking proposes a more sensible approach to parking provision by enabling parking where the market demands it, while also encouraging public transport usage by imposing a maximum parking ratio. The Board supports residential parking permit schemes to ensure residents can park close to their homes.
PT135	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		i) That the Local Board endorses the Unitary Plan provisions related to the identification and management of Historic Heritage.
PT136	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		ii) That the Local Board generally endorses the Unitary Plan provisions for Historic Character, but requests that the provisions provide for new Historic Character areas in a way that recognizes post-1940 historic character such as State Housing and other post-World War II patterns of historical development.
PT137	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		iii) The Board support full notification of resource consent applications for demolition and new buildings that alter historic heritage buildings and historic character sites.
				iv) The Board supports ongoing work to identify archaeological features and cultural landscapes, for inclusion in the Unitary Plan over time.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
PT138	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		v) That the Local Board requests the inclusion of new Historic Heritage Places and Historic Character Areas identified through the Puketapapa Historic Heritage Survey in the relevant overlays of the Unitary Plan as follows:
PT139	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		The following places should be included as historic heritage places:
PT140	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		- Former Mount Roskill Borough Council Building, 560 Mount Albert Road
PT141	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		- Arkell Homestead, 461 Hillsborough Road
PT142	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		- Saint Francis Retreat 50 Hillsborough Road
PT143	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		- Saint David's in the fields (El Rey Country Club) 202 Hillsborough Road
PT144	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		- War Memorial Hall and Memorial, 13 May Road
PT145	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		- Three Kings Congregational Church 513A Mount Albert Road
PT146	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		- Residence, 520 Mount Albert Road
PT147	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		- "Coleraine", Logan Manor, 1 Warren Avenue
PT148	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		- Residence, 8 Liverpool Street
PT149	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		- Memorial to Wesley School 54 Mc Cullough Avenue
PT150	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		- Brooks House, Turret House, 143 White Swan Road
PT151	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		- "Atalanga", The King of Tonga's house at 183 Saint Andrews Road be investigated for heritage protection.
PT152	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		- Upper Wesley State Housing area: Comprehensively planned in 1939, this is the first large state housing area in Mount Roskill. Extent of character area suggested reflects the whole of the comprehensively planned area. The area retains state housing street layout and housing stock largely intact and includes the 1950s shops, allotted with preference to returned servicemen at the Fearon Avenue/ Parau Street corner, as well as evidence of the Wesley Training college - historic trees and monument marking site of stone buildings. Located on slopes of the Three Kings tuff ring.
PT153	Puketapapa	Residential		- Foch Ave and Haig Avenue: The full length of Foch Avenue - the north side at the western end remains quite intact in terms of established residential character-with bungalows and a couple of transitional villas at the corner of Hardley Avenue. The south side at the west end is more varied in built character but retains some early house types. These two streets were part of a 1923 subdivision. 1940 aerial photo shows this area largely developed by then, and the streets are good representative examples in this area which retain predominantly bungalow style housing, as well as some Modern apartments and flats, which are a feature of this area.
PT154	Puketapapa	Residential		- Kings Road and Princes Avenue: Part of a 1910 subdivision. Housing stock includes some transitional villas, bungalows and English cottage types. These streets are good representative examples of this period of development in the northern part of former Mount Roskill borough and retain a collective established residential character, noting that there has been some degree of ongoing development.
PT155	Puketapapa	Heritage and Historic Character		vi) The Board strongly supports a single maximum permitted height, whereby the Town Centre/THAB height and the blanket height sensitive area height are the same, and this value is developed by applying a fine grain approach. The Board further believes that any infringements of the blanket height sensitive area control around volcanic cones should be a non-complying activity. The Board is concerned that in areas such as Mount Roskill South and the Roma Road light industry area, there is confusion as to what the anticipated built height will be. This approach is also at odds with the Town Centre heights. The Board is very concerned that the 8m permitted height may have little bearing on the actual building height that results.
PT156	Puketapapa	Coastal		vii) 1944 Control: The Board notes that the 1944 threshold is a blunt tool and a more informed approach to heritage preservation is required, as is being undertaken by the Puketapapa heritage analysis. This work is in the initial draft report stage and the initial findings are recommended above, however there may be further historic items/areas that should be protected as refinement of the report progresses.
PT157	Puketapapa	Coastal		i) Mangroves: The Board is supportive of an approach that allows removal of recently mangroves as a permitted activity. Furthermore the Board remains of the view that only specifically protected areas of mangroves should require resource consent for removal. In support of this it should be a permitted activity to remove mangroves in the General Management Area and restricted discretionary activity in Significant Ecological Area. The Board is also of the view that, in addition to hand held tools, mechanical and electrical tools should also be able to be utilised in mangrove removal subject to appropriate environmental controls.
				ii) Pacific Oyster Removal: The Board is of the view that the oyster removal provisions of the Unitary plan are too restrictive. The Board is of the view that Plan should be more flexible and provide for Pacific oyster removal as a permitted activity, so that this practice can be undertaken in a practical manner. The Board considers it appropriate to be able to grind oyster shells and replace on the beach as sand, subject to appropriate environmental controls.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
PT158	Puketapapa	Coastal		iii) Foreshore Protection: The Board supports the foreshore protection controls within the draft UP and specifically the controls that restrict development in proximity to the foreshore. To this end, the yard rules should be clarified to ensure that coastal margins are also included in the lake and riparian yards controls.
PT159	Puketapapa	Coastal		iv) Stormwater management/wastewater: The Board was concerned about flooding and overflow of stormwater and wastewater in the area west of Keith Hay Park. This area has been historically subject to flooding and wastewater inundation and the Board's concern is that the increase in intensification will exacerbate the current issues. Currently wastewater and stormwater is separated, however discussions with Watercare have indicated there are no immediate plans to increase the capacity of the infrastructure in this locality. This areas needs to remain Single House zone until this matter is resolved, at which point a Mixed Housing zone may be appropriate.
PT160	Puketapapa	Coastal		v) Oakley Creek/Wesley: The Board was of the view that it was supportive of the more fine grained approach that the Unitary Plan proposed for this area than previous drafts. The Board suggests a Single House zone for the area north of O'Donnell Street. The main issue in the Oakley Creek area relates to more stringent control of development adjacent to waterways. The Board supports Auckland Council stormwater department purchasing property adjoining the creek margin, then improving the creek margin and width and reselling the property. This approach would see increased capacity in the stormwater network and also improve the banks of this important stream network. The Board was of the view in this area that it was better to create higher density further away from the stream margin and create more open space around the margin. The Board supports the future planning framework outcomes in this area.
PT161	Puketapapa	Coastal		vi) Manukau Harbour: The Board is supportive of the Manukau Harbour Forum recommendations, particularly relating to water quality and Pacific oyster removal. The Board endorses those recommendations.
PT162	Puketapapa	Mapping		i) The Board welcomed the opportunity to take part in the mapping workshop and was supportive of the approach taken in the workshop. The Board supports the amendments to the planning maps as outlined above in these recommendations.
PT163	Puketapapa	General		m) The Board would like to express its thanks to the Council officers who have assisted in the development of the Board's unitary Plan position both through the community engagement process and in the drafting of the Local Board feedback.
PT164	Puketapapa	General		n) The Board would like to thank the local residents, businesses and community groups who have engaged with the process and have given their views.
R001	Rodney	Growth		3.1 Legacy Structure Plans Legacy structure plans previously consulted upon should be acknowledged in the Unitary Plan and used as the basis of the Unitary Plan and those adopted structure plans unaffected by the rural urban boundaries should have any proposed zone changes implemented i.e. Kaukapakapa. In some instances structure plans have been reflected in the unitary plan, however, there are instances where new zones have been proposed in structure plans and require a plan change and these new zones are not reflected in the draft Unitary Plan. It is requested that the structure plans in Rodney be further investigated to ensure that live zones are implemented where possible.
R002	Rodney	Residential		3.2 Subdivision rules and assessment criteria should require new developments to enhance existing open space and/or provide new areas of open space in the immediate vicinity of the development.
R003	Rodney	Growth		The Rodney Local Board area includes significant areas of new greenfields development and it is essential that the development of these areas include neighbourhood reserves and other areas of open space which support good urban design such as protecting and enhancing waterways and their riverbanks.
R004	Rodney	Rezoning requests		4.1 The concept of mixed housing subject to detailed design requirements to ensure quality developments is supported, however it is considered that the introduction of this zone into Rodney would be inconsistent with the character of most of the rural and coastal settlements within the Rodney Local Board area, with the exception of the existing areas including the northern end of Snells Beach (Whisper Cove), Omaha South and Kumeu Town Centre (Maddren site), and new potential areas of intensification around transport links such as the rail link to Kumeu/Huapai.
R005	Rodney	Growth		The Rodney Local Board area includes a few very specific areas of higher density housing and it is considered that no new areas should be included unitary plan. The Rodney Local Board consider rail in Rodney as a key future public transport asset that should be enhanced. Given this and the development occurring in the area development around the rail link should be considered for intensification.
R006	Rodney	Residential		4.2 The second dwelling provisions in the proposed residential zone provisions are supported.
R007	Rodney	Residential		The second dwelling provisions are in effect a replacement of the minor household unit provisions although different restrictions apply.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
R008	Rodney	Residential		4.3 The impervious surfaces threshold under Rule 4.1.5 for the Coastal and Rural Settlement Zone is unworkable and should be increased to enable the construction of dwellings with a floor area greater than 200m2 as a permitted activity to enable a family home to be constructed on sites.
R009	Rodney	Rural		This matter was raised as an error because for the rural and coastal settlement zone the impervious area threshold total must be higher than maximum building coverage as buildings form an impervious surface and must be counted as such. Additionally, it is considered unreasonable to restrict buildings to 200m2 and inappropriate to force buildings to two storeys where particularly where there may be potential landscape and visual effects.
R010	Rodney	All Zones		4.4 The requirement for a home star rating for five or more units is supported.
R011	Rodney	General		The Local Board see merit in this proposal.
R012	Rodney	Precincts		4.5 A Rodney Landscape precinct imposing a minimum lot size of 8000m2 is requested for those areas now zoned Large Lot that were formally areas of the Rodney Low Intensity and Landscape Protection Zones with a minimum site size of 8000m2.
R013	Rodney	Residential		Some areas of the above Rodney zones were identified as having a minimum site size of 8000m2 due to landscape effects i.e. Sandspit. It is requested that these minimum site sizes are retained.
R014	Rodney	Residential		4.6 The proposal to permit childcare education centres up to 200m2 and provide for this activity as a restricted discretionary activity is supported.
R015	Rodney	Residential		The need to provide for childcare facilities is acknowledged by the local board as is the current difficulty in establishing these facilities in many areas.
R016	Rodney	Residential		4.7 Request that the minimum site sizes in Helensville, Parakai and Snells Beach remain at 600m2 rather than the proposed 500m2.
R017	Rodney	Residential		The Local Board considers that the character and amenity of these areas is significantly affected by site size and that 500m2 is considered to intensive.
R018	Rodney	Rezoning requests		4.8 Request that Waimauku be zoned rural and coastal settlement rather than single house as the area does not have reticulated wastewater services or provide the required infrastructure to the area and provide for a minimum site size of 1500m2 which is consistent with the current zoning.
R019	Rodney	Rezoning requests		The issue of site size and servicing has been raised as an error as the maps indicate a design and development overlay while it is not listed with a specific site size in Table 1 (see below). The previous on site servicing rule for Rodney required a 1500m2 site minimum and Waimauku has been designed to this minimum. Waimauku has one street which is jointly serviced with a treatment system, the remainder is on site.
R020	Rodney	Rezoning requests		4.9 Huapai South Residential Support a residential live zone for the area in Huapai South bounded by Station, Nobilo and Main Road which incorporates Terraced House and Apartment Zone opposite the town centre and adjacent to the railway and Single House Residential for the remainder of the block. It is considered that there is no impediment to a live residential zoning being implemented for Huapai South in the unitary plan.
R021	Rodney	Rezoning requests		4.10 A single house zone for the entire area identified in Appendix 6, Figure 2, McKinney Road Structure Plan of the Rodney Section of the Auckland District Plan is identified as medium intensity urban is supported once the rural urban boundary and structure or area plan for the Warkworth area has been confirmed.
R022	Rodney	Rezoning requests		The potential for this area to be intensified as noted in the Appendix below is supported, however, as this area is currently close to the edge of town it is appropriate to determine the 30 year urban boundary and the uses within it first. It should be noted that some of this area is proposed as Large Lot Residential.
R023	Rodney	Business		5.1 Building Heights Warkworth It is requested that the height of buildings in the Warkworth town centre be restricted to 2 storeys on the riverbank side of town between Percy Street and Elizabeth Street and that 4 storeys be provided for in the remaining town centre business areas, except the corner of Elizabeth Street and Mill Lane to the river.
R024	Rodney	Business		The visual connection with the riverbank in Warkworth contributes significantly to the town's character and sense of place. Therefore, building heights should be limited in this area. The remainder of Warkworth should be aligned with building heights in other town centres as the role of Warkworth as a satellite town is acknowledged.
R025	Rodney	Business		5.2 Warkworth Business Zone It is requested that consideration of the extension of Warkworth business zones to include the areas identified as Live Work be further considered for Mixed Use (Business).
R026	Rodney	Business		It is recognised that adequate business land needs to be provided to cater for the next 30 years.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
R027	Rodney	Business		5.3 Kumeu/Huapai Town Centre It is requested that Kumeu/Huapai be identified as a Town Centre small rather than a Local Centre and that the rules for the Kumeu Town Centre (Maddren site) be reflected in the unitary plan.
R028	Rodney	Business		It is considered that the status of Kumeu/Huapai as a Satellite town(s) subject to significant growth reinforces its future as a Town Centre rather than a Local Centre.
R029	Rodney	Business		5.4 New Rural Local Centre It is requested that a new centres status of Rural Local Centre be introduced for Snells Beach, Waimauku and Kaukapakapa which retains the activities of a Local Centre and reduces the height from 4 to 3 storeys.
R030	Rodney	Business		It is considered that an additional step in the hierarchy of town centres needs to be added to reflect the diversity and hierarchy of rural towns and villages. Additionally the current four storey height limit for these towns does not reflect the character and nature of these areas.
R031	Rodney	Business		5.5 Helensville Town Centre Support the status of Helensville as a Town Centre and the proposed heritage precinct which restricts building height in some areas.
R032	Rodney	Heritage and Historic Character		Helensville's heritage should be protected whilst enabling the town to reach its full potential.
R033	Rodney	Business		5.6 Wellsford Town Centre It is requested that Wellsford be identified as a Town Centre small rather than a neighbourhood centre.
R034	Rodney	Business		The identification of Wellsford as a neighbourhood centre is considered to be an error in the draft unitary plan and it is considered most appropriate to identify Wellsford as a Town Centre small as it services a wide area and is in a position to accommodate business growth.
R035	Rodney	Business		5.7 Business Buildings The requirement for buildings in the business zones to be a restricted discretionary activity and be assessed against design criteria is supported along with the requirement for buildings over 5000m2 GFA to have a sustainable green rating.
R036	Rodney	Business		It is considered that there is merit in these requirements in order to enable high quality town centres.
R037	Rodney	Business		5.8 Retail Activities The approach of ensuring that retail activities are primarily located in town and local centres to support revitalisation and non complying in industrial areas is supported.
R038	Rodney	Business		The local board acknowledge the importance of protecting the role of town centres and protecting industrial land for industrial activities.
R039	Rodney	Transport		5.9 Car Parking in Business Areas The proposal to not require on-site parking on good transport routes (maximum carpark standards) is supported in central areas, however, due to the lack of public transport and the dispersed nature of residents in Rodney these standards are not considered appropriate for the Rodney Local Board area.
R040	Rodney	Transport		The local board consider that carparking provisions are required in Rodney.
R041	Rodney	Business		5.10 Leigh Business Area Consider that rezoning Leigh Light Industry from Mixed Business does not reflect the town centre retail heart of Leigh and it is requested that this area be rezoned Local Centre Rural with a height limit of 2 storeys.
R042	Rodney	Business		The town/ village area of Leigh should be recognised rather than being solely an industrial town centre.
R043	Rodney	Business		5.11 Te Hana Business Area Consider that rezoning Te Hana Light Industry from Mixed Business does not reflect the future town centre retail heart of Te Hana and it is requested that this area be rezoned Local Centre Rural with a height limit of 3 storeys.
R044	Rodney	Business		The town/ village area of Te Hana should be recognised rather than being solely an industrial town centre.
R045	Rodney	Business		5.12 Huapai South Future Urban Support a future urban zoning for the Access, Nobilo, Station Road block at Huapai South rather than a live business or residential zone at this stage until further investigation has occurred to confirm the land uses within the rural urban boundary.
R046	Rodney	Rezoning requests		It is acknowledged that some areas in Huapai require further investigation rather than a live zoning immediately.
R047	Rodney	Residential		5.13 Huapai East Live Residential Zone It is requested that the area from Riverhead Road, the full length of Koraha Road (both sides) and Oraha Road as far east as Burns Lane be zoned Single House Residential in the unitary plan.
R048	Rodney	Rezoning requests		It is considered that this area is able to be zoned residential immediately as it has the required infrastructure nearby. The site is within walking proximity to the township and bus services are available support residential development.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
R049	Rodney	Business		5.14 Huapai Mixed Use (Business) Support a mixed use (business) zone on the southern side of Main Road, Huapai from Oraha Road to the Railway due to the existing commercial and residential activities in this area.
R050	Rodney	Rezoning requests		The current mix of commercial and residential uses in this strip of land requires further consideration and may be appropriate as a mixed use (business) zone.
R051	Rodney	Business		5.15 Landscape Buffers It is requested that landscape screens or buffers for light industrial zones be considered where they adjoin or are adjacent to State Highways, residential areas or town entrances/gateways.
R052	Rodney	Business		A number of restricted activities in Rodney required landscape buffers to screen development from roads or sensitive activities. It is requested that rules be imposed in a more general rather than site specific manner in the unitary plan.
R053	Rodney	Business		5.16 Forestry Road, Riverhead Industry A precinct or overlay is requested for the activities noted in Scheduled Activity 129 in the Rodney Section of the Auckland District Plan for Forestry Road, Riverhead, rather than heavy industry as this area was never intended for heavy industrial uses and specific controls apply.
R054	Rodney	Business		Specific conditions regarding visual effects and other matters currently apply for the existing industrial zone and these should be carried over to the unitary plan.
R055	Rodney	Precincts		5.17 Puhoi Cheese Factory A precinct or overlay is requested for the activities noted in Scheduled Activity 160 in the Rodney Section of the Auckland District Plan for the Puhoi Cheese Factory. The Puhoi Cheese Factory is a key tourism activity and producer in Puhoi and the current provisions should be carried through to the unitary plan.
R056	Rodney	Precincts		5.18 Leigh Fisheries Scheduled Activities A precinct or overlay is requested for the activities noted in Scheduled Activity 195 Leigh Fisheries of the Rodney Section of the Auckland District Plan.
R057	Rodney	Rural		The Leigh Fisheries scheduled activity seems to be removed and the rural and coastal zone is proposed. However, the Scheduled Activity provided for continued use and expansion and these development rights should be carried through into the unitary plan.
R058	Rodney	Heritage and Historic Character		6.1 Repair and Maintenance Heritage Buildings That the proposal to make the repair and maintenance of historic heritage buildings a permitted activity is supported.
R059	Rodney	Heritage and Historic Character		The need to enable the upgrade of heritage buildings without resource consent is acknowledged.
R060	Rodney	Heritage and Historic Character		6.2 Demolition of Heritage Buildings That the proposal to prohibit demolition of Category A historic heritage buildings is not supported as there are some circumstances where due to the structure of the building and costs of the repair it is not reasonable to require the works to be undertaken and this rule may result in buildings being left unmaintained and unsafe.
R061	Rodney	Heritage and Historic Character		It is considered that flexibility is required to cover all circumstances.
R062	Rodney	Heritage and Historic Character		6.3 Puhoi Historic Village It is requested that a historic character overlay be imposed over Puhoi similar to the Helensville overlay and that this reflects the key elements of the Puhoi Historic Village Special 14 Zone as well as design rules and includes larger lot sizes in the centre of the village.
R063	Rodney	Precincts		Puhoi appears to only have a handful of specific heritage items protected in the draft unitary plan. Special 14 (Puhoi Historic Village) Zone of the Rodney Section of the Auckland District Plan has not been carried over into the new rules. Puhoi previously included a precinct where 4ha was provided as a minimum site size in the centre of Puhoi to reflect the open spacious special character of the town. The proposal is for rural and coastal settlement zone (unserviced) in this area would have a minimum lot size of 4000m2.
R064	Rodney	Heritage and Historic Character		6.4 Pre 1944 Heritage Buildings The blanket restriction for the protection of pre 1944 heritage buildings in specific areas is supported with further refinement and the inclusion of Puhoi Village.
R065	Rodney	Heritage and Historic Character		Puhoi is an important historic village that should be included in the protected areas.
R066	Rodney	Treaty of Waitangi		6.5 Sites of Significance to Iwi The identification and mapping of archaeological sites and other sites of significance to Maori, where iwi agree that these should be mapped in a public document, is supported.
R067	Rodney	Treaty of Waitangi		The Local Board wish to confirm that the iwi have had the opportunity to engage regarding sites of significance.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
R068	Rodney	Coastal		7.1 Mangroves The proposed rules to permit the removal of mangroves not in existence post 1996 are supported.
R069	Rodney	Coastal		Flexibility is required regarding mangrove removal particularly in recreational areas.
R070	Rodney	Natural Environment		7.2 Stock Exclusion The rules regarding stock exclusion from watercourses are supported.
R071	Rodney	Natural Environment		Given the intensity of grazing required before stock exclusion is required and the need for environmental protection of our waterways this rule is supported.
R072	Rodney	Natural Environment		7.3 Deans Island, Sandspit The Significant Environmental Area (SEA) notation for Deans Island, Sandspit is supported.
R073	Rodney	Natural Environment		Planning documents for this area such as the Reserve Management Plan identify Deans Island as ecologically significant.
R074	Rodney	Rural		8.1 Activities in Rural Zones It is requested that consideration be given to providing for a greater range of business activities in rural areas particularly visitor accommodation and rural tourism type activities.
R075	Rodney	Rural		It is considered that a greater range of business activities that are based on their rural location should be provided for. The majority of these are tourism based activities such as visitor accommodation and tourism spin offs from rural activities such as the growing of produce, the sale of it along with some other goods not made on the site and associated cafés or eating facilities. Historically these activities have been limited to those produce grown and processed on the site and obtaining resource consent for associated eating establishments has been difficult.
R076	Rodney	Natural Environment		8.2 Kawau Island It is requested that the planning provisions for Kawau Island be reconsidered in particular reviewing the SEA's on Kawau Island creating a precinct for the Island to cover matters such as the coastal setback, the absence of roads and to carry the concepts within the Kawau Island Vision Statement into the unitary plan.
R077	Rodney	Natural Environment		Kawau Island is a special and unique environment and it is considered that the current provisions of the draft unitary plan do not adequately meet future needs of the island.
R078	Rodney	Natural Environment		8.3 Visitor Accommodation It is requested that the provisions of Plan Change 65 to the Rodney District Plan which introduced a refinement of the visitor accommodation rules to restrict long term stays in order to avoid visitor accommodation being used as a residential dwelling be utilised in the unitary plan.
R079	Rodney	Natural Environment		The visitor accommodation provisions being used to construct a building which was then rented out long term as residential accommodation has historically been an issue in Rodney and it is suggested that provisions of plan change 65 may be of use in the unitary plan.
R080	Rodney	Rural		8.4 Transferrable Development Rights The proposed use of transferrable development rights for rural subdivision is supported and it is considered imperative that two sites can be created for every single development right transferred and that receiver sites in countryside living zone should not need to be identified in advance of obtaining a subdivision right as this will result in these subdivisions provisions being unattractive to subdividers.
R081	Rodney	Rural		The TDR provisions are supported; however, additional receiver environments are required in the Rodney area. Flexibility regarding receiver sites is also required when applying for an entitlement and it is not always possible to determine the receiver when making an application.
R082	Rodney	Rural		8.5 Countryside Living Receiver Environments The identification of additional receiver countryside living areas is also supported and is considered of critical importance to the success of transferrable development right planning provisions.
R083	Rodney	Rural		It is also considered that countryside living are useful as greenbelts.
R084	Rodney	Rural		8.6 Minor Household Units The removal of the minor household provisions for rural areas is a significant loss of development rights for Rodney and it is requested that an equivalent provision be included into the unitary plan as the mechanisms i.e. restrictions on building size and design of the Rodney Section of the Auckland District Plan are considered effective to mitigate any visual effects in rural areas.
R085	Rodney	Rural		It is unclear why the minor household provisions have been removed from rural areas and it is considered that these provisions are essential for rural communities to provide for dependent family members or farm workers and or to provide a variety of housing types in rural areas. These provisions have changed over time, but are generally historic and should be retained in future planning provisions. Ten metres is considered an appropriate distance of the minor household unit from the main dwelling.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
R086	Rodney	Rural		8.7 Entitlement to Erect Dwellings It is requested that Rule 2.9 of the Rural Zone Land Use Controls be amended to allow one dwelling per site to be erected in the rural area provided that it can be proven that a dwelling is able to be erected and comply with all development controls rather than requiring the net site area to be 1 hectare.
R087	Rodney	Rural		It is considered that this rule (see below) does not reflect the variety of situations in Rodney where owners currently have a development right based on existing rules i.e. historically small sections 8000m ² or significantly smaller not meeting the 1 hectare minimum. This right will be removed if the proposed provisions are adopted. It is also considered that the reason for the creation of the lot i.e. closed road or severance lot is not an effects based rule. The provisions of the Rodney Section of the Auckland District Plan which allowed dwellings on sites 1,000m ² or greater, which is [are] capable of being occupied by a building under the rules of this [the Rodney] Plan are workable and reasonable and should be carried through to the unitary plan. It is acknowledged that point e of the rule provides for existing rules to be referred to; however, it appears that all of the rules a e must be complied with.
R088	Rodney	Rural		The proposed rule for dwellings in the rural area is as follows: 1. The site on which a dwelling may be erected as a permitted activity must comply with the following controls:
R089	Rodney	Rural		a. it must not be a closed road or road severance lot
R090	Rodney	Rural		b. the net site area must be at least 1ha
R091	Rodney	Rural		c. it is a site granted subdivision consent, excluding transferable rural site subdivision.
R092	Rodney	Rural		d. it was separately recorded on a Valuation Roll at 1 November 2010
R093	Rodney	Rural		e. the applicable District Plan on 1 November 2010 provided the right to erect one dwelling on the site as a permitted or controlled activity.
R094	Rodney	Rural		2. One dwelling on a site that does not comply with clause 4.3.7.2.9.1 above is a noncomplying activity.
R095	Rodney	Coastal		8.8 Non Complying Coastal Subdivisions It is requested that the unitary plan provisions provide for non complying coastal subdivisions to be notified. Community members in Muriwai have consistently raised concerns regarding the lack of notification of non complying coastal subdivisions. The concerns raised relate to the visual and landscape effects of future buildings on newly subdivided sites.
R096	Rodney	Rural		8.9 Mixed Rural Zone It is requested that the Mixed Rural Zone be extended to cover those areas outlined in the Rodney Rural Strategy and that the activities provided for within the zone be expanded to provide for a greater range of business activities.
R097	Rodney	Rural		The extent of areas zoned mixed rural in the draft unitary plan is limited. The extent does not reflect the Rodney Rural Strategy (see below) which was reflected in the Auckland Plan. It is considered that the Rodney Rural Strategy should be further investigated and implemented not only the extent of the mixed rural but also the intent of the rural production and mixed rural zones (including activities).
R098	Rodney	Precincts		8.10 Special 22 Point Wells Omaha Flats Zone It is requested that a precinct be created to enable the provisions of the Special 22 (Point Wells/Omaha Flats) Zone, previously plan change 63 to be reflected in the unitary plan including the one off subdivision opportunity provided by this recent plan change.
R099	Rodney	Precincts		Due to the very recent timing of these plan changes the Local Board considers that they should be reflected in the unitary plan.
R100	Rodney	Rural		8.11 Countryside Living Port Albert Road, Wellsford The proposed new countryside living zone on Port Albert Road, Wellsford is supported.
R101	Rodney	Rural		The Local Board recognise the need for additional countryside living zones for transferable development rights to be utilised.
R102	Rodney	Rural		8.12 Countryside Living Taupaki It is requested that the area from the Taupaki rural community up to the existing Redhills Roads residential area as identified in the draft RUB is rezoned countryside living due to provide a buffer between the urban and rural zones.
R103	Rodney	Residential		Although this area is not appropriate for residential development, the current land use and location is appropriate for countryside living development.
R104	Rodney	Precincts		9.1 Sandspit Motor Camp It is requested that a precinct is created over the Sandspit Motor Camp site at Sandspit to carry the provisions of the Scheduled Activity in the Rodney Section of the Auckland District Plan through to the unitary plan.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
R105	Rodney	Heritage and Historic Character		The proposed zone of Large Lot results in camping grounds being non complying, however the existing camping ground on Council land has operated historically for many years under a scheduled activity and provision for its continuation and expansion should be provided for.
R106	Rodney	Parks and Community		9.2 Skate Facilities Provisions enabling skate ramps and facilities to establish as a permitted activity are supported.
R107	Rodney	Parks and Community		The local board consider that resource consent costs for establishing skate facilities in open space zones are significant and unnecessary. It is understood that under the draft unitary plan a resource consent would be required in the Conservation zone and not in the Informal Recreation and Sport and Active Recreation zones for most skating facilities.
R108	Rodney	Rural		9.3 Atlas Site, Warkworth It is requested that the Atlas site, south of the showgrounds at 80 Great North Rd, Warkworth be zoned as Sport and Active Recreation to enable buildings for recreational purposes to be constructed rather than the proposed rural production zone.
R109	Rodney	Rural		The Atlas site is a Council owned site that has been retained for sport and recreation purposes and should be zoned for this purpose.
R110	Rodney	Rezoning requests		9.4 Zoning Baxter Street, Warkworth It is requested that the last three retail service zoned sites on the eastern end of Baxter Street, Warkworth which are owned by Council are zoned Informal Recreation.
R111	Rodney	Rezoning requests		The subject sites shown below (see arrows) are currently managed as open space adjoining the Mahurangi River and will continue to be used for informal recreation in the future.
R112	Rodney	Rezoning requests		9.5 Future Reserve Greens Road, Dairy Flat The land Council has acquired for recreation purposes at Greens Rd, Dairy Flat should be zoned for sport and active recreation.
R113	Rodney	Rezoning requests		This future reserve requires an appropriate zoning immediately.
R114	Rodney	Rezoning requests		9.6 Zone Point Wells Reserve It is requested that the Reserve at 513 Point Wells Road is zoned an appropriate open space zone for the activities on site rather than the proposed Single House zone.
R115	Rodney	Rezoning requests		The site has a Reserve Management Plan and is currently used as a reserve.
R116	Rodney	Rezoning requests		9.7 Parakai Recreation Reserve It is requested that consideration be given to providing for camping within the Sport and Active Recreation Zone.
R117	Rodney	Rezoning requests		There are reserves upon which this activity occurs i.e. Parakai Reserve and it is considered that this activity may be appropriate in the Sport and Active Recreation zone on a case by case basis.
R118	Rodney	Rezoning requests		9.8 Glenmore Road Reserve, Warkworth It is requested that the Reserve on Glenmore Road, Warkworth be zoned Sport and Active Recreation rather than the proposed Informal Recreation.
R119	Rodney	Rezoning requests		The proposed zone will enable a number of recreational and community uses sought by the community and advocated for by the Local Board to occur on the site.
R120	Rodney	Rezoning requests		10.1 Temporary Activities The temporary activity rules in the Rodney Section of the Auckland Council District Plan are onerous and impractical and should be replaced with more practical standards for events using best examples from throughout the region.
R121	Rodney	Rezoning requests		The Local Board have not been able to determine what the proposed rules for temporary activities will be and seek to ensure that they are based around best practice across the region.
R122	Rodney	Rezoning requests		10.2 Indicative Roads It is requested that indicative roads are included in the unitary plan as a mechanism for the provision of new roads and it is considered that the specific location of these roads can be carried forward from the Rodney Section of the Auckland District Plan with some further refinement.
R123	Rodney	Rezoning requests		Rodney includes significant areas of greenfields development and pre-planning for key roading linkages is an important aspect of that development. The Local Board have not been able to view any maps of any proposed indicative roads at this point, however, they understand that indicative roads will be included in the unitary plan.
R124	Rodney	Rezoning requests		10.3 Sharing Land Value Uplift from Rezoning The Local Board strongly oppose the suggested sharing land value uplift from rezoning which in effect a capital gains tax.
R125	Rodney	Growth		It is considered that value uplift is not the appropriate mechanism to achieve the required funds to support future growth.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
R126	Rodney	Precincts		10.4 Matakana Plan Changes It is requested that any decisions on Plan Change 64 Matakana Village, Plan Change 148 Matakana Country Park and Plan Change 163 Morris and James Pottery be reflected in the notified version of the unitary plan utilising precincts and overlays.
R127	Rodney	Growth		Due to the very recent timing of these plan changes the Local Board considers that they should be reflected in the unitary plan.
R128	Rodney	Viewshafts		10.5 View Shafts It is requested the following view shafts from public roads be identified on the planning maps and protected; view from Wenderholm Hill heading south; Waiwera Hill looking south out to Rangitoto and Mahurangi East Road to Kawau Island along Arabella Lane.
R129	Rodney	Viewshafts		These view shafts are significant for Rodney and Auckland generally and opportunities to protect them should not be lost. In many cases this may mean particular restrictions on trees.
R130	Rodney	Rezoning Requests		11.1 Corry Block South of Wellsford It is requested that the Corry Block 1580 State Highway 1, Wellsford which is currently zoned Future Urban is zoned Industrial in the unitary plan. The need to provide business land for future growth in Wellsford is supported by the Local Board.
R131	Rodney	Business		11.2 Centennial Park Road, Wellsford It is requested that an industrial zone be considered for the site at 113 Centennial Park Road, Wellsford (Lot 2 DP170202) between Centennial Park Road and the Railway which is currently used for consented industrial activities.
R132	Rodney	Business		The subject site is currently industrial and located between future industrial areas to the north and south.
R133	Rodney	Rezoning requests		11.3 Kelly Park Film Zone It is noted that the Kelly Park Film zone (Special 28) was for the purposes of filming and should be imposed as a precinct with an underlying zone of Rural Production. The proposed countryside living zone was noted as an error and should be removed.
R134	Rodney	Rural		The proposed countryside living zone is inappropriate in the remote central Rodney location, as shown below.
R135	Rodney	Precincts		11.4 Special 10 Goldsworthy Bay Marine Recreation Zone It is understood that the Special 10 (Goldsworthy Bay Marine Recreation) Zone from the Rodney Section of the Auckland District Plan was an integral part of a future marina at Goldsworthy Bay and it is considered that precinct or other mechanism should be put in place to carry the relevant rules through to the unitary plan.
R136	Rodney	Rezoning requests		This zone has been removed and replaced with a Rural Coastal Zone, however, without further investigation; it is considered that this zone should not be removed.
R137	Rodney	Rezoning requests		11.5 Waitoki Zones It is requested that the zones proposed for Waitoki are reconsidered to ensure that they reflect the current uses and the Waitoki Vision document i.e. open spaces, commercial areas and residential areas.
R138	Rodney	Rezoning requests		The Local Board consider that the unitary plan is the opportunity to provide appropriate live zones. The draft proposes that Waitoki is zoned rural and coastal settlement.
R139	Rodney	Infrastructure		12.1 Infrastructure It is considered essential for the appropriate infrastructure to be in place prior to growth being accommodated i.e. water supply, wastewater treatment, stormwater management, roading projects, public transport and social and recreational infrastructure.
R140	Rodney	Infrastructure		Releasing urban land without the necessary infrastructure raises expectations for development that may not be able to be met in the short term.
R141	Rodney	Growth		12.2 Plan and Stage Growth It is requested that any future growth is well planned and staged.
R142	Rodney	Growth		The local board acknowledge that urban land requires careful planning prior to release.
R143	Rodney	Growth		12.3 Enforceable Future Urban Rules It is requested that clear and enforceable rules should be put in place to ensure that there is no creep of development into future urban areas until they are rezoned.
R144	Rodney	Growth		Future Urban land in the former Rodney District has been subject to a number of non complying resource consent applications to develop land prior to a live zoning. This if successful, compromises future planned development of areas.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
R145	Rodney	Growth		12.4 Green Belts It is requested that rural green belts , which could include countryside living zoned land, should be retained between each town and village and metropolitan Auckland. The retention of the character of Rodney s rural towns and villages is dependent upon the retention of greenbelts.
R146	Rodney	Growth		12.5 Structure Plans It is requested that the structure plans for Warkworth, Helensville, Kumeu-Huapai as well as the area plan for Rodney be prioritised in order to determine the appropriate future land uses within the rural urban boundary.
R147	Rodney	Growth		The satellite areas within Rodney will be subject to significant growth and it is necessary to further consider as soon as possible both the land uses and future community needs so that planning can occur.
R148	Rodney	Growth		12.6 Helensville It is requested that options to provide for future growth in Helensville are investigated including the provision of the required infrastructure and live zonings to support this growth.
R149	Rodney	Growth		The community in Helensville have been very clear about their desire for growth in Helensville and this is supported by the Local Board.
R150	Rodney	Rezoning requests		12.7 Edge Areas The rezoning of the Halls Farm Special Zone located west of Orewa and the State highway 1 motorway to countryside living is supported.
R151	Rodney	Rezoning requests		This zone should be limited to the area of the current special zone.
R152	Rodney	Growth		12.8 Rural Urban Boundary Kumeu/Huapai/Riverhead 1. The existing townships i.e. Kumeu-Huapai / Riverhead / Waimauku should be kept separate with rural buffers.
R153	Rodney	Growth		2. Intensification of existing Countryside Living Zones to the north of Kumeu to the Large Lot Residential Zone is supported.
R154	Rodney	Growth		3. The entrances (gateways) to towns from the state highway should remain rural.
R155	Rodney	Growth		Consequently this means that the RUB extending south of Riverhead should not extend as far as the state highway.
R156	Rodney	Growth		4. The extension of RUB to the west of Riverhead as far as the stream excluding, the high productive soils in the area south of Riverhead Road around to Lathrope Road, is supported.
R157	Rodney	Growth		5. There should be a clear rural buffer between the urban development at Westgate to the south and the towns and villages in Rodney e.g. urban development should cease at Brighams Creek and Taupaki identified as countryside living.
R158	Rodney	Growth		6. Any additional required urban land being realised through the implementation of Waimauku Structure Plan future urban zones would be supported.
R159	Rodney	Growth		12.9 Feedback on the Warkworth Rural Urban Boundary is as follows: 1. Extending the RUB to the ridge to south, up to the ridge just north of the satellite station as proposed during consultation, is supported.
R160	Rodney	Growth		2. The western boundary of the RUB should finish at the natural stream boundary rather than the future motorway.
R161	Rodney	Growth		3. The intensification of the Viv Davie Martin Drive Countryside Living area to the west of Warkworth within the RUB is supported.
R162	Rodney	Growth		4. The area west of Hudson Road and east of the existing Countryside Living area being zoned future urban is supported.
R163	Rodney	Growth		5. Concern is expressed regarding any future extension along Sandpit Road due to traffic effects.
R164	Rodney	Growth		6. The extension of the RUB north from the Warkworth Showgrounds to Goatley Road, adjoining Matakana Road in the west is supported. Further possible provision of urban land east of Matakana Road from Claydon Road to Sandspit Road south of quarry should not occur within the 30 year timeframe.
R165	Rodney	Growth		7. Intensification at Hepburn Creek Road is opposed due to landscape, character, servicing and roading issues.
R166	Rodney	Growth		8. It is considered that density being used to determine the land area required within the RUB for urban development should be based on the Single House zone density as a minimum, being 500m2. A similar approach should also be taken to other RUB areas in Rodney.
R167	Rodney	Growth		12.10 Feedback on the Silverdale Rural Urban Boundary is as follows: 1. Withdrawal of the northern RUB boundary back to the watercourse north of Wainui Road is supported.
R168	Rodney	Growth		2. The future business area in Silverdale West is supported, however, it is requested that this area be limited to the area (triangle) within Wilks Road, the motorway and Dairy Flat Road.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
R169	Rodney	Growth		3. The RUB, including a future residential area, should be extended south to join with the eastern side of the Greens Road future sports reserve. This new urban area should be limited to Greens Road, Kennedy Road and SH17 and should not extend east as far as the motorway.
R170	Rodney	Growth		4. Zoning the land outside the RUB and adjoining the western and southern sides of the Green Road future reserve countryside living would be supported.
R171	Rodney	Growth		5. A greenbelt should be retained between Silverdale and Auckland City.
R172	Rodney	Growth		6. Any RUB line to the west should follow a defensible natural boundary (i.e. ridge or stream) or a main road.
R173	Rodney	Growth		7. The removal of any future urban area between Dairy Flat Highway and the watercourse on the northern side of Old Pine Valley Road is supported.
R174	Rodney	Growth		8. Consideration should be given to removing the aerodrome from within the RUB in the area south of Wilks Road.
R175	Rodney	Growth		9. Further specific investigation should be undertaken into all areas of the proposed Silverdale RUB to determine the appropriateness of land for urban development prior to areas being zoned future urban.
R176	Rodney	Growth		13. The Local Board request that the feedback is carefully considered in the further drafting of the unitary plan. Being a rural local board, it has been necessary to consider a variety of issues in this feedback across a large number of proposed zones. The Local Board look forward to further discussing these issues with the Governing Body as the opportunity arises.
UH001	Upper Harbour	Growth		Rural Urban Boundary 2. One of the most significant issues in the Upper Harbour Board area is the Rural Urban Boundary (RUB) and the demarcation of what land goes in or outside the urban boundary.
UH002	Upper Harbour	Growth		3. This is the land around Whenuapai, Brighams Creek Road and North of the motorway (SH18). Whenuapai is outside the RUB. It is zoned for mixed rural development.
UH003	Upper Harbour	Growth		4. The area is currently of rural character with a range of rural lifestyle blocks and some farming activity. The area has a significant coastal edge to the Upper Harbour providing high amenity areas. The area is dominated by the military Whenuapai Airbase.
UH004	Upper Harbour	Growth		5. This area is targeted for inclusion within the RUB and for development of housing along the coastal margins each of the airfield and employment/industry west of the airfield. This follows the additional work done by the Council after the draft plan was released.
UH005	Upper Harbour	Growth		6. The Board accepts that over time this area is appropriately developed for urban development and rural lifestyle blocks. Therefore the Board accepts that this block should be brought within the RUB.
UH006	Upper Harbour	Growth		7. In the Board's view, the critical structure plan process and development of a framework plan is essential to ensure appropriate development of the area. While the Board would support future residential development in the area, it does not support industrial and employment use within this block. The Board's view is there is significant employment opportunities elsewhere within the NORSGA area and these are the appropriate locations for that activity.
UH007	Upper Harbour	Growth		8. This area has a unique character and quality. It offers the opportunity for large lot residential development.
UH008	Upper Harbour	Growth		9. If the issues of noise from the airport flight paths make the area unsuitable for intensive residential development then the Board's view is that this land should remain for rural lifestyle blocks and countryside living rather than be developed for employment activity.
UH009	Upper Harbour	Growth		10. Consequently the Board would: (a) support the inclusion of this area within the RUB;
UH010	Upper Harbour	Growth		(b) require a detailed structure plan process (framework plan) to determine the appropriate mix of development activities and scale of development and staging for release of land;
UH011	Upper Harbour	Growth		(c) want infrastructure in place concurrent with the release of land for residential development;
UH012	Upper Harbour	Growth		(d) oppose industrial uses west of the Whenuapai Airbase as currently contemplated in the planning reports;
UH013	Upper Harbour	Growth		(e) expect the framework plan to examine areas suitable for residential development and areas which should be retained in rural lifestyle blocks.
UH014	Upper Harbour	Growth		11. The Board would support Monterey Park being included within the RUB. This form of development and the current applications before the Environment Court show that some form of urban development is appropriate on this block. The Environment Court process will determine the extent of that development.
UH015	Upper Harbour	Growth		12. The Board does support including Scott Point within the RUB. This is the logical extension of the Hobsonville Development. The land is suitable for urban development, and will provide an important housing environment for the Upper Harbour area.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
UH016	Upper Harbour	Growth		13. The framework plan for this area will need to address matters such as infrastructure, open space, sportsfields and community facilities.
UH017	Upper Harbour	Growth		14. There is a longstanding unresolved issue with the RUB boundary in Quail Drive, Albany Heights. This dates back to North Shore City Council when a structure plan and rezoning package for this area was promoted.
UH018	Upper Harbour	Growth		15. The Board supports the RUB including this area.
UH019	Upper Harbour	Growth		16. The particular location is shown on attachment A.
UH020	Upper Harbour	Growth		12. With the exceptions above, the Board supports the current location of the RUB.
UH021	Upper Harbour	Residential		17. The Board is aware of the proposals of the Auckland Plan Committee to split the Mixed Housing zone into two zones: one zone being a three storey Mixed Housing zone adjacent to town centres and major growth nodes, and the other being a two storey 8m zone applying more generally across the current mixed housing areas. As part of this proposal, developments which exceeded height would be subject to the normal Resource Management Act tests relating to notification rather than a presumption of non-notification.
UH022	Upper Harbour	Residential		18. Significant areas of the Upper Harbour Board are zoned for mixed housing. The Board has received significant feedback through the Draft Unitary Plan process on the uncertainty around this zone and in particular the prospect of 10m high buildings without the neighbours having an input.
UH023	Upper Harbour	Residential		19. The Board fully supports the suggestions to the Auckland Plan Committee to split the Mixed Housing zone into two subzones. In the residential areas around West Harbour, parts of Hobsonville and Albany, this split zoning approach would better reflect the existing scale of development, and community aspirations.
UH024	Upper Harbour	Residential		20. The Board believes that a sensible pragmatic approach to the allocation of these two subzones would end up in a good planning result for Upper Harbour.
UH025	Upper Harbour	Residential		21. The Board supports the Mixed Housing zone and intensification models for Hobsonville Point subject to the comments below.
UH026	Upper Harbour	Growth		22. The Board is conscious of the planning impact of concentrating such a large area of land with high intensification housing. These can work successfully where adequate provision is also made for public and communal open space, sports fields, community facilities and for transport. Use of framework plans is critical in ensuring a robust evaluation of the physical and community infrastructure necessary to support these high intensity developments. The Board supports the approach in the Draft Unitary Plan. The Board would not want the holistic planning approach, which ensures these physical and community infrastructures are provided as part of the development, to be watered down through the feedback process.
UH027	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		23. The Board accepts the "future Development Areas" being rezoned now to "mixed housing" or THAB in appropriate circumstances, provided any development is subject to a framework plan.
UH028	Upper Harbour	Parks and Community		24. Bomb Point is a major open space potential facility for Upper Harbour. The Board supports the proposals which would see Bomb Point protected in part for a marae and in part for public open space, as part of the Hobsonville Point development. The Unitary Plan zoning should reflect the intended use of Bomb Point by zoning Bomb Point public open space, with an appropriate zoning for the marae area. This could be part of a package which commits the future development area to mixed housing zone, but with a requirement for a framework plan prior to any subdivision or major development.
UH029	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		25. The former marine industrial area is zoned for heavy industry. Auckland Council Property Limited is seeking the land be zoned for mixed housing but subject to a framework plan before any development occurs. The Board supports the rezoning of this land from heavy industrial to mixed housing and agrees that it needs to be subject to a framework plan to ensure the appropriate intensity of development typologies and provision of physical and community infrastructure, as part of redevelopment of this 20ha.
UH030	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		26. Much of the Greenhithe area is zoned for residential large lot development. This essentially sets a density based on subdivision controls of one house per 4,000m ² .
UH031	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		27. This zoning works well on the southern side of the Greenhithe Ridge. On the northern side and around the Greenhithe Village, sections are typically in the 1,000-1,200m ² size. While it is recognised that the subdivision control does not prevent housing in section sizes of this area, nevertheless there is significant uncertainty and concern within the Greenhithe community over the level of control.
UH032	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		28. Equally the Board, and we think most of the community, wouldn't want to go to the Single Dwelling zone with its density of 500m ² . This would significantly change the character of the Greenhithe community.
UH033	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		29. The Board's preference is that a zoning regime be introduced for Greenhithe either through a precinct overlay or a subsetting of the Large Lots zone to provide for subdivision/density at 1,200 m ² – 1,500 m ² .
UH034	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		30. Significant parts of the West Harbour area are zoned for mixed housing.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
UH035	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		31. Development along the foreshore of West Harbour exhibits the characteristics of the single dwelling zone with moderate sized sites with large detached houses.
UH036	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		32. The Board's view is that this land is appropriately zoned for single dwellings.
UH037	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		33. The Landing subdivision in Albany is currently zoned mixed housing. This area has a coastal edge location. It is characterised by single dwellings on medium sized lots. The Board's view is that this area should be zoned for single dwellings.
UH038	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		34. The area around East Coast Bays Road and Northcross is zoned for THAB.
UH039	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		35. The Board agrees that the area around Northcross itself is appropriately zoned THAB and should remain so.
UH040	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		36. However the rest of the East Coast Bays Road frontage should be zoned for Mixed Housing A zone. Three level terrace houses along this road appropriately reflect the balance between providing for growth along this high frequently public transport route, and ensuring development is in keeping with the local area. It also needs to be recognised that the adjacent properties in the Upper Harbour area are on the southern downhill slopes from this ridge. Four level development will have a dominating effect on this area.
UH041	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		37. Consequently the Board believes that this area should be zoned for Mixed Housing A at three levels.
UH042	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		38. The Board is aware of a block of land on the northern side of Oteha Valley Road east of the motorway which is zoned for single dwelling.
UH043	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		39. There has been a long-standing proposal to develop this land for mixed housing.
UH044	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		40. The Board's view is that this land is appropriately zoned for Mixed Housing A.
UH045	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		41. The Board strongly supports the principle of driving quality design in areas of significant development or intensive housing.
UH046	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		42. The Board supports the concept of the Auckland Design Manual. The Board recognises that as a best practice guide it sits alongside the Unitary Plan. What is critical to the Board is ensuring the assessment criteria and design triggers within the Plan, incentivise developers to follow the Auckland Design Manual. If intensive housing is to be successful in Auckland, then the Unitary Plan must require quality development.
UH047	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		43. The Board's view is that careful consideration needs to be given to the parking standards in intensive housing areas. The concentration of activity and reduced on-site parking opportunity means any spill over of parking is on the street. These areas are already tightly designed so have little additional capacity.
UH048	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		44. The Board is also of the view that minimum parking provisions on site should apply to developments within metro, town and local centres. These minimum parking provisions need to recognise that retail and corporate businesses require more parking for their staff compliment and are more dependent on short-term parking for customers than other activities. If developments do not cater sufficiently for on-site staff parking, the vehicles spill out onto the surrounding streets and create congestion.
UH049	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		45. The Board feels strongly that access to quality open green spaces needs to be available across all socioeconomic groups, numerous studies have been conducted regarding the direct benefits of open/green spaces to promoting physical activity, mental health and overall wellbeing and it is particularly important for people with disabilities, young children or elderly.
UH050	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		46. Whilst there is an inherent tension between intensification and the acquisition and maintenance of quality open space, development pressures should not mean that quality open spaces are forsaken.
UH051	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		47. The New Zealand Urban Design Protocol, to which Auckland Council is a signatory, states that quality urban design:
UH052	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		a. Facilitates green networks that link public and private open space;
UH053	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		b. Provides formal and informal opportunities for social and cultural interaction;
				c. Provides environments that encourage people to become more physically active.
UH054	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		48. Part 2 Regional Policy Statement, 2.2 Enabling Quality Urban Growth, 2.2.6 Public Open Space and Recreation Facilities, Policies, Point 2 reads: "Increase the amount of public open space and recreation facilities in areas where there is an existing deficiency." In order to future proof the Draft Unitary Plan, as population concentrations and spatial distributions change, the Board proposes that the following wording be added to point 2 "and where substantial population growth is anticipated", so that point 2 reads: "Increase the amount of public open space and recreation facilities in areas where there is an existing deficiency and where substantial population growth is anticipated."
UH055	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		49. The Board supports the intensification of the Albany Metropolitan Centre. This Albany central area is the part of the Board area best able to accommodate intensification.
UH056	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		50. The Board supports a broad range of uses here including retail, business, entertainment, community activity and residential. It also supports intensive development within the centre.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
UH057	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		51. The Albany lakes are a critical feature of the Albany Centre. The Board supports some form of appropriate sunlight protection to the open space around the lake.
UH058	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		52. The Board strongly supports the employment and business zoning for the Albany Precinct.
UH059	Upper Harbour	Rezoning requests		53. In the Unitary Plan the area is zoned light industrial. The activities and development controls are appropriate. However the zoning name undersells the importance of these areas as general business areas and significant employment. The planning policies and controls need to recognise and foster the significant employment node Albany offers through a variety of office, warehouse, industrial, trade and some associated retail uses.
UH060	Upper Harbour	Natural Environment		54. There has been significant feedback in the Upper Harbour Board area to the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs).
UH061	Upper Harbour	Natural Environment		55. The Board is aware of a number of instances where areas of low ecological value have been protected through this SEA technique. It almost appears that the primary information to identify these areas was from aerial photography rather than on the ground evaluation.
UH062	Upper Harbour	Natural Environment		56. The Board's view is that:
UH063	Upper Harbour	Natural Environment		• SEAs is an important technique to protect critical ecological areas and native bush.
UH064	Upper Harbour	Natural Environment		• It should only be applied where there are demonstrable high quality areas.
UH065	Upper Harbour	Natural Environment		• It should only be applied following an on-site inspection and discussion with the property owners.
UH066	Upper Harbour	Natural Environment		• The application of the SEA should not compromise the ability of property owners to get reasonable and realistic building platform(s) on their land with areas around the house for the normal enjoyment of private property (accessory buildings, gardens, play areas etc).
UH066	Upper Harbour	Coastal		57. The Board strongly supports a number of initiatives to protect the coastal fringe and coast areas of Upper Harbour.
UH067	Upper Harbour	Natural Environment		58. The Board supports controls on earthworks and stormwater management to protect water quality in all streams and the Waitemata Harbour.
W001	Waiheke	Coastal		a) i) The Board supports specific provision in Unitary Plan for Houseboats via the inclusion of a specific identified area or inclusion within identified Mooring Management Areas.
W002	Waiheke	Coastal		ii) The Board also notes that the inclusion of a specific area would provide for the activity and would require a clear purpose through objectives, policies and rules. Rules could apply to both land and water with a license and bylaw system to regulate activities associated with houseboats.
W003	Waiheke	Coastal		iii) The Board supports moving to a fair system applicable to all while recognizing the historic nature of the use. Occupation and use could be addressed via license/permit granted for a set period of time to an individual on condition that they are not transferable or automatically renewed.
W004	Waiheke	Coastal		iv) The Board acknowledges that section 12 of the Resource Management Act could be used to address this issue, however this quickly becomes a monitoring and enforcement issue, and affected by council resources. The Board therefore does not feel this is the most effective way to address this situation.
W005	Waiheke	Coastal		v) The Board notes that houseboats will need to be considered on a location by location basis.
W006	Waiheke	Natural Environment		vi) The Board supports the 2km limit and agrees there should be no discharge of any waste (ablutions, grey water and hard waste) from boats or ferries in the whole of the inner Hauraki Gulf. The Board notes that a small area of the inner Hauraki Gulf is technically outside the 2km limit and considers this should be included in the no discharge area.
W007	Waiheke	Coastal		vii) The Board notes that mangroves have expanded as a result of human occupation and they provide a habitat to birdlife.
W008	Waiheke	Coastal		viii) The Board acknowledges that there are mixed views in the community on this issue. The Board does not support the removal of mangroves to pre-1996 levels as a "permitted" activity. Rather, the Board is of the view that sedimentation is the real issue and that this needs to be adequately addressed in the Unitary Plan, including stormwater standards.
W009	Waiheke	Coastal		ix) The Board is concerned that the removal of mangroves to pre-1996 levels could result in more silt ending up in the Hauraki Gulf. The Board favours dealing with the reduction of silt and run-off in the first instance rather than mangrove clearance being a permitted activity around Waiheke.
W010	Waiheke	Coastal		x) The Board notes that aquaculture areas are not being reduced and that a framework is included within the Unitary Plan to enable the expansion of the activity, and the Auckland Council administers permits for the use. The Board does not support the expansion of Aquaculture.
W011	Waiheke	Natural Environment		xi) The Board does not support making provisions more permissive for development and subdivision in outstanding natural landscape areas, and outstanding and high natural character areas.
W012	Waiheke	Natural Environment		xii) The Board supports a precautionary approach within the Unitary Plan to any GMO issues.
W013	Waiheke	Coastal		b) That the Waiheke Local Board supports the Auckland Council decision that the draft Unitary Plan not replace the Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan at this time.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
W014	Waiheke	General		c) That the Waiheke Local Board notes the Board's feedback is restricted to the impact of the draft Unitary Plan on the area under Waiheke Local Board's jurisdiction.
WR001	Waitakere Ranges	General		On the general approach to the development of the Unitary Plan a) That the Manukau Harbour Forum endorses the general approach to the development of the Unitary Plan with a consistent approach to zones and layers, but requests that local, place-based issues including those for the Manukau Harbour are also identified.
WR002	Waitakere Ranges	Coastal		b) That the Manukau Harbour Forum requests that the Unitary Plan policy and methods should be more directive on the cultural, social and economic wellbeing benefits attributed to the Manukau Harbour including its role in supporting live, work, play concepts.
WR003	Waitakere Ranges	Coastal		c) That the Manukau Harbour Forum considers that all harbours in Auckland should be afforded the same status, that is they are of national importance given their relationship with New Zealand's largest city and the people that live, work and play within it. It is noted that the Manukau Harbour is the receiving environment of regional and national utility services, which needs to be taken into account to achieve equitable status.
WR004	Waitakere Ranges	Natural Environment		d) That the Manukau Harbour Forum supports having Significant Ecological Areas and Outstanding Natural Features within the Unitary Plan, and requests the Unitary Plan provides accuracy in defining boundaries for zones and overlays, (including Significant Ecological Areas and Outstanding Natural Features) on both public and private land to ensure consistent interpretation and administration of the plan.
WR005	Waitakere Ranges	Natural Environment		e) That the Manukau Harbour Forum considers that the Unitary Plan should have strong outcomes about improving water quality including requiring a range of stormwater and wastewater treatment options in order to improve the quality of water in our watercourses and harbours.
WR006	Waitakere Ranges	Infrastructure		f) That the Manukau Harbour Forum requires that infrastructure be in place before development occurs to avoid adverse effects on the Harbour. There needs to be certainty on the environmental outcomes to be achieved, particularly around stormwater and wastewater management.
WR007	Waitakere Ranges	Natural Environment		g) That the Manukau Harbour Forum requests that the Unitary Plan promote the use of best practice techniques on all levels and where appropriate that this be incorporated into or defines an activity status, e.g. waste disposal, stormwater, earthworks, fertiliser use, sprays etc.
WR008	Waitakere Ranges	Coastal		h) That the Manukau Harbour Forum recommends the following approach for pacific oysters.
WR009	Waitakere Ranges	Coastal		i) A permitted activity status for pacific oyster removal in all coastal environments (General Coastal Marine Area, Significant Ecological Areas, Outstanding Natural Features), subject to appropriate removal controls to ensure environmental protection.
WR010	Waitakere Ranges	Coastal		ii) That the permitted activity status extends to the removal of the pacific oyster bed and not just empty shell deposits.
WR011	Waitakere Ranges	Coastal		iii) Provide the ability to remove pacific oysters via methods appropriate to the environmental conditions and extent of oyster beds, including mechanical extraction, subject to appropriate removal controls to ensure environmental protection.
WR012	Waitakere Ranges	Coastal		i) That the Manukau Harbour Forum considers that while the administration of the Unitary Plan could be assisted by using a date reference to define when an area was free of mangroves, against which permitted activity removal is assigned, the method is a blunt tool and not particularly evidence based. The method should be expanded to allow an evidence based assessment (including photography) that is able to demonstrate mangrove encroachment and its effects into the environment and define the most appropriate encroachment date. The 1996 date reference for permitted mangrove removal should be deleted.
WR013	Waitakere Ranges	Coastal		j) That the Manukau Harbour Forum recommends in addition to the suggested changes to the date based assessment process for mangroves, the following approach for mangrove removal is included in the Unitary Plan:
WR014	Waitakere Ranges	Coastal		i) A permitted activity status for mangrove removal in all coastal environments (General Coastal Marine Area, Significant Ecological Areas, Outstanding Natural Features), subject to appropriate removal controls to ensure environmental protection.
WR015	Waitakere Ranges	Coastal		ii) In all other cases, the process of obtaining a resource consent for mangrove removal must be simplified.
WR016	Waitakere Ranges	Coastal		iii) Applicants should be permitted to obtain blanket consents for mangrove removal for protected areas.
WR017	Waitakere Ranges	Coastal		k) That the Manukau Harbour Forum suggest that policy be added to the Unitary Plan that requires active management of mangroves and pacific oysters by the Auckland Council rather than relying on community initiatives.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
WR018	Waitakere Ranges	Coastal		l) That the Manukau Harbour Forum requests that dredging be enabled and consent processes simplified particularly to support water transport linkages, channels and posts – refer to MHF resolution to support the Manukau Harbour Restoration Society. Unsure that provisions covering the deposition of dredged material in the Coastal Marine Area or on land, align with the activity status for dredging and with sufficient criteria to require deposition management including contaminant testing.
WR019	Waitakere Ranges	Coastal		m) That the Manukau Harbour Forum requires that open space, public access and reserve linkages be at the forefront of decisions on growth on the Manukau Harbour interface. This must include the provision for upgrades, growth and the provision of space for new wharfs and ports and the relationship of these activities with public open space and roads.
WR020	Waitakere Ranges	Coastal		n) That the Manukau Harbour Forum requests that the potential for the Onehunga Wharf to support harbour transport linkages and tourism be promoted, with the wharf and surrounding environment being opened to the public.
WR021	Waitakere Ranges	Transport		o) That Auckland Council use relevant tools including the designation process, land acquisition, Reserves Act, Public Works Act, to secure wharf and port facilities and additional land to future proof opportunities.
WR022	Waitakere Ranges	Coastal		p) That the Manukau Harbour Forum supports the provision of Coastal Protection Yards, setbacks and overlays to manage the coastal interface.
WR023	Waitakere Ranges	Transport		q) That the Manukau Harbour Forum considers that there must be a thorough investigation on transport linkage needs to serve the southern RUB extensions and intensification, including the role of water transport and harbour access.
WR024	Waitakere Ranges	Natural Environment		r) That the Manukau Harbour Forum recommends that the Unitary Plan be used as a vehicle to promote a strong precautionary approach to the use and release of Genetically Modified Organisms.
WU001	Whau	General		b) On the general approach to the development of the Unitary Plan that i) The Whau Local Board agree with the move to a consistent zoning and the use of other mechanisms such as overlays and precincts to take account of local differences.
WU002	Whau	General		ii) Consideration needs to be given to staging of development to allow transition of areas where new zoning will allow for increased densities and intensification.
WU003	Whau	General		iii) Triggers before additional development should be allowed must include.
WU004	Whau	All zones		1) Planning including integrated facility and infrastructure network planning and area, town, precinct and neighbourhood visioning and planning. In many cases this will be updates to past work and it is imperative that these build on previous place work to reflect the trust and relationships already built. It is also noted that intensification is enabled across wider suburban areas, and an understanding of what is needed to support this increased growth in these areas needs to be understood.
WU005	Whau	All zones		2) Leading infrastructure i.e. open space, utilities and transport As far as possible it should also include community and recreation infrastructure. If that is not installed it should be planned and budgeted for.
WU006	Whau	All zones		3) Compliance with design and character guidelines that have been developed with communities and Local Boards.
WU007	Whau	All zones		c) On Urban design principles that: i) There must be a design led and place-based approach to deliver the step change needed to deliver Auckland Plan. These should be principle based rather than prescriptive and should allow design solutions to be worked out for local places so we retain the local identity of our areas.
WU008	Whau	All zones		ii) The Whau Local Board support design assessment for new buildings and significant alterations in towns and metropolitan centres and for terraced and apartments, however the urban design principles should be more strongly referenced within the plan for consideration when assessing developments. It is not clear what will be the difference between design requirements required to be satisfied and advocacy guidelines.
WU009	Whau	All zones		iii) Provision of affordable housing must be actively provided through the Unitary plan.
WU010	Whau	All zones		iv) As the Unitary Plan is developed all Local Boards should be kept updated on how the Unitary Plan provisions will deliver high quality urban environments that respond to context.
WU011	Whau	All zones		v) The Whau Local Board agrees with focussing intensification around transport nodes and routes. There is the need for more urgent work before the draft document is released to ensure intensification is being directed to transport nodes and routes in the following areas: Tiverton and Wolverton Rds , Golf Road, Great North Rd in Fruitvale.
WU012	Whau	All zones		vi) Greenways (cycling and walking routes) should be considered when assessing intensification opportunities.
WU013	Whau	All zones		vii) The Unitary Plan must promote green building initiatives inline with the Green Star system (including green roofs, low energy design).

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
WU014	Whau	All zones		viii) Onsite alternative storm water management should be incentivised through the Unitary Plan and its associated regulatory processes.
WU015	Whau	Residential		d) On the Residential Housing Package that: i) The Whau Local Board support the proposal for six residential zones (Terraced Housing and Apartment Building, Mixed Housing, Single House, Large Lot, Rural and Coastal).
WU016	Whau	Residential		ii) The Whau Local Board agree with: a) height limits associated with each zoning.
WU017	Whau	Residential		b) requirement for a mix of apartment sizes.
WU018	Whau	Residential		iii) The integration between different land use zones and the transition between higher density to lower density development needs further consideration and planning before the draft document is released.
WU019	Whau	Residential		iv) Some areas of the Whau need more consideration such as how the Mixed Housing zone has been applied to general suburban areas taking into account accessibility to services/ facilities and transport e.g. Fruitvale, Avondale and Green Bay. This should be reviewed before the draft document is released.
WU020	Whau	Residential		v) Housing types need to respond to different family groupings – multi-generational in one collection of housing.
WU021	Whau	Residential		vi) Houses installing alternative energy sources should be supported through the Unitary Plan.
WU022	Whau	Residential		vii) Whilst minimum size is important for apartments, this should also be combined with quality and usability of the space/ area within units to ensure quality apartment units are developed.
WU023	Whau	Residential		viii) Ensure the Unitary Plan supports the adaptability of residential dwellings to evolve over time providing the ability for retrofitting dairies and other local neighbourhood business activities in residential areas to create more walk-able communities and alternatives to car use.
WU024	Whau	Residential		ix) Residential intensification review should take strong account of local topography and geo-technical issues.
WU025	Whau	Business		e) On the Business Activity Package: that: i) Unitary Plan zoning must urgently take more account of freight routes not just public transport routes to support employment areas.
WU026	Whau	Business		ii) The Whau Local Board recommends that Kelston/ Span Farm should be light industrial zone noting the difficulty of access without a bridge to Rosebank, with a long term consideration of transitioning to a mixed use zone.
WU027	Whau	Transport		iii) Consideration of access to public transport infrastructure and frequency must be taken into account when parking requirements are being decreased.
WU028	Whau	Transport		iv) More consideration needs to be taken of property use when setting parking minimums or ratios e.g. truck and bus depots where staff leave vehicles.
WU029	Whau	Business		v) Support the principal of retail restrictions in industrial areas, however there should be the provision of “nodes” within significant employment (industrial) areas providing local facilities, services, retail – food etc. Agree that big box retail should not be allowed in these areas.
WU030	Whau	Heritage and Historic Character		f) On the Historic Heritage and Historic Character Package that: i) The Whau Local Board agree with rolling over existing schedules.
WU031	Whau	Heritage and Historic Character		ii) Note that urgent work needs to be done checking Category C/3 buildings and to identify other potential sites.
WU032	Whau	Heritage and Historic Character		iii) Current approaches for notification with regard to heritage are too limited so for example demolition should be notified.
WU033	Whau	Heritage and Historic Character		iv) The Cultural Heritage Inventory is a best practice and must be referenced in the Unitary plan to be taken account of when considering developments and notification.
WU034	Whau	Heritage and Historic Character		v) More work is needed on defining character areas and that Council need to provide adequate resourcing to enable this to be progressed.
WU035	Whau	Heritage and Historic Character		vi) The Whau Local Board is concerned with a blanket age protection approach around access to aerial photographs and suggest instead that age should trigger further consideration rather than protection.
WU036	Whau	Heritage and Historic Character		vii) The Whau Local Board is concerned that past local heritage planning in the Robertson Road area, Avondale has not been brought into the Unitary Plan and urgently requires further consideration in the overlays.
WU037	Whau	Natural Environment		g) On the Natural Environment Package that: i) In urban coastal areas the Unitary Plan needs to support the ability for rewarding covenanting and explore use of transferable land rights as a mechanism to protect and enhance natural coastal environments.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
WU038	Whau	Natural Environment		ii) It is essential that increased open space provision for both public and private needs is addressed in the Unitary Plan to ensure adequate provision as areas are intensified.
WU039	Whau	Natural Environment		iii) There is a need for appropriate open space zoning for golf courses and urban horticulture and community allotments that reflects their actual use and role in the local environment.
WU040	Whau	Natural Environment		iv) The Whau Local Board believes that the protection and removal of Mangroves should be managed through the Unitary Plan but does not endorse the Manukau Harbour Forum approach.
WU041	Whau	Natural Environment		h) With regard to engaging the community that: i) The Whau Local Board submits that delivering the Auckland Plan and its aspirations for intensification using the current forms of communication will create higher levels of stress in the communities of Auckland, more delays for developers, difficulty securing the investment needed to build the City we aspire to and could create a more distrust of Council and its processes.
WU042	Whau	Parks and Community		ii) The Unitary Plan needs to support increased and higher quality communication on individual developments with the wider surrounding community particularly with regard to the community's actual opportunity and role in decision-making.
WU043	Whau	Parks and Community		iii) The Whau Local Board endorses that all developments must display large all weather signs prior to any proposed development informing surrounding community of the development's intention and what is the current status of any decisions / opportunity for comment and where more information can be sought.
WU044	Whau	Business		i) On our key centres that: i) The Whau Local Board is concerned that the legacy precinct planning and the concept planning information for key areas such as New Lynn, Avondale, Rosebank Industrial Area have not been taken into account as part of the development of the Draft Unitary Plan. These processes and documents incorporate community and business anticipated outcomes for these areas gathered over years of engagement and need to be factored into the development of the Unitary Plan to demonstrate Council's commitment to achieving the agreed goals.
WU045	Whau	Business		ii) The Whau Local Board support Unitary Plan zoning the areas around Avondale Racecourse to support more intensive residential development.
WU046	Whau	Business		iii) The Whau Local Board request Officers consider the Avondale Racecourse zoning and Unitary Plan provisions support and enable continuation of horse racing with required supporting infrastructure, combined with sports fields use, Avondale Markets and community activities. There should also be consideration of other land uses and activities that are aligned to Council's strategic direction for growth and development of the Avondale area and request Officers urgently review the zoning to consider this.
WU047	Whau	Business		iv) The Whau Local Board requests that zoning and provisions in the Unitary Plan for Avondale Central Reserve supports the desire for the establishment and clustering of recreation and community facilities in combination with sports and recreation use of this public open space and request Officers urgently review the zoning to confirm this.
WU048	Whau	Business		j) The Whau Local Board supports the Unitary Plan being used to manage Auckland's Genetic Modification policy for Auckland.
WU049	Whau	Business		k) The Whau Local Board support the ability for preserving community access to GE free food by adopting the previous policy of GE-free in field and food particularly whilst further investigation is undertaken.
WU050	Whau	Business		l) The Whau Local Board support a precautionary principled approach in the Unitary Plan with regard to Genetic Modification.
K086-K148	Kaipatiki			* Second set of resolutions given after the 2nd Mapping Workshop. Second set of resolutions has been kept separate from full list of resolutions and has not been split in to themes. Please go to the bottom of this spreadsheet for resolutions from second set.
	Kaipatiki			<i>The following feedback is provided after the discussions at the draft Unitary Plan mapping workshops on 12 July 2013 and 2 August 2013. The Board notes that it is considered by some members that the following zoning changes do not go far enough to reflect the desire of part of the Board to achieve an outcome of no change in development potential.</i>
K086	Kaipatiki			76. There is a divergence of view on the future scale of development in Northcote, reflecting the first part of the Board's feedback. An officer proposal in response to feedback received is supported by one view within the Board; this is to change the Northcote town centre status to medium, resulting in a 6 storey centre, surrounded by a 5 storey THAB height overlay and with 4 storey THAB beyond out to the edge of current Res 6A area. Northcote is one of the smallest town centres in the region in land area and retail/services terms, and comprehensive redevelopment likely around it should be lowered in terms of height. The other view supports limiting the height to 3 storeys.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
K087	Kaipatiki			77. An officer proposal in response to feedback received from Housing New Zealand Corporation, and taking into consideration likely comprehensive redevelopment in the medium term, is to change Mixed Housing areas in Greenslade Crescent/Potter Avenue/Ko Street and also Cadness Street/Tonar Street/Fraser Avenue to THAB at either 4 stories, or 5 if within height overlay area. It is considered that the flooding risk will be addressed through Hillcrest catchment projects and as an overlay. One view supports the officer recommendation in response to feedback received to change these Mixed Housing blocks to THAB as proposed. The other view does not support such a change. The Board has no adverse comment on an officer proposal to change Auckland Council properties adjoining Greenslade Reserve to THAB for the same reasons as above. Flooding risk remains a significant issue on properties on the corner of Tonar and Cadness Streets. An officer proposal to change two properties to Single House zone is supported by the Board, with the view that if future area redevelopment progresses, these properties become part of the open space network for flooding mitigation.
K088	Kaipatiki			78. A proposal in response to feedback received to pull back the THAB height overlay to the east side of Potter Avenue and the south side of Greenslade Crescent, as these are beyond 250 metres from the centre, is acknowledged by the Board in the context of general differences of views regarding Northcote development. The southern part of Cadness Street, from Cadness Loop reserve, would still be included in the THAB 5 storey height overlay.
K089	Kaipatiki			79. The Board supports the officer proposal in response to its request that the THAB zone be changed to Mixed Housing A along the east side of College Road from number 31 to 77 and at numbers 4 to 10 Deuxberry Avenue, as potential THAB zone apartment development would cause shading and dominance impacts south and eastwards down the slope towards Tuff Crater and the Single House zone area.
K090	Kaipatiki			80. The Board supports an officer proposal to change the THAB zone at 12 to 18 Deuxberry Avenue to Mixed Housing B. This provides a transitional buffer in this height sensitive area for the adjoining Single House area in Arahia Street. The Board also supports the officer proposal to change the Single House zone at 41, 45, 47, 53 and 55 College Road to Mixed Housing B as area is relatively flat and provides a transition buffer for Single House zone rear lot properties down slope in Arahia St.
K091	Kaipatiki			81. A proposal in response to feedback received to change THAB along the east side of College Road from No.75A to 101 to Mixed Housing A is acknowledged by the Board in the context of general differences of views regarding Northcote development. The reasoning behind this change is the steep slope down to St Peters Street and Tuff Crater and any associated shading and bulk impacts from potential apartment buildings.
K092	Kaipatiki			82. The Board is supportive of a proposal in response to feedback received to change THAB east of 36 Exmouth and 11 Deuxberry to Mixed Housing A, in recognition of the slope down northward to Tuff Crater, that this is beyond 250 metres from the centre, and the Single House zone area across Deuxberry Avenue.
K093	Kaipatiki			83. The Board supports the officer proposal in response to its request that the THAB zone be changed to Mixed Housing A in the following locations to create a transitional buffer between THAB zone areas and Mixed Housing B and Single House zone areas: 4 – 30 Martin Crescent; 14 – 66 Ocean View Road; 71 Potter Avenue; Liston Street; Lenihan Street; 39 – 53 Raleigh Road; 3 – 23 James Evans Drive; 3, 5 and 6 – 10 Fowler Street; 58, 64 – 68, 73 – 81, 82 – 88 and 104 Lake Road; 2 and 4 Kororo Street; 3 – 23 Dudding Avenue; 17 – 37 Exmouth Road; 3 and 5 Howard Road; 68 – 96 Tonar Street; and 82 – 86 College Road.
K094	Kaipatiki			84. The Board supports the officer proposal in response to its request that the THAB zone be changed to Mixed Housing B in the following locations to create a transitional buffer: 6 – 27 Dudding Avenue; and 6 and 8 Kororo Street.
K095	Kaipatiki			85. The Board supports the officer proposal in response to its request that Mixed Housing A be confirmed on the following properties to reinforce the transitional buffer between THAB zone and Mixed Housing B or Single House zone: 10 and 12 Ocean View Road, 212 – 218 and 235 – 243 Lake Road; 56 Northcote Road; 6 – 66 Tonar Street; 42 – 48 Raleigh Road; and 25 – 33 James Evans Drive.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
K096	Kaipatiki			86. The Board supports an officer proposal to confirm Mixed Housing B on the remaining properties around Northcote Central as these are a transition between higher intensity areas nearer the town centre and the general Mixed Housing B and Single House suburbs, for example, Exmouth Road, Raleigh Road, James Evans Drive, Fowler Street, Kororo Street, Holdaway Avenue, Kaihu Street, and St Peter's Street. In light of the split of Mixed Housing, the application of Mixed Housing A to the 150 – 200 metres beyond THAB zone has been identified by officers, but this is to be limited in Northcote as the THAB zone goes beyond 250 metres beyond the centre to reflect the existing Res 6A extent. The Board acknowledges this change but is concerned at the application of Mixed Housing A in areas directly adjoining the Single House zone. The Board requests that these areas are changed to Mixed Housing B. Examples of these are along the south side of Exmouth Road (including Howard Road, Dudding Avenue and Kororo Street) and Raleigh Road (James Evans Drive and Fowler Street).
K097	Kaipatiki			87. The Board is supportive of an officer proposal in response to feedback received to pull the THAB 5 storey height overlay closer to the Town Centre and remove the 5 storey overlay from THAB properties south of Raleigh Rd and Exmouth Rd and east of 20 Exmouth Rd and 3A&B Deuxberry Avenue.
K098	Kaipatiki			88. The general proposition from staff that Birkenhead is a 6 storey medium town centre with limited 5 storey THAB overlay around is noted by the Board.
K099	Kaipatiki			89. The Board supports a proposal in response to feedback received to remove the THAB 5 storey overlay from the south side of Zion Road, as it is across from a Single House zone on a local residential street.
K100	Kaipatiki			90. The Board supports a proposal in response to feedback received to also remove the THAB 5 storey overlay from 99 Birkenhead Avenue and 17 – 21 Highbury Bypass.
K101	Kaipatiki			91. The Board supports removing the 5 storey THAB overlay on the bulk of the Mahara Avenue (from 16 – 28 Mahara Ave), but there is a difference in views as to whether this should be kept as 4 storey THAB, in light of proximity to the city centre and public leisure space, or changed to Mixed Housing A, in light of traffic accessibility onto Highbury Bypass. Taking these factors into account, the Board supports the officer proposal to split the street between THAB to the south and Mixed Housing A to the northern end. The existence of a SEA on parts of 30 – 34 and 40 – 42 Mahara Avenue indicates that it would be appropriate for Mixed Housing A be applied north of 28 Mahara Avenue, and the SEA on 25 Mahara Avenue suggests that the northern half of the east side of Mahara Avenue should be Mixed Housing A.
K102	Kaipatiki			92. The Board does not support an officer proposal to change 10 Huka Rd from Single House to THAB. While the site is large and close to the town centre, it has significant and ongoing land stability issues.
K103	Kaipatiki			93. The Board supports an officer proposal to change Mixed Use at 3 & 5 Huka Rd to Single House, as these properties are within the existing Res 3B zone.
K104	Kaipatiki			94. Although is an existing 4B zone, the Board does not support an officer proposal to change 4 – 10A Colonial Road from Single House to THAB because of concerns about undermining the heritage value of the area.
K105	Kaipatiki			95. The Board supports the officer proposal to lower the height limit in the Town Centre zone on Rawene Road and Hinemoa Street to 4 storeys, as it is adjacent to a Single House zone with a historic character overlay.
K106	Kaipatiki			96. The Board supports the officer proposal in response to its request for investigation of further transitional zoning to change the height limit to 5 storeys in the Town Centre zone on south side of Mokoia Rd and east side of Birkenhead Ave and Hinemoa St (these areas adjoin sloping parts of the town centre and provide a transition to the surrounding residential, reserve or mixed use areas to the south and east) as well as changing heights to 4 storeys on the small Town Centre zone block fronting Hinemoa Street south of Enterprise Street. The Town Centre zone block 2 – 22A Mokoia Road, 15 – 17 Rawene Road and the Rawene Road car park are to remain at 6 storeys.
K107	Kaipatiki			97. The proposal in response to feedback received to change the THAB in Wernham Place to Mixed Housing on the east side and Single Housing on the right side (numbers 3/3A) is supported by the Board, particularly in light of the change to the south side of Onewa Rd as noted below.
K108	Kaipatiki			98. The Board requests that the THAB zone along the south side of Onewa Rd be changed to Mixed Housing A, primarily as this butts directly up against Single House zoning to the south. The Board also asks officers to review the application of the proposed Mixed Housing A in light of the SEAs in the area and Le Roys Bush in the vicinity of Church St and Wilding Ave.
K109	Kaipatiki			99. The Board supports the officer proposal in response to its request to remove the 5 storey overlay from the THAB zone on 211 – 225 and 260 and 264 Onewa Road, as this is adjacent to proposed Mixed Housing A zone areas where a more sensitive height transition is desirable on local residential streets.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
K110	Kaipatiki			100. The Board supports the officer proposal to change the THAB zone to Mixed Housing A in the following locations, to create a transitional buffer between THAB zone areas in Highbury and the Single House zone areas predominating particularly southwards: 2C and D and 13 – 21 Zion Road; 213 Onewa Road; 100 – 100D and 105 and 113 Birkenhead Avenue; 3 – 7 Colonial Road; 114A – 118A and 140 – 144 Mokoia Road; 132, 134 and 141 Porritt Ave; and 1A and B Glenwood Avenue.
K111	Kaipatiki			101. The Board supports the officer proposal to change the THAB zone on 4 Colonial Road and the Single House zone on 6, 10 and 10A Colonial Road to Mixed Housing A to provide a better buffer with THAB and Mixed Use zones adjacent and along Mokoia Road.
K112	Kaipatiki			102. The Board supports an officer proposal to change the Local Centre zone block between Brassey Road and Rugby Road to the Mixed Use zone. This is not a local centre and the bulk of retail and services are in adjacent Neighbourhood Centre blocks. Mixed use allows a wider range of activities including residential and limits retail size.
K113	Kaipatiki			103. The proposal in response to feedback received to change Mixed Housing to Single House generally in the Chatswood area (streets off and including Chelsea View Drive, Porritt Avenue, Colonial Road and Onetaunga Road) is supported by the Board. The Board also supports changing the THAB along the north side of Chelsea View Drive to Single House. The cul-de sac nature of the subdivision, the uneven topography, and the consistent character of housing built in same era warrants such a zoning.
K114	Kaipatiki			104. The Board is of the opinion that, due to the difficult topography, it would be appropriate to change the THAB zoning on the north side of Mokoia Road, opposite the Chatswood centre, to Mixed Housing A. Other properties to the north on the eastern side of Roseberry Avenue and western side of Glenwood Avenue would be more appropriately zoned as Mixed Housing B. The Mixed Housing B zone should also apply to Mixed Housing properties in Balmain Road, except for the THAB at 2 Balmain Road which should remain.
K115	Kaipatiki			105. The Board supports an officer proposal to change the THAB zone to Mixed Housing A in the following locations, to create a transitional buffer between the THAB zone and the Mixed Housing B/Single House zone in the Chatswood residential area: 13, 15 and 17 Chelsea View Drive; 150 – 160 Mokoia Road; and 2 Balmain Road, and to Mixed Housing B at 9, 11, 19, 21, 23, and 25 Chelsea View Drive.
K116	Kaipatiki			106. The Board supports an officer proposal to change the Mixed Housing B zone to Mixed Housing A at 10 – 26 Glenwood Avenue and 11 – 19 Roseberry Avenue, as these sites are within 250 metres of the FTN route along Mokoia Rd and there are no SEA on these sites.
K117	Kaipatiki			107. The Board supports the officer proposal in response to its request to remove the 5 storey overlay from the THAB zone on south side of Mokoia Road as this is adjacent to proposed Mixed Housing A zone areas where a more sensitive height transition is desirable on local residential streets.
K118	Kaipatiki			108. The Board supports an officer proposal in response to feedback received to Change Light Industry zone on 118 Beach Haven Road to Mixed Housing. This reflects the residential development on site and low likelihood of any business development on the existing Bus 1 zone.
K119	Kaipatiki			109. The officer proposal in response to feedback received to change Mixed Housing to Local Centre zone along frontage 321 – 329 Rangitira Road is supported by the Board. This will enable further centre development and greater 'mainstreet' retail/service enclosure for the centre.
K120	Kaipatiki			110. The Board supports the officer proposal in response to its request that the Single House zone be changed to Mixed Housing A at 319A and B Rangitira Road and 107 Beach Haven Road as these properties are adjacent to a local centre.
K121	Kaipatiki			111. The Board supports the proposal in response to feedback received to change Mixed Housing to Local Centre zone at 99 Beach Haven Road, providing a retail/business enclosure for the new open space fronting Rangitira Road and rectifying the centre block shape. The Board also supports changing the Local Centre zone to POS – Civic and Community on the new open space at 364 Rangitira Road, reflecting the new community plaza/open space use.
K122	Kaipatiki			112. The Board does not support a proposal to change the Mixed Housing zone to Mixed Housing A along the 200 – 250 metre frontage to Rangitira Road and Beach Haven Road approaching the Beach Haven local centre, which was proposed because of bus route accessibility and the generally flat land along both side of road. Also considered was the corridor application of Mixed Housing A, extending to Verrans Corner on Rangitira Road, to Glenfield town centre along Beach Haven Road and Kaipātiki Road, and along Birkdale Road as follows bus routes that the Board expects to be considered as future FTN routes and indicated as such in FTN proposals. These proposals were not supported as the level of development in this area enabled by this change would be inappropriate and this general area is very suburban in nature. However, this change is still considered a medium to long term prospect, to be evaluated in future reviews of the Plan.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
K123	Kaipatiki			113. In the context of general differences of views regarding the Wairau Valley zoning as outlined in part one of this feedback, the Board supports changing the Light Industry zone at the northern end of northern end of Link Drive to the Mixed Use zone, reflecting what has been developing here for many years and as services to the THAB areas to the north. The rest of Link Drive area including Croftfield Lane should be zoned as General Business in recognition of, and to enable, the large format retail that has been predominant over many years, proximity to the Bus 8 zone and residential potential in respect to access to the Sunnynook Busway station, and to deter standard small scale retail and residential.
K124	Kaipatiki			114. The Board sees merit in the officer proposal, first investigated by the North Shore City Council, to change the southern Wairau area from Light Industry zone to General Business. This recognises the changing nature of the area to retail large format and also signals change over time to an office-based business centre with retail supporting (for employment reasons). However, the Board ultimately does not support changing this zoning for the notified Unitary Plan, as the matter of rezoning the southern Wairau area as a business centre needs further analysis and is a medium to long term prospect. There are likely to be impacts on other town and metropolitan centres and the location needs to be carefully master-planned and coincide with major infrastructure planning and investment, including a new busway station and/or third harbour crossing.
K125	Kaipatiki			115. The Board supports the proposal in response to feedback received to change THAB zones to Mixed Housing A zone in the Bruce Road area and north Wairau Road/View Road area. The application of THAB here is not around a centre but adjacent to the Wairau employment area which does not provide the retail and services expected of centres that support THAB, as well as being somewhat remote from Busway stations on east side of SH1 motorway.
K126	Kaipatiki			116. The Board does not support the proposal in response to feedback to change the Transpower sub-station at 4A Wairau Rd from "POS – Sport and Active Recreation" to the Light Industrial zone, as the underlying zone should remain as POS should this facility ever vacate the site.
K127	Kaipatiki			117. The Board has a diverging view on the future scale of development in Glenfield, though in the context of a height increase to 6 storeys it requests that there be a 4 storey height limit on the Glenfield Road 'mainstreet' to reflect its traditional retail-strip nature. This would also mean that there would be no 5 storey THAB height overlay surrounding the Glenfield centre, as then a discrepancy would exist between the Town Centre zone and surrounding residential areas.
K128	Kaipatiki			118. The Board supports the officer proposal to change THAB to Mixed Housing A along Waverley Avenue, as this is beyond 250 metres and down-hill from the town centre zone, and at the following locations to give a more transitional buffer and to ensure THAB is not beyond 250 metres of the town centre zone: 24 – 36 Sunnyfield Crescent; 7 – 37 Camelot Place; 23A – 33 and 30 – 38 Peach Road; 5A – 17 and 12 and 14 Powrie Street; Taynith Place; 378 – 382 Glenfield Rd.
K129	Kaipatiki			119. The Board supports the officer proposal to change the Mixed Housing along the west and north side of Sunnyfield Crescent to THAB, as this is within 250 metres of the town centre zone and consistent with ridgeline approach to THAB in Glenfield, as well as at 21 – 27, 34 and 36 Kaipātiki Road; 2 and 2A Waverley Ave; and 50 – 56 and 60 Bentley Avenue, as these are sides of roads and are still within 250 metres of the Town Centre zone.
K130	Kaipatiki			120. The Board does not support an officer proposal to include both side of Peach Road (numbers 7 – 23 & 12 – 26) in the THAB 5 storey height overlay, initially proposed because of the more gentle slope and proximity to the town centre zone. 5 storeys is not considered appropriate around Glenfield town centre.
K131	Kaipatiki			121. The Board supports an officer proposal to confirm Mixed Housing B at 4 – 8 and 42 – 52 Marlborough Avenue, as well as all properties in Mulberry Place, as these properties are beyond 250 metres from Glenfield Road Also include as Mixed Housing B zone.
K132	Kaipatiki			122. The Board supports an officer proposal to confirm Mixed Housing A at 11, 11A and B Marlborough Avenue as these properties are well within 250 metres of Glenfield Road.
K133	Kaipatiki			123. The Board requests the change of THAB zone to Mixed Housing B on properties on both sides of Marlborough Avenue (including Mulberry Avenue), due to the steep topography and distance from the town centre, and also to some properties further along High Road (numbers 33 – 45) due to the ridge line sloping down to the east. The Board supports the officer proposal to apply the Mixed Housing A zone 150 – 200 metres beyond the THAB zone identified, as well as 200 – 250 metres along Glenfield Road as a frequent transport route.

Resolution Number	Local Board	Feedback Theme	Mapping (Y/N)	Feedback
K134	Kaipatiki			124. The Board supports the officer proposal in response to feedback received to change Single House zone frontage properties along both sides of Sunnybrae Road to Mixed Housing B. This is a key corridor up to Glenfield and Wairau Valley with great accessibility. However, the Marywil Crescent area has a single house per site covenant and is coherent as a Single House area. The Board also supports keeping the west side of Sunnybrae Road's current Res 2B, behind the frontage, as Single House.
K135	Kaipatiki			125. The officer proposal in response to feedback received to change Single House to Mixed Housing A on Poenamo site on Northcote Road/Sunnybrae Road is supported as this is a large site with travellers' accommodation next to a main arterial road and the SH1 motorway.
K136	Kaipatiki			126. The Board supports the officer proposal to change the Neighbourhood Centre zone on block 48 – 54 Northcote Road to Mixed Use. These are large drive in off-street retail units with car parking and a service station. Mixed Use is more in line with the adjacent general business area than being a neighbourhood centre.
K137	Kaipatiki			127. The Board supports the officer proposal in response to feedback received to change the Mixed Use zone to Business Park on properties along The Warehouse Way. This area is a typical office-only office park that is currently Bus 7 business park zone. Mixed Use will enable introduction of retail, residential, industry and the like that is not envisaged or supported for this office location.
K138	Kaipatiki			128. The Board requested officers to investigate the application of Mixed Housing A to key arterial roads that run east-west and connect to Busway stations. The Board has submitted comments to Auckland Transport on the proposed FTN. The Board supports the officer proposal to apply this to Pupuke Road, Raleigh Road, Archers Road, and the remaining stretch of Wairau Road that is not covered by the Glenfield Rd 250 metre coverage area or the View Road Mixed Housing A zone area. However, the Board does not support this being applied to Ocean View Road. The Board notes officer advice that flooding risk poses an impediment to more intensive development along the Chartwell Avenue/Bentley Ave route and that road widening would be needed in some locations.
K139	Kaipatiki			129. The Board has requested that officers investigate the zoning for the Chelsea Sugar Works site to ensure that the zoning applied is both appropriate to the current use of the site, whilst protecting the Chelsea Estate Heritage Park.
K140	Kaipatiki			130. The Board supports a section size of 300 square metres for the Mixed Housing B zone rather than the proposed 250 square metres.
K141	Kaipatiki			131. The board supports a proposal in response to feedback received to change Mixed Housing zone to Mixed Use zone at 44 Akoranga Drive. This was proposed to reflect consent for mixed office and professional services development adjacent to AUT and Awataha Marae and the surrounding context of institutional and mixed residential/education activities and buildings.
K142	Kaipatiki			132. The Board generally supports changing a number of Mixed Housing zoned properties to Single House in areas identified as flooding risk, unless specifically discussed and addressed otherwise, as identified by the Stormwater North unit. These changes are shown on separate GIS-generated maps and will be applied directly to the next version of the planning maps. The Board notes that this does not include flooding issues in the Northcote Central area, as addressed in previous considerations.
K143	Kaipatiki			133. Because of a 200 – 250 metre distance from the frequent network route proposed, its suitability for potential redevelopment and its proximity to the centre, the Board supports changing the western side of Birkdale Road almost to Gatman Street (66 Birkdale Road) to Mixed Housing A zoning.
K144	Kaipatiki			134. The Board supports the proposal in response to feedback received to change the following Single House zones to Mixed Housing, where the existing Res 2B translated over to Single House: Crocombe Crescent, 6 Sampson Place, Lydia Avenue and the north side of Raymond Terrace, with south side adjacent to the reserve remaining as Single House zone.
K145	Kaipatiki			135. The Board supports a proposal in response to feedback received to change the Single House zoning along the north side of Hillcrest Ave up to Sylvia Road to Mixed Housing, to reflect existing Res 4A zoned properties.
K146	Kaipatiki			136. The Board supports the officer proposal to remove the Neighbourhood Centre zone from the square block on the northern boundary of "Fernz" (2 Rangatira Road) on Verran Road and return it to Single House, as with rest of this large property. This appears to be an anomaly in the North Shore District Plan.
K147	Kaipatiki			137. The Board supports the proposal in response to feedback received to change the Single House zone at the rear of 69 Hadfield St to Public Open Space – Conservation as this is part of the bush reserve.
K148	Kaipatiki			138. The Board supports the proposal in response to feedback received to change the Single House zone to Public Open Space – Conservation at properties to the rear of 26 Mappin Place and 26 Langstone Place. These are part of the Chatswood bush reserve.