

Public notification submissions summary

Proposed Land exchange at Hillary Crescent, Belmont

1. Public notices advising of Auckland Council's intention to exchange the reserve land were placed in the New Zealand Herald, North Shore Times and on council's website on 28 July 2017 calling for any objections to the proposal to be made in writing to council by 28 August 2017.
2. A total of 57 submissions were received during the consultation period. The ratings of the responses are set out in Table 1.

Table 1: Response rating of submissions received

Rating	Total	Percentage
Strongly agree	8	14%
Agree	9	16%
Neutral	3	5%
No rating provided	3	5%
Disagree	8	14%
Strongly disagree	26	46%

Submissions Analysis

3. The submissions from those who disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposed land exchange fall in two distinct categories:
 - Reserves Act 1977 matters (12 submissions)
 - Resource Management Act 1991 matters (22 submissions).
4. Council is required to consider objections that relate to Reserves Act 1977 matters in making its decision on the proposed land exchange.

Reserve Management Act 1977 matters

5. Of these 12, five did not provide any particular reasons for their objections. This makes it difficult for the council to consider the merit of their objections in its decision-making.
6. The remaining seven submissions provided more detail and are assessed as requiring specific responses to their objections:
 - one submission objected to reserve land loss and a separation of the proposed new pocket park
 - four submissions objected to the poor quality of reserve access
 - two objected on the basis of requiring more information.
7. Analysis of these submissions concluded that the five objections with specific reasons have little merit. The proposed reserve concept plans clearly set out an overall gain of reserve land, including improved access and amenity.
8. The objecting submissions and response are set out in Table 2, including the action to be taken to address the two submissions which required more information.

Table 2: Specific submission responses

Objection	Response
Reserve land-loss & separation (pocket park)	An increase of reserve land (1708m ²), improved reserve amenity and visual relief (of pocket park) resulting from the land exchange.
Poor reserve access	Improvement to access amenity (width, slope, surface, planting). Location of new access points at similar locations to previous entrances.
Poor reserve access	Improvement to access amenity (width, slope, surface, planting). Location of new access points at similar locations to previous entrances.
Closure of reserve access	Four existing access points into Northboro Reserve will be replaced by four new and improved access-ways.
Required more information	Letter with accompanying information pack to be supplied.
Required more information	Letter with accompanying information pack to be supplied.
Concerned with insufficient access to reserve for maintenance vehicles	The existing maintenance vehicle access from Northboro Road direct to the reserve will be retained.

Resource Management Act 1991 matters

9. Twenty-two submissions relate to Whai Rawa's proposed development of their land for medium to high density housing and the associated effects of increased traffic to the surrounding roads. These objections fall outside the scope of the Reserves Act 1977. They are Resource Management Act 1991 matters that will be dealt with as part of Whai Rawa's resource consent.

Iwi consultation

10. Consultation was undertaken with 12 iwi identified as having mana whenua associations with the site. A rating summary of iwi position on this matter is set out in Table 3.

Table 3: Response rating of all mana whenua iwi

Rating	Total	Percentage
In support	1	8%
Have no issue	4	33%
No response provided	6	50%
Object	1	8%

11. One submitted an objection to the proposed land exchange but did not provide a reason for their objection. It is difficult to consider this objection as there is no further detail provided, however it appears to be a general objection rather than a specific issue with the proposed land exchange.