

**Date:** Tuesday 8 March 2016  
**Time:** 9.30am  
**Meeting Room:** Upper Harbour Local Board Office  
**Venue:** 30 Kell Drive  
Albany

---

## Upper Harbour Local Board

### OPEN MINUTE ITEM ATTACHMENTS

---

ITEM	TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
9.1	<b>Mayfair Retirement Village traffic concerns</b>	
	A. Mayfair Retirement Village traffic concerns and Rosedale Road example	3
17	<b>Approval of Upper Harbour Local Board feedback on the Better Urban Planning review and proposed changes to the Resource Legislation Amendment Bill</b>	
	A. Better Urban Planning and Resource Legislation Amendment Bill submissions	7



SUBMISSION TO UPPER HARBOUR COMMUNITY BOARD MEETING 8TH MARCH 2016

MY NAME IS DOUG ASTLEY AND PAM LAWRINSON AND I REPRESENT THE 200 RESIDENTS OF MAYFAIR VILLAGE.

1. YOU WILL HAVE READ OUR SUBMISSION ON TRAFFIC CONCERNS REGARDING THE PORTION OF OTEHA VALLEY RD BETWEEN THE SEVILLE SHOPS AND THE TRAFFIC LIGHTS AT NORTHCROSS AND OUR PARTICULAR CONCERNS REGARDING ACCESS TO MAYFAIR VILLAGE AND SEEK YOUR SUPPORT FOR A SOLUTION.

THE SPEED LIMIT ON THIS SECTION IS 50KPH WHICH WE CONSIDER ADEQUATE BUT MANY VEHICLES EXCEED THIS AND SOME USE THIS PORTION OF OTEHA VALLEY RD AS A SPEEDWAY.

TO ASSIST YOU IN UNDERSTANDING A SUGGESTED SOLUTION WE HAVE FOR YOU PHOTOS OF THE MEASURES TAKEN IN ROSEDALE RD WHERE KNIGHTSBRIDGE VILLAGE HAD A SIMILAR PROBLEM. WE UNDERSTAND THIS SOLUTION HAS BEEN VERY SATISFACTORY.

2. IN ADDITION THE USE OF VISUAL SIGNS INDICATING "SLOW DOWN" WHEN VEHICLES EXCEED THE SPEED LIMIT AND ALSO STATING THE VEHICLE SPEED, IS WIDELY USED THROUGHOUT THE REGION AND WE BELIEVE WOULD BE APPROPRIATE ON THIS SECTION FOR TRAFFIC TRAVELLING BOTH WAYS.

3. THE PEDESTRIAN REFUGE SUGGESTED FOR PEDESTRIANS FROM HARROWGLEN WISHING TO CROSS OTEHA VALLEY RD TO THE BUS STOP OUTSIDE MAYFAIR VILLAGE WOULD BE A SAFETY MEASURE.

4. THE PLANNED EXTENTION OF MEDALLION DRIVE ACROSS OTEHA VALLEY ROAD JOINING UP WITH FAIRVIEW ABOVE THE FAIRVIEW VILLAGE IS MENTIONED ONLY BECAUSE A MEMBER OF COUNCIL STAFF TOLD ME INFORMALLY THAT SOME STAFF QUESTIONED THE NEED FOR AND TIMING OF THIS WORK.

WE HAVE ALSO SUBMITTED THESE CONCERNS TO AUCKLAND TRANSPORT WHO HAVE ADVISED US THAT THEIR NETWORK OPERATIONS AND SAFETY TEAM WILL INVESTIGATE EACH OF THE CONCERNS WE HAVE RAISED AND WE EXPECT TO RECEIVE A FORMAL RESPONSE WITHIN APPROXIMATELY A WEEK.

I NOW INVITE PAM LAWRINSON TO SHARE A RECENT CLOSE SHAVE SHE EXPERIENCED WHILE TURNING RIGHT INTO MAYFAIR VILLAGE FROM OTEHA VALLEY RD.

Item 9.1  
Attachment A



*ROSEDALE RD / GRANBY COLLINS APPROACH*





*GRAHAM COXONS / RESIDUE 19 10768236510W*



Attachment A  
Item 9.1



## Upper Harbour Local Board

### Feedback on Productivity Commission's 'Better Urban Planning Issues' discussion document

1. The Upper Harbour Local Board (the Board) welcomes the opportunity to provide comment on the Productivity Commission's 'Better Urban Planning Issues' discussion document. The Board considers this an important piece of work, as there is great potential to improve the current urban planning system to meet the challenges presented by increased growth and development.
2. However, it is difficult to provide lengthy and detailed comment in general, as the initial thinking is still high-level and lacks specific detail upon which to provide views. The Board would appreciate the opportunity to comment further once the Productivity Commission releases specific proposals later this year.
3. The Board believes there are very few opportunities for it to meaningfully engage in the approval of resource consents, and would like to see more meaningful involvement in decisions that have local impact. This should not be taken to mean, however, that the Board expects to be decision-makers on resource management issues. Improved engagement could occur through dialogue with developers and planners at an earlier stage of the consents process, which would ensure that local views and concerns are known and understood from the outset. Such involvement would provide the opportunity for projects and consents to be amended before it becomes too late or expensive to make alterations.
4. In addition, the Board would support improved public involvement in planning and resource management decisions as part of a new approach. The Board believes that current levels of public engagement is lacklustre for a number of reasons:
  - a. plans and rules are often too complex to expect a reasonable level of understanding from the public, so it is difficult for the general public to provide an informed opinion;
  - b. the inability of the public to be involved in the process if they weren't involved from the start;
  - c. inaccessible communications that do not clearly indicate how the public will be affected from the proposed changes; and
  - d. situations arise where the public may want to be involved, but are unable to do so because the process precludes it (such as the out of scope changes put forward for the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan).
5. The Board has a vision for a practicable engagement and consultative process that is accessible, prioritises informed submissions and minimises the opportunity for special interest groups to hijack or delay proceedings.

## Upper Harbour Local Board

### Feedback on Resource Legislation Amendment Bill

1. The Upper Harbour Local Board (the Board) welcomes the opportunity to provide comment on the proposed Resource Legislation Amendment Bill (the Bill). The Board believes resource management is an important issue that has the potential to greatly impact the amenity of the local board area and wider Auckland region.

#### *Greater centralised planning control*

2. The Board supports the aspirational goal of local authorities providing sufficient business and residential development for long-term demand. However, adequate planning for growth is very complex, and requires strategic thinking across land use, infrastructure, assets and funding, as well as developing and implementing structure plans, district plans, asset management plans, infrastructure strategies and long-term and annual plans. The challenge for local authorities is to ensure that all of these mechanisms enable development in a holistic and 'joined up' way.
3. The Board is curious as to the how the additional proposed requirement under sections 30 and 31 of the Resource Management Act (RMA) will be measured and further the existing aim of Auckland Council to provide for growth.
4. The Board is also concerned about the additional responsibility of local authorities to provide for development capacity. This is because other resource management responsibilities of the local authority may be removed under several of the new proposals, which may undermine the ability of local authorities to provide for these developments. The removal of local powers has the potential for the unique knowledge and plans of local authorities to be disregarded. Consequently, the result could be inadequately structured developments. This could impose social and financial costs to the local authority as they deal with unintended and cumulative consequences from piecemeal developments.
5. The Board has concerns about the proposed creation of a new regulation-making power under the RMA. While this new body may streamline some processes, it also has the ability to inhibit the proposed role of the local authorities under section 30 and 31 of the RMA. . Rather than installing the new body under the RMA to streamline development, other mechanisms to speed up local development could be considered such as user-pays.
6. One of the Board's interests is the disposal of hazardous substances to the highest possible standard. While the Board is supportive of removing unnecessary duplication generally, the Board wants to ensure that if these responsibilities are centralised, then disposal is kept to the highest possible standard.
7. The Board fundamentally opposes provisions that enable central government to erode local decision-making by prohibiting certain rules, or ruling certain activities to be



permitted without consideration of local views, without the involvement of local authorities. This is particularly concerning in areas where it is proposed that there be limited opportunities whereby a Ministerial decision can be queried or challenged.

8. The Board would also support alteration of section 15 (1)(a) of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 to allow regulatory responsibilities relating to the RMA to be allocated to local boards, which would ensure the principle of subsidiarity ('local decisions made locally') is upheld.

*Simplification of plan-making*

9. The proposed focus on agility of plan-making is idea concept the Board strongly supports. The Board has been critical in the past of the laboured process to generate plans, as by the time they are finalised, the plans can almost be outdated and not as functional as if they were produced faster with more flexibility built in to the process. The Board encourages an investigation into the removal of possible loopholes which can be exploited to slow down the approval process of plans.
10. The Board believes there are possible issues with the proposed collaborative process for plan-making. The Board predicts there will be difficulty with ensuring the quality of front-end engagement in order to minimise later efforts. Often engagement programmes will not reach all those affected by proposed changes until people are immediately impacted. This is a constant barrier for front-end collaboration, and may not result in achieving the intended benefits of such a process.
11. The Board supports collaboration that is easily accessible at all stages of the process of plan-making. If members of the public want to be involved, they should not be shut out of the process. The recent out of scope changes to the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan and inability of the public to submit on these changes (unless they originally submitted) is a poor example of collaboration. Simultaneously, the Board is critical of engagement approaches which allow an unnecessary slowing down of the planning process. 'Consultation fatigue' is also an issue among some stakeholders, and while in principle the Board is supportive of consultation, the Board believes it must be practicable and add value to the decision-making process by allowing people or groups to contribute their informed opinion.
12. Fast tracking simple resource consents has been an effective mechanism in the past, and the Board endorses such an approach. The Board would like more information around what types of consents are eligible to be fast tracked, and whether the activities to be fast tracked is a decision for a local authority or central government. The criteria regarding fast tracking will determine the benefits of this proposal; as if it is too broad this could cause negative externalities, such as missing or inadequate infrastructure. Alternatively, if the fast track rules are too restrictive, then there will be a very small benefit as not enough consents are being processed.

13. The Board is very supportive of the proposals to allow joint notification to streamline the process from unnecessary delays. This is a common delay in local urban redevelopment projects and hinders progress on projects with elongated timelines from notification periods.
14. The Board strongly supports utilising the technological advancements from online platforms.