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Terms of Reference

Responsibilities

This committee guides the physical development and growth of Auckland through a focus on land use planning, housing and the appropriate provision of infrastructure and strategic projects associated with these activities. Key responsibilities include:

- Relevant regional strategy and policy
- Infrastructure strategy and policy
- Unitary Plan
- Spatial plans
- Plan changes to operative plans
- Housing policy and projects
- Special Housing Areas
- City centre development
- Tamaki regeneration
- Built heritage
- Urban design
- Environmental matters relating to the committee’s responsibilities
- Acquisition of property relating to the committee’s responsibilities and within approved annual budgets
- Initiatives of the following CCOs that have a significant impact upon the implementation of the Auckland Plan and other relevant plans, policies and strategies:
  - Panuku Development Auckland
  - Auckland Transport
  - Watercare Services Limited
  - Regional Facilities Auckland (stadia)

Powers

(i) All powers necessary to perform the committee’s responsibilities, including:
   (a) approval of a submission to an external body
   (b) establishment of working parties or steering groups.

(ii) The committee has the powers to perform the responsibilities of another committee, where it is necessary to make a decision prior to the next meeting of that other committee.

(iii) The committee does not have:
   (a) the power to establish subcommittees
   (b) powers that the Governing Body cannot delegate or has retained to itself (section 2).
Exclusion of the public – who needs to leave the meeting

Members of the public

All members of the public must leave the meeting when the public are excluded unless a resolution is passed permitting a person to remain because their knowledge will assist the meeting.

Those who are not members of the public

General principles

- Access to confidential information is managed on a “need to know” basis where access to the information is required in order for a person to perform their role.
- Those who are not members of the meeting (see list below) must leave unless it is necessary for them to remain and hear the debate in order to perform their role.
- Those who need to be present for one confidential item can remain only for that item and must leave the room for any other confidential items.
- In any case of doubt, the ruling of the chairperson is final.

Members of the meeting

- The members of the meeting remain (all Governing Body members if the meeting is a Governing Body meeting; all members of the committee if the meeting is a committee meeting).
- However, standing orders require that a councillor who has a pecuniary conflict of interest leave the room.
- All councillors have the right to attend any meeting of a committee and councillors who are not members of a committee may remain, subject to any limitations in standing orders.

Independent Māori Statutory Board

- Members of the Independent Māori Statutory Board who are appointed members of the committee remain.
- Independent Māori Statutory Board members and staff remain if this is necessary in order for them to perform their role.

Staff

- All staff supporting the meeting (administrative, senior management) remain.
- Other staff who need to because of their role may remain.

Local Board members

- Local Board members who need to hear the matter being discussed in order to perform their role may remain. This will usually be if the matter affects, or is relevant to, a particular Local Board area.

Council Controlled Organisations

- Representatives of a Council Controlled Organisation can remain only if required to for discussion of a matter relevant to the Council Controlled Organisation.
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1 Apologies

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2 Declaration of Interest

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

3 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Planning Committee:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 6 March 2018, including the confidential section, as a true and correct record.

4 Petitions

4.1 David Roos - Petition requesting safer pedestrian access in Victoria Quarter

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To receive a petition from David Roos.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. David Roos will present a petition to the Planning Committee.

3. The petition is addressed to the Mayor, Auckland Council, Auckland Transport, the Waitematā Local Board, Auckland City Centre Advisory Board, New Zealand Transport Association and the Ministers for Transport and Urban Development.

4. The petition asks for “the delivery of safer walking facilities for Auckland City Centre’s nearly 20,000 residents living in and around the Victoria Quarter (the area bounded by Victoria, Hobson and Union Streets).”

5. Further information about the petition can be found at: https://www.change.org/p/safer-pedestrian-access-around-the-cook-street-nelson-street-and-union-street-area

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Planning Committee:

a) thank David Roos for his attendance.

b) note the content of the petition submitted by David Roos requesting safer pedestrian access in Victoria Quarter.

c) refer the petition to council’s Development Programmes Office and Auckland Transport for consideration.
5  Public Input

Standing Order 7.7 provides for Public Input. Applications to speak must be made to the Governance Advisor, in writing, no later than one (1) clear working day prior to the meeting and must include the subject matter. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders. A maximum of thirty (30) minutes is allocated to the period for public input with five (5) minutes speaking time for each speaker.

5.1  Public Input - Public Transport Users Association - Trains to Huapai campaign

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Christine Rose, representing the Public Transport Users Association will speak to the committee regarding the Trains to Huapai Campaign.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:
a) receive the presentation from Christine Rose on behalf of the Public Transport Users Association regarding trains to Huapai and thank her for attending.

5.2  Public Input - Changda International Limited - Vesting of Land on a Closed Landfill at West Hoe Heights, Orewa

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Olric Thomas, Senior Project Manager - Changda International Limited, will speak to the committee regarding the vesting of land on a closed landfill at West Hoe Heights, Orewa.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:
a) receive the public input from Olric Thomas on behalf of Changda International Limited regarding the vesting of land at West Hoe Heights, Orewa and thank them for attending.
6 Local Board Input

Standing Order 6.2 provides for Local Board Input. The Chairperson (or nominee of that Chairperson) is entitled to speak for up to *five (5)* minutes during this time. The Chairperson of the Local Board (or nominee of that Chairperson) shall wherever practical, give *one (1)* day’s notice of their wish to speak. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders.

This right is in addition to the right under Standing Order 6.1 to speak to matters on the agenda.

At the close of the agenda no requests for local board input had been received.

7 Extraordinary Business

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

(a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and

(b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,
   (i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
   (ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.”

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

(a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-
   (i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and
   (ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”

8 Notices of Motion

There were no notices of motion.
Vesting of Land on a Closed Landfill at West Hoe Heights, Orewa

File No.: CP2018/02857

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To decline the vesting of three lots of land on a closed landfill at 207 West Hoe Heights, Orewa within the West Hoe Heights Special Housing Area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. Changda International New Zealand Ltd (Changda) is developing the West Hoe Heights Special Housing Area in Orewa. As part of this development, Changda is seeking to vest three lots of land (Lots 701, 704 and 611) with Auckland Council (see scheme plan and map of lots in Attachment A). These lots are on a closed landfill (see map of landfill in Attachment B).

3. Subdivision consent was granted to Changda in November 2016. Condition 98 of the consent allows for the vesting of Lots 701 and 704 as open space (local purpose reserves), and Lot 611 as a public road, if landowner approval is obtained from Auckland Council.

4. If landowner approval is not obtained, then the consent requires Lot 701 and 704 to be established as a private park and Lot 611 as a pedestrian walkway with easements in favour of Auckland Council. These would be managed through an incorporated society.

5. In considering this decision, the Planning Committee has two options:
   - Option one: to accept vesting of the lots of land on a closed landfill.
   - Option two: to decline vesting the lots of land on a closed landfill (the preferred option).

6. Option one, vesting the lots of land on a closed landfill, would expose the council to significant technical, environmental, financial, and legal risks. The closed landfill has never been in the council’s ownership and by accepting it the council would be taking full responsibility for managing any risks and costs associated with the land.

7. There is little benefit to the council in accepting these lots. There is already sufficient open space provision at Western Hoe Heights, as assessed under the Open Space Provision Policy (2016), meaning Lots 701 and 704 are not required for this purpose.

8. Auckland Transport considers that a public road on Lot 611 is not required for the efficient operation of the road network. A walkway, as provided for by the consent conditions, will provide sufficient connectivity for residents. A road constructed over a closed landfill could incur considerable technical and financial risks to Auckland Transport as the asset owner and they would not accept this asset.

9. While short-term risks are covered by consent conditions (management plan and bond) Changda has suggested that the council could mitigate the long-term risks and costs of taking ownership of a privately owned closed landfill through a targeted rate on West Hoe Heights residents. However, the council does not typically raise targeted rates to cover maintenance costs. Creating such a rate would expose residents to financial risk if the costs of managing the landfill rose. It would also be conditional on consultation (and public support) through a long-term plan or annual plan process.

10. In contrast, option two, not vesting the lots of land on a closed landfill, does not expose either the council or Auckland Transport to any further technical, environmental or financial risks. Instead an incorporated society will be liable for managing the lots of land as a private park with easements across it to enable a pedestrian walkway.
11. For these reasons it is recommended that the Planning Committee select option two and decline the vesting of the lots of land located on a closed landfill.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations
That the Planning Committee:

a) decline the vesting in council of Lots 701, 704 and 611 located on a closed landfill at 207 West Hoe Heights on subdivision scheme plan No. 3124770-GS-007 Rev H.

b) note that vesting Lots 701, 704 and 611 would expose Auckland Council to significant technical, environmental, financial, and legal risks through taking responsibility for managing the closed landfill on this land.

c) note that Lots 701, 704 and 611 are not required for either open space or transport connectivity at West Hoe Heights.

d) note that the Development Programme Office will advise Changda International New Zealand Limited of the Planning Committee’s decision to decline vesting of the land.

Horopaki / Context

West Hoe Development

12. Changda International New Zealand Limited (Changda), the developer of West Hoe Heights Special Housing Area, is undertaking a staged residential development for 570 dwellings, as shown on the scheme plan (No. 3124770-GS-007 Rev H) in Attachment A.

13. A Special Housing Area was established in 2014 and extended in May 2016 to include the 207 West Hoe Heights site which is located over part of a closed landfill (see map in Attachment B). The purpose of the extension was to enhance access to the main development areas and achieve a slight increase in the number of dwellings provided.

Consent Conditions

14. Changda was granted subdivision resource consent (SLC-67956 - now referenced as SUB60036453-C) in November 2016 under the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act 2013. The application was assessed under the Auckland Unitary Plan Decision Version 2016. The consent included provision for creation of new roads, public open space and walkways. Some of this land has already been accepted by council.

15. Condition 98 of the consent (see Attachment C) sets out two options for the ownership of the closed landfill; with the land to be either vested at no capital cost to council, or not vested and retained in private ownership and managed through an incorporated society.

16. In the event that the land is vested in council, the land would be developed as follows:

- Land for local purposes of 13,933m² (Lot 701) adjoining a separate open space that the Environment and Community Committee has already decided to acquire.
- Land for local purposes of 7,184m² (Lot 704) to provide pedestrian access from West Hoe Heights road to Lot 701 and onto the main southern park and wider park network.
- Public road of 90 metres long, 1,983m² (Lot 611) to form a road connection within the development area between the eastern and western roads of the development.

17. Condition 98 of the consent requires landowner approval from the council to take over the three lots before these can be developed as open space and a public road.

18. In the event that approval from the council is not obtained, condition 98 provides for Lots 701 and 704 to be established as a private park and for Lot 611 to be established as a pedestrian walkway with easements in favour of Auckland Council.
19. Subsequent consent conditions provide for the ongoing development, monitoring and maintenance of these lots under both scenarios.

Closed Landfill
20. Rodney County Council, leased land at West Hoe Heights between 1967 and 1977 to operate a municipal solid waste landfill. At the end of the lease period, the landfill was capped with clay and reinstated with topsoil and grass and has been farmed by its private landowners. The landfill has never been owned by council.

21. Since 1977, the land has been sold a number of times and, more recently, was subdivided. Currently Changda own two thirds of the landfill site and the remaining one third remains in separate private ownership. The three lots of land that Changda is now proposing to vest to council contain its part of the closed landfill.

22. Changda has its own long-term discharge consents for the landfill, which they obtained as part of their development (REG68097 NRSI 46681). Historical discharge consents held by Auckland Council expired in December 2017.

23. Changda proposes that the transfer of responsibility for the land containing the closed landfill will also include the long-term discharge consent obtained by Changda. This means that the council would be responsible for compliance with that consent, and the operation and management of the closed landfill, including untested leachate and gas management systems.

24. In addition to a settlement monitoring plan and a bond required by the consent conditions for the future management of the road and landfill, Changda has also suggested that Auckland Council should set a targeted rate for West Hoe Height residents. Changda considers such a rate would mitigate the short-term and long-term risk of taking ownership of a privately owned closed landfill. This would pay for the ongoing operation and maintenance of the landfill including the road.

Previous Decisions by Hibiscus and Bays Local Board
25. Condition 98 of the consent incorrectly delegated decision making to the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board rather than Auckland Council, and contained several typographical errors. In response to this, the local board sought clarification on their decision making responsibilities and a technical assessment of the risks of accepting the closed landfill by council officers.

26. The delegation and typographical errors have now been corrected under s13 of the Interpretations Act as an error in a previous exercise of power to grant the consent.

27. The technical assessment of the risks of managing the closed landfill are discussed further in the next section ‘Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice’. The full assessment provided to the local board is also shown in Attachment D.

28. After receiving this technical assessment on 20 September 2017 the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board noted the significant risks presented to council of vesting the landfill (Resolution number HB/2017/1). The board then resolved to provide feedback to the relevant committee that the closed landfill should not be acquired by the council (see full board resolutions in Attachment E).

Decision-Making Authority of Planning Committee
29. The decision to acquire or dispose of land is allocated to the Governing Body pursuant to section 17 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009.

30. The Parks, Recreation and Sports and the Environment and Community committees in 2015 and 2017 previously accepted the vesting of 93,551m² of public open space land, as part of this development at no capital cost to council (resolution numbers PAR/2015/87 and ENV/2017/80). This land provides sufficient public open space as assessed under the Open Space Provision Policy (2016).
31. The Environment and Community Committee could also make a decision in relation to the vesting of Lots 701 and 704 for open space. However, it is not appropriate for that committee to consider the vesting of Lot 611 given that it does not have the delegated responsibility to accept new public roads.

32. The Planning Committee has the delegated responsibility for Special Housing Areas, urban design and acquisition of property relating to its responsibilities. Therefore, this matter has been referred to the Planning Committee to enable an integrated decision over the acceptance of all three lots of land containing the closed landfill.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Options Assessment

33. The council has two options available to it under condition 98 of the resource consent:

- Option one: to accept vesting of the lots of land on a closed landfill.
- Option two: to decline vesting of the lots of land on a closed landfill (the preferred option).

34. Maintaining the status quo (or making no decisions with regards to vesting the land) has not been considered as an option because only two options are provided for by condition 98 of the resource consent. To not make a decision would be unreasonable given that managing the use and development of land (including subdivision) is a core regulatory function of the council.

35. Both options have been fully assessed against a range of criteria including the likely technical, environmental, legal and financial risks. Effects on connectivity through the development and the open space requirements of residents have also been considered.

36. Such an assessment considers both known and unknown risks. A critical component of each risk is whether it can be avoided, mitigated or managed to acceptable levels. Table One below sets out the options assessment.

| Table One: Options Analysis for Accepting or Declining Vesting of Land |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| **Criteria**             | **Option One: Accept Vesting of Land** | **Option Two: Decline Vesting of Land** |
| Environmental Risks      | The council would be liable for achieving compliance with consents which rely on new and largely untested systems to manage landfill emissions. | No risk to the council. An Incorporated Society will be responsible for achieving compliance with consents |
|                          | Two thirds of the landfill would be owned by Auckland Council and one third by another private landowner. | Two thirds of the landfill would be owned collectively through an incorporated society and one third by another private landowner |
|                          | Any development on the neighbour’s land would not be under the control of the council, but the council would be liable for environmental impacts arising. | |
## Item 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option One: Accept Vesting of Land</th>
<th>Option Two: Decline Vesting of Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical risks (landfill)</td>
<td>The council would be liable for all long-term technical risks.</td>
<td>An Incorporated Society will be responsible for managing long-term risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short-term risks are managed by consent conditions.</td>
<td>Short-term risks are managed through consent conditions. Risks to the council will be minimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No landfill gas controls were required while the site remained undeveloped.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changda now proposes to place up to 5 metres of fill over the closed landfill as part of the development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This additional cover material has the potential to contain residual landfill gas within the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The weight of additional fill material will significantly increase the amount and composition of the leachate generated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changda are required by their consents to install new control measures to manage leachate, which include service trenches, methane stripping prior to trade waste disposal and wetland leachate treatment systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council officers are not satisfied that the proposed treatment systems have demonstrated they will operate effectively in New Zealand. Thus additional ongoing monitoring and maintenance is required to ensure that they operate effectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor performance in new systems could be difficult to rectify as much of the infrastructure will be buried.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on ability to rectify any future issues with the landfill and the landfill management systems because of limited scope of ownership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option One: Accept Vesting of Land</th>
<th>Option Two: Decline Vesting of Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical risks (road or carriageway)</strong></td>
<td>Only construction of a walkway would be accepted by Auckland Transport, due to the risk of subsidence associated with a carriageway. Utility providers could share a walkway corridor. Auckland Transport do not consider the proposed public road is fundamental to the wider requirements for traffic connectivity in the West Hoe development because of the predicted low traffic volumes. Only a walkway would be accepted by Auckland Transport for the reasons outlined under Option One. Creation of a private road would not be supported by Auckland Transport as they may be asked by the community to take over managing the road in the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The extent to which road or carriageway subsidence likely to occur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The extent to which not accepting the vesting of the road (carriageway) will adversely affect other utility providers sharing the proposed road or walkway corridor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial risks and costs</strong></td>
<td>The council would be responsible for all costs beyond the agreed short-term parameters in the consent conditions. Annual operating costs are estimated to be between $150,000 and $300,000 per annum for the leachate and landfill gas management. Financial risk as the costs of managing the closed landfill may change in the future. These costs cannot be accurately estimated due to the use of unproven technologies in the landfill. Costs for maintaining the road and open space have not been calculated. No operational or capital expenditure budgets have been allocated so additional funding would be needed.</td>
<td>An incorporated society will be responsible for all financial risks and costs. Minimal costs to council in terms of its standard regulatory function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs to the council associated with operating (including RMA consenting and compliance costs), inspecting and maintaining the closed landfill and its control systems, depreciation and renewals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs to the council relative to historical management costs and whole-of-life costings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs to Auckland Transport of expenditure associated with operating, inspecting and maintaining the carriageway, depreciation and renewals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criteria

#### Legal risks
- Enduring liability on council.
- Extent of consent non-compliance.
- Potential for the owners of the remainder of the landfill or road to seek that council take responsibility for their portion and any upgrades.
- Precedent for council to take on private closed landfill.
- Precedent for Auckland Transport to take on new roads over a closed landfill.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option One: Accept Vesting of Land</th>
<th>Option Two: Decline Vesting of Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council has no legal obligation to assume ongoing responsibility for the management of discharges from the site.</td>
<td>Incorporated society will be required by the consent to assume legal responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The council does not currently manage any private landfills.</td>
<td>Changda accepted the consent conditions which set out two clear alternative pathways for the future ownership and development of the closed landfill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land development across Auckland is occurring on increasingly marginal land (e.g. contaminated or unstable land). The council should not be regarded as the depository of marginal land, as part of a subdivision plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting this land creates a precedent for the council to assume ownership of marginal land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Community and urban design risks
- Assessment against the Open Space Provision Policy (2016) to ensure community needs are meet within the development.
- Assessment against the Parks and Open Space Acquisition Policy (June 2013).
- Extent to which appropriate connectivity is provided across the site.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open space requirements have been met and the additional land is not considered necessary by council officers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites subject to hazards, such as closed landfills, are not considered suitable for public open space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport advice that a walkway provides appropriate connectivity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A private park can be provided and maintained by an Incorporated Society, as set out in the consent conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>However, access could be restricted to only those areas where easements have been created in favour of Auckland Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport advice that a public road is not required for connectivity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Preferred Option and Reasons

37. As Table One shows, under option one, all risks and responsibilities will be transferred to the council. This means option one exposes council to unacceptable technical, environmental, legal and financial risks.

38. Furthermore, the land is not needed to meet the residents’ community and urban design needs. Auckland Transport advise the public road is not necessary and its preference is for a walkway as provided for by the consent conditions.
39. Auckland Council has not been formally asked to strike a targeted rate by Changda under option one at this stage. However, this has been suggested to mitigate financial risks. The council does not typically raise targeted rates to cover maintenance costs. Creating such a rate would expose local residents to financial risk if the costs of maintaining the landfill rose. Levying a targeted rate would also be conditional on consultation (and public support) through a long-term plan or annual plan process.

40. In contrast, option two retains the risk and responsibilities with the landowner through creation of an Incorporated Society as provided for by the consent conditions. This minimises the environmental, legal and financial risks to council while meeting the open space and transport connectivity needs of residents.

41. For these reasons, option two is recommended: that the Planning Committee does not accept vesting of the three lots of land on a closed landfill at 207 West Hoe Heights, Orewa.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

42. As described above, feedback was sought from the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board on the recommended decision at their business meeting on 20 September 2017.

43. As shown in Attachment E, the local board noted the significant risks to the council of acquiring the landfill and provided feedback to the relevant committee that the closed landfill ‘should not be acquired by the council’ (HB/2017/167).

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

44. No consultation with mana whenua was undertaken in writing this report. The land use resource consent was processed on a non-notified basis under the provisions of the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act 2013, which restricted consultation.

45. Mana whenua have previously provided feedback to Auckland Council that the reduction of discharge of leachates from closed landfills is a desired outcome for them, as kaitiakitanga of Auckland’s lands and waterways.

46. Through monitoring and enforcement of Changda’s consent for the closed landfill, Auckland Council will seek to minimise the environmental impact of leachate discharges to the local environment.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

47. The financial implications associated with the vesting of the closed landfill are outlined above in Table One and are not repeated here in detail.

48. In summary, under option one, the council will become liable for the operating costs of the landfill, estimated to be between $150,000 and $300,000 per annum. The council and Auckland Transport will also become liable for significant financial risks, as the costs of managing the landfill and associated public road may rise in future.

49. In contrast, if the recommended option two: not to vest the lots, is adopted the council will not be liable for any costs associated with operating the closed landfill or financial risks.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

50. The risks associated with the vesting of the closed landfill are outlined above in Table One and not repeated here in detail.

51. In summary, under option one, the council will become liable for significant technical, environmental, financial and legal risks and liabilities associated with assuming responsibility for the closed landfill.

52. If the recommended option two: not to vest the lots is adopted, the incorporated society will become liable for these risks rather than the council.
Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

53. The Development Programme Office has been communicating technical advice from council to Changda and will inform them of any decision made by the Planning Committee. Conditions of the subdivision resource consent held by Changda then set out the processes to be followed under either option.
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Specific to Stage 3

97. Prior to the ...

98. Prior to the approval of the survey plan for Stage 3, the consent holder shall also ensure that the following conditions have been met:

- Lots 603, 604, 609 & 610 shall vest in Auckland Council as public roads without compensation of development contribution offset

- Easements in gross in favour of the Auckland Council for the purpose of providing overland flow, shall be created over parts of Lot 512 and shall be included in a memorandum of easements endorsed on the survey plan and be granted or reserved

- Lots 521 and 522 shall vest in Auckland Council as a public road (pedestrian walkway) without compensation of development contribution offsets

- Lot 700 shall be created as a freehold lot and then transfer in Auckland as Recreation Parks. As this lot is the subject of an unconditional agreement for the sale and purchase of land relative to 5000m², no compensation or development contributions offsets, other than that expressly set out in the agreement, are available to the consent holder.

- Lot 611 shall either:
  - vest in Auckland Council as a public road without compensation of development contribution offsets only if the land owner approval to take over the closed landfill area from Auckland Council is obtained prior to the approval of the survey plan for this stage; or
  - In the event that the approval from Auckland Council is not obtained, Lot 611 shall be established as a pedestrian walkway in accordance with conditions 141 and 172. An easement in favour of Auckland Council for the public access over Lot 611 shall be duly granted and reserved.

- Lot 701 and 704 shall either:
  - vest in Auckland Council as a Local Purpose Reserve without compensation of development contribution offsets only if the land owner approval to take over both lots from Auckland Council is obtained prior to the approval of the survey plan for this stage; or
  - In the event that the approval from Auckland Council is not obtained, Lot 701 and 704 shall be established as a private park in accordance with conditions 141, 174-176.

- Lot 704 shall either:
  - vest in Auckland Council as a Local Purpose Reserve without compensation of development contribution offsets only if the land owner approval to take over the closed landfill area from Auckland Council is obtained prior to the approval of the survey plan for this stage; or
In the event that the approval from Auckland Council is not obtained, Lot 704 shall be established as a private park in accordance with conditions 141, 170, 171, 173 and 176. An easement in gross in favour of Auckland Council to provide public pedestrian access over Lot 704 to West Hoe Heights shall be duly granted and reserved.
Technical Assessment of Acquisition of West Hoe Closed Landfill by Auckland Council

Item 9

No Enduring Liability

1. Legal review of the historical arrangements for the waste deposition has confirmed that council has no enduring responsibility for the site, principally on the basis that payments were made to the original landowner for the landfilling activity lease with the expectation that they then owned the responsibilities arising. In addition, the land has then changed ownership some 5 times since 1979, with disclosure of the landfill being clearly indicated in the site records, and the sale price likely to have reflected its presence.

2. Council holds discharge consent (15274) for the site, due to expire in December 2017. However, as a result of development changes on site and Changda being granted consents for long-term discharges (REG 68097 NRSI 46661, expiring 30 October 2021), 15274 has been superseded and is effectively redundant as it no longer reflects discharge issues and controls. CLCLR is considering the options to surrender its consent, or allowing it to lapse.

3. Council is not responsible for managing private risk, does not manage any private landfills, and where historic discharge consents extend over private land is actively reducing consent boundaries back to its own landholdings because it cannot give effect to consents over private land. It also does not intend to hold consent over the non-Changda site portion.

Landfill management

4. Historically leachate from the landfill has been discharged into a tributary of the Nukumea Stream. Monitoring confirms that the discharge now meets the Auckland Unitary Plan permitted activity criteria, and in the absence of the proposed development council would have allowed the consent to lapse later this year.

5. Monitoring shows landfill gas is present at the site however discharges have historically met Auckland Unitary Plan permitted activity rules and therefore did not require consent. No specific landfill gas controls have been necessary while the surrounding site remained undeveloped with landfill gas being safely vented through the landfill cover.

6. Changda’s development introduces potential landfill gas migration pathways via services trenches through the landfill, and people who could be exposed in nearby residential houses and through activities on or near the landfill. The development will fill up to 11 metres of clay material across Changda’s section of the landfill, as well as constructing new systems to collect and treat leachate, including removing methane. Gas migration controls will be required to safely manage residual landfill gas discharges for buildings bordering the waste footprint and infrastructure on, in or around the landfill site.

7. The effects of loading the landfill wastes with a large mass of clay may result in landfill gas being squeezed out to the edges of the site. While a gas collection trench is proposed to intercept gases that migrate to the edge of the cap and towards the residential development, it is not yet clear how gas controls for services trenches will be implemented.

8. The substantial amount of capping will reduce surface water infiltration into the landfill and reduce leachate volumes; however, leachate could become more concentrated. The new control measures designed to manage leachate and landfill gas will require ongoing monitoring and maintenance to ensure that they continue to operate effectively.
9. During construction leachate is being discharged to the trade waste network and requires methane removal. This is unique amongst Auckland’s closed landfill sites and the technical risks and operational costs are not yet known. Following construction, assuming a suitable level of performance can be achieved, leachate will be treated in a wetland treatment system prior to discharge to the Nukumea catchment. There are no known constructed wetland systems treating landfill leachate in New Zealand, and the science for removal of landfill contaminants is not well demonstrated. Therefore there is some uncertainty around whether the consent conditions for discharge into the sensitive Nukumea receiving environment will be able to be met.

10. On development completion, Changda seek to vest their landfill land including the new leachate and gas management systems, plus transfer the discharge consent to council. Council would then assume all ongoing responsibility for maintenance of the site plus discharge consent compliance for as long as this is required, which may be some decades.

Costs

11. The costs associated with the management of a closed landfill includes consent management incurring monitoring and regulatory audit costs, maintenance, and potentially CAPEX costs for renewals or replacement control equipment and structures. These costs will potentially continue over decades until the risks and effects are reduced to levels that allow for passive discharge to the environment. In this case, there are additional subsurface leachate drains, a wetland system, methane stripping and gas interception equipment. The discharge to trade waste requires a Trade Waste Agreement, equipment requires maintenance, and volumetric discharge costs apply. There are performance risks for the wetland and methane stripping systems, and further risks should any subsurface infrastructure require repair or replacement. Whole of life costs for these landfill control systems are not currently known.

12. Maintenance costs for structures and developments at the surface of landfills require more engineering design, more flexible components and potentially have a shorter life than for a non-landfill site due to instability and aggressive operating environments. Landfill caps generally provide a poor plant growing environment and planting around infrastructure is discouraged. Grass requires ongoing mowing to keep it short to enable monitoring access and reduce fire risks and the various hazards require additional health and safety controls. Any developments and activities on closed landfills require additional approvals to ensure barriers and control systems are maintained and protected.

Risks to council should it accept the landfill and landfill related assets.

13. Financial Risk – council will be responsible for the as yet unknown costs of all expenditure associated with operating, inspecting and maintaining the closed landfill and its control systems, as well depreciation and renewals of the assets for some decades. Costs are expected to be much greater than historical management costs due to the increased controls and potential risks of exposure for residents. There are no whole-of-life costings available. No OPEX or CAPEX budgets have been allocated based on the development.

14. Environmental risk – Council would be liable for any failure of any controls that result in discharges to the environment, nuisance or property damage. Approximately 1/3 of the total landfill area is in the ownership of another landowner, which means council would not have full control over inputs into the landfill or activities that may impact its performance.
15. **Legal risk** – Council’s current position of having no enduring liability for the site would increase, including potential enforcement action for any consent non-compliance issues. There could also be potential legal risks arising from the owners of the remainder of the landfill seeking council to take on responsibility for their portion, which may require further expenditure for capping, leachate controls and consents. Vesting this site may create a precedent for council to be pressured to take on similar land from other developers.

16. **Technical risk** – leachate treatment is proposed through an as yet unproven wetland system, with a contingency trade waste discharge to should it not perform as expected. The trade waste discharge however requires methane gas pretreatment for which there are unquantified technical maintenance requirements and costs. Gas management proposed for the site is a passive venting system. Poor performance or failure of leachate or gas systems could be difficult and costly to rectify given the infrastructure will be buried.

**Can these risks be avoided, mitigated or managed to an appropriate level?**

17. Options to mitigate financial, environmental, and technical risks have been considered and addressed where possible by Changda during the consenting process. However, all the remaining risks would be passed on to council. At this point in time there are too many unknowns to determine if these risks could be further mitigated. The base level of risk should council agree to the vesting of the land, far exceeds that which council has historically accepted in managing the site.

18. Council functions under section 31 of the Resource Management Act enable it to ensure effects are being managed. These functions relate to the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including for the purpose of the prevention or mitigation of any adverse effects of the development, subdivision, or use of contaminated land. Council in its regulatory role must therefore ensure that the site is being managed to meet the purposes of the Act.

**If council does not accept the land, what other options?**

19. The developer could consider the following range of options for future private landowners to manage the effects of the closed landfill:
   a) Landfill ownership and management could sit with individual property owners; or
   b) Landfill ownership could sit with individual landowners, with management be undertaken by a body corporate employed by the landowners; or
   c) Landfill ownership could sit with individual landowners and management undertaken by council through a targeted rates agreement.

Option a) is unlikely to enable coordinated management of the site however option b) is potentially a better mechanism to ensure this can occur. The targeted rates option c) has council managing a private landfill which is contrary to the CLAMP, introduces risk for ensuring compliance, and requires additional resources to undertake management and administration.

**Conclusions**

20. On the basis of the legal review that has been outlined in this report, council currently has no enduring liability for the West Hoe landfill site, and the land value of the site has always reflected the use of the site as a landfill.

21. Significant financial, environmental, legal, and technical risks associated with the future management of this site exist, which would all be transferred to and owned by council should it agree to vest the site.
22. There are no compelling reasons under the Closed Landfill Management Plan (CLAMP) for council to take on the ownership or management of this private landfill. Land development across Auckland is expected to occur on increasingly marginal land in future, due to the limited supply of land for residential development. Developers may incorrectly assume that council is prepared to accept marginal land as part of a subdivision plan, for example contaminated or unstable land. Therefore it is important that council consider the full impact of agreeing to own or manage these sites, and avoid setting a precedent with this site which would impose an additional ongoing burden on ratepayers.

23. On the basis of the significant landfill related risks outlined above, Engineering and Technical Services staff recommends that council does not accept ownership of the West Hoe landfill.
Resolutions of Hibiscus and Bays Local Board in relation to vesting of land at West Hoe Heights

C1 Further advice on proposed vesting of land for open space – West Hoe Heights

The Chairperson spoke to the item.

Resolution number HB/2017/167

MOVED by Chairperson J Parfitt, seconded by Member M Williamson:

That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board:

a) note the significant risks associated with the acquisition of the West Hoe Heights closed landfill, as outlined in this report.

b) note that on the basis of these significant risks, the Engineering and Technical Services unit recommends that Lots 701 and 704 containing the closed landfill and associated control assets are not accepted by council.

c) note that the decision making authority to acquire or dispose of land is allocated to Governing Body pursuant to s17 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, and that local boards do not have allocated or delegated responsibility to make decisions in relation to the acquisition or disposal of park land.

d) note that consent conditions 98, 99 and any others relating to approval of acquisition of the land will be corrected under section 13 of the Interpretation Act 1999 as an error in a previous exercise of the power to grant the consent with the condition being amended to refer to the approval of Auckland Council.

e) note that the developer Changda International Limited will be advised of council’s position by the Development Project Office.

f) requests that the views and feedback of the local board be provided to the relevant committee when consideration of the acquisition of Lots 701 and 704 is presented to Auckland Council and the local board confirms that the closed landfill should not be acquired by the council.

g) confirm that there be no restatement of this confidential report, attachment, or resolutions until reasons for confidentiality no longer exist.

CARRIED
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval to publicly notify a change to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (the Auckland Unitary Plan) to amend the operative Hobsonville Corridor Precinct.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. The proposed plan change amends the Auckland Unitary Plan’s Hobsonville Corridor Precinct text and diagrams, inserts new sub-precinct text and a new diagram for the sub-precinct. Within the new sub-precinct, standards and assessment criteria for buildings and development located along Hobsonville Road and adjacent to Hobsonville Primary School are introduced. It also identifies preferred future road alignments and a future arterial within the new sub-precinct. Additional precinct-wide storm water controls are introduced and changes are made to the operative text to ensure the provisions are consistent with other precincts.

3. Together these amendments seek to improve the transport network, stormwater and built form outcomes within Hobsonville Corridor. Development within the proposed plan change area will also rely on Auckland Unitary Plan zones, Auckland-wide and overlay provisions where applicable.

4. The proposed plan change area consists of the existing Hobsonville Corridor precinct (the precinct) in the Auckland Unitary Plan in addition to a new proposed sub-precinct southwest of Brigham Creek Road (called Sub-Precinct C). The proposed plan change amends the planning maps to add Sub-Precinct C, insert a new precinct plan and new provisions for Sub-Precinct C, and amends the operative Auckland Unitary Plan provisions for the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct.

5. The land within the new proposed Sub-precinct C was originally part of the precinct in the proposed version of the Auckland Unitary Plan (at that time it was known as Sub-precinct A). These provisions were recommended to be deleted by the Independent Hearings Panel. The effects of this deletion were not fully understood at the time the council made its decisions in 2016.

6. The preparation of the proposed plan change has included input from Auckland Transport, Auckland Council’s Healthy Waters unit and the Auckland Design Office. These teams support the proposed plan change. This collaboration has ensured that the proposed plan change provisions will enable improved delivery of transport, storm water and urban design outcomes for the Hobsonville Corridor area.

7. The proposed plan change has also been informed by feedback. Mana whenua representatives were sent the draft proposed plan change in January 2018 and two meetings have been held with iwi to discuss the proposed plan change. In addition, there was a two-week public engagement period in November 2017.
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Planning Committee:

a) approve the public notification of the proposed plan change to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) for the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct (included as Attachment B to the agenda report).

b) endorse the section 32 evaluation report that supports the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct proposed plan change (included as Attachment D to the agenda report).

c) delegate to the Manager Planning North West and Islands the authority to approve minor editorial amendments to the proposed plan change to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) for the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct, if required, in advance of public notification.

Horopaki / Context

8. The existing Hobsonville Corridor Precinct is located between Hobsonville Road and the Upper Harbour Highway (State Highway 18) and extends from Brigham Creek Road eastwards to Memorial Park Lane alongside the Hobsonville Domain. The proposed plan change adds a new Sub-precinct C to the existing Hobsonville Corridor precinct. This new Sub-precinct C would extend the precinct southwest from Brigham Creek Road to the Rawiri Stream. The wider context of the proposed plan change area is shown in Attachment A.

9. The area within Sub-Precinct C was originally included as Sub-precinct A within the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan. The Independent Hearings Panel (IHP) agreed with submissions that sought deletion of Sub-precinct A on the grounds that the underlying Light Industry Zone and associated plan provisions rendered a sub-precinct unnecessary. The council accepted the recommendations of the IHP. This decision did not address transport, urban design and stormwater matters which have since arisen.

10. While the proposed plan change considers the interface of the Light Industry Zone and residential properties in Hobsonville Corridor, in the future this issue will also be investigated in other parts of the city. This is likely to include the monitoring of existing interfaces as well as addressing this issue during the urban zoning of future urban zoned land following structure planning.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

11. The Hobsonville Corridor Precinct’s purpose is to provide a comprehensive and integrated approach to development and transport outcomes within Hobsonville Corridor. The operative Hobsonville Corridor Precinct provisions apply to the local centre and require high standards of design and landscaping to provide active, pedestrian-orientated frontages along roads within the Hobsonville retail area. This area is referred to as Hobsonville Corridor Sub-Precincts A and B, which are zoned Mixed Use and Local Centre respectively.

12. These provisions do not, however, apply along Hobsonville Road southwest of Brigham Creek Road where buildings face residential zoned properties on the other side of the road, or along the boundaries of Hobsonville Primary School.

13. The proposed Sub-precinct C would apply to the land bordered by State Highway 18, Brigham Creek Road, Hobsonville Road and Rawiri Stream. This land is zoned for light industry.
14. The proposed plan change includes inserting an additional diagram, Precinct Plan 3, relating specifically to this proposed sub-precinct. Specific provisions proposed for Sub-precinct C are shown in Attachment B and include:

- a Restricted Discretionary activity resource consent status for new buildings along Hobsonville Road and adjacent to Hobsonville Primary School
- standards requiring new buildings and subdivision to provide for roads to connect to Strategic Access Points, as indicated on Precinct Plan 3
- standards for buildings adjacent to Hobsonville Primary School, including a more restrictive height in relation to boundary control, building setbacks and landscaping requirements
- standards for buildings that have frontage to Hobsonville Road, including more restrictive building height, height in relation to boundary, front yard and landscaping requirements
- assessment criteria relating to the design of buildings along Hobsonville Road and adjacent to Hobsonville Primary School.

15. The indicative roading provisions in the new Sub-precinct C seek to ensure the delivery of a connected transport network throughout the Sub-Precinct and to achieve an appropriate level of amenity along Hobsonville Road. These reasons align with the purposes of the existing Hobsonville Corridor Precinct. Proposed Precinct Plan 3 is included in Attachment B and shows:

- indicative future arterial road from Whenuapai
- preferred future road alignments
- indicative strategic access points
- existing road alignments.

16. The proposed plan change also introduces controls to address storm water issues in the precinct. The Stormwater Management Area 1 control is proposed to be applied to the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct to address hydrology mitigation (Attachment C). An additional standard is also proposed to require at-source storm water treatment (Attachment B). The proposed standard for at-source stormwater treatment seeks to achieve improved water quality outcomes and reflects the current Network Discharge Consent for the precinct.

17. The proposed plan change also proposes amendments to the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct provisions. These include new areas of land zoned open space acquired by the council, and corrections to zone boundaries based on updated property boundaries (Attachment C). The proposed amendments also include editorial and formatting changes to clarify existing operative precinct provisions and provide consistency with other precincts in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Attachment B).

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

18. The Hobsonville Corridor Precinct is located within the Upper Harbour Local Board area. A workshop seeking the Local Board’s views on the draft plan change was held on 2 November 2017. The Local Board’s view on the draft plan change were taken into consideration during the preparation of the proposed version of the plan change.

19. The Local Board supported the draft plan change and also requested that the provisions include standards for buildings along Hobsonville Road, as opposed to relying on assessment criteria. The proposed plan change now includes both standards and assessment criteria for these buildings.

20. Public feedback on the draft plan change was sought from 6 - 20 November 2017. This included on the internet and two local drop-in sessions. These sessions were well-attended and more than 30 separate pieces of feedback were received.
21. The themes from the public feedback included concerns about the scale of recent development along Hobsonville Road, and the need for transport improvements. In addition, more detailed feedback about the text of the provisions was received from a number of planning consultants and landowners. This feedback has informed the development of the proposed version of the plan change.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

22. Iwi groups with mana whenua interest in the proposed plan change area were contacted during the previously approved consultation on the draft plan change. Ngāti Whatua o Kaipara and Te Kawerau ā Maki have met with council staff to help to inform the preparation of the proposed plan change.

23. On 3 November 2017 all iwi groups with an interest in the area were emailed information about the draft plan change and asked for their comment. A meeting was held on 27 November 2017 to discuss the draft plan change and was attended by Te Kawerau ā Maki.

24. Resource Legislation Amendment Act 2017 made changes to Māori participation within the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). Schedule 1 of the RMA was amended to insert a new clause 4a which requires councils to provide a copy of a draft proposed plan change prior to notification, and to have particular regard to any advice received from iwi before notifying the proposed plan change.

25. Council staff contacted the relevant iwi authorities on 26 January 2018 with a copy of the draft proposed plan change and asked for comments. A meeting was held with a representative from Te Tari Taiao o Nga Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust on 8 February 2018, where the draft proposed plan change was further explained and discussed.

26. Te Tari Taiao o Nga Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust provided comments seeking additional requirements within the provisions relating to tree selection when re-vegetating sites. A new assessment criterion reflecting the preference for native, eco-sourced and non-deciduous trees has been added to the proposed plan change in response.

27. The importance of the relationship between the precinct and projects in the area, including the Rawiri Stream restoration project was raised by Te Tari Taiao o Nga Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust and Te Kawerau a Maki. The proposed provisions include objectives and policies relating to this stream environment.

28. Staff will contact the iwi authorities to confirm their position in response to the question of a having a commissioner with an understanding of tikanga Māori and the perspectives of local iwi and hapū being on the hearings panel, under Section 34A(1A) of the RMA.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications**

29. There are administrative costs associated with the statutory processes required to update the Auckland Unitary Plan. These costs are provided for within the existing Plans and Places department budget.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

30. Not proceeding with the proposed plan change presents risks around poor transport outcomes if land developers do not follow council and Auckland Transport’s preferred road alignment. There may also be poor urban design outcomes along Hobsonville Road and adverse effects of stormwater on the receiving environment.
Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

31. Following approval by the Planning Committee, council staff will publicly notify the proposed plan change by the end of April 2018. The council’s website will be updated as the process proceeds. A four-week submission period will be followed by a two-week further submission period. A hearing of submitters will be held by independent commissioners, and this is likely to occur in July 2018.
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Attachment A – Plan Change Location

Plan Change Location
Attachment B: Proposed Plan Change

I603. Hobsonville Corridor Precinct

I603.1. Precinct Description:

The Hobsonville Corridor Precinct is located between Hobsonville Road and the Upper Harbour Highway (State Highway 18), and extends from Brigham Creek/Rawiri Stream eastwards to Memorial Park Lane at the Hobsonville Domain.

The purpose of the precinct is to provide a comprehensive and integrated approach to development to enable integrated land use and transport outcomes to occur in the proximity of the Brigham Creek interchange. High standards of urban design and landscape development are required throughout the Sub-precinct A and B, with to provide active, pedestrian-oriented frontages along Hobsonville Road. In Sub-precinct C the precinct provisions and to provide for maintain a good standard of visual amenity for Hobsonville primary school and residents on the south side of Hobsonville Road.

There are two sub-precincts in the precinct:

- Sub precinct A - divided into Area 1 and Area 2, and
- Sub precinct B, and
- Sub-precinct C.

The zoning of the land within the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct is Business- Mixed Use Zone, Business-Local Centre Zone, Business-Light Industry Zone and Open Space- Informal Recreation Zone and Open Space- Conservation Zone.

The I603.10.1 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 1 shows sub-precinct boundaries, indicative roads, strategic access points, frontage controls and open space. I603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct Plan 2 – Sub-precincts A and B transport plan and I603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct Plan 3: Sub-precinct C sets out key transport infrastructure. I603.10.4 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 4 is a diagram of a typical slip lane design and I603.10.5 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct Plan 5 shows the landscape frontage areas around Hobsonville Primary School.

Stormwater management within the precinct is guided by an integrated catchment management plan and is the subject of a granted stormwater network discharge consent which contains both an overall management approach and specific requirements for both hydrological mitigation and quality treatment at source on-site stormwater management and large scale communal stormwater management ponds and wetlands. In addition, stormwater is managed in the precinct through the application of the Stormwater Management Area Flow 1 and requirements for stormwater quality treatment at source.

The zoning of the land within the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct is Business- Mixed Use Zone, and Business- Local Centre Zone.

The provisions of the relevant overlays, Auckland-wide and zones apply in this precinct unless otherwise specified below.
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1603.2. Objectives

(1) The Hobsonville Corridor Precinct is developed in a comprehensive and integrated way for residential and business activities, retail and mixed-use to service projected population growth at Hobsonville and the Hobsonville Peninsula.

(2) Transport and land use patterns are integrated, particularly around the Brigham Creek interchange to achieve a sustainable, liveable community.

(3) Subdivision and development is compatible with existing landscape features and sensitive to the ecological qualities of the upper Waitemata Harbour.

(4) High density employment and residential activities are adjacent to transport, and land is used efficiently.

(5) Transport linkages within the precinct provide direct, alternative routes to using Hobsonville Road and the State Highway network.

(6) High-quality urban design outcomes are achieved in the local centre and pedestrian linkages are promoted through the sub-precincts are promoted.

(7) Employment opportunities are enabled.

(8) Stormwater management and treatment mitigates adverse effects of development on the receiving environments.

(9) Adverse effects of stormwater are avoided or mitigated.

Sub-precinct A

(8) Mixed use development is comprehensively planned and a range of commercial, retail and residential activities enabled.

Sub-precinct B

(9)(10) Development is of a format, scale and design quality that reinforces the local centre as a focal point for the community.

(11) High-quality urban design outcomes are achieved in the local centre.

(12) Sub-precinct B is the compact, pedestrian orientated retail core of the precinct with a mix of large and small scale retail activities (including two supermarkets) to service the local convenience needs of the existing and future residential and employment population in Hobsonville.

(13) Hobsonville Road is the focal point of pedestrian activity, with active frontages and high quality urban design.

Sub-precinct C
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(13) Development along Hobsonville Road and adjacent to Hobsonville Primary School provides a good amenity interface with the residential properties on the opposite side of Hobsonville Road as well as with the school.

(14) The Rawit Stream environment is enhanced through riparian planting and the provision of pedestrian access.

All relevant The zone, Auckland-wide and overlay, Auckland-wide and zone objectives apply in this precinct in addition to those specified above.

1603.3. Policies

1603.3.1 Development

(1) Promote comprehensive and integrated development of the precinct in accordance with 1603.10.12 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 42 - Sub-precincts A and B and 1603.10.2.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 23 - Sub-precinct C Transport plan.

(2) Require subdivision to provide for demonstration the inter-relationship and future integration with other land both within the sub-precincts and the wider precinct.

Sub-precincts A and B

(3) Enable high intensity development, particularly adjoining Hobsonville Road, to provide for high densities of employment, and residential activity adjacent to the transport network.

(4) Provide for compact mixed use environments by:

(a) managing development to provide a range of commercial, retail and residential activities; and

(b) enabling residential and office activities above street level in the Business - Local Centre Zone.

(5) Enable medium to high density housing in Area 1 of Sub-precinct A.

(6) Manage the location, scale and type of retail activities within Sub-precinct A to ensure that the retail development in that sub-precinct does not detract from the viability of a compact, pedestrian oriented centre in Sub-precinct B.

(7) Enable a mix of retail activities in Sub-precinct B including:

(a) two supermarkets; and

(b) small scale retail and commercial services.

1603.3.2 Built form

(1) Manage potential reverse sensitivity effects between mixed use and industrial development and residential and other sensitive activities by controlling the design of mixed use and industrial developments.
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(2) (3) Manage development so that its scale and design contributes to the creation of high-quality amenity through pedestrian connections and public open space.

*Built form in Sub-precincts A and B*

(3) (10) Encourage higher employment densities along public transport corridors by requiring development fronting Hobsonville Road to be at least two storeys.

(4) (11) Recognise the importance of Hobsonville Road as the primary street for public interaction in the local centre by requiring buildings in Sub-precinct B with frontages to Hobsonville Road to:

(a) avoid blank walls;

(b) provide easily accessible pedestrian entrances;

(c) provide minimum floor heights to maximise building adaptability to a range of uses;

(d) maximise glazing;

(e) erect frontages of sufficient height to frame the street;

(f) provide weather protection for pedestrians;

(g) locate vehicle crossings to provide for safe vehicular and pedestrian movements in accordance with IS03.10.1 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 1; and

(h) be designed according to perimeter block principles where car parking is provided behind buildings except for kerbside parking; and

(i) provide for pedestrian linkages in accordance with IS03.10.1 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 1 and IS03.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2 — Transport plan.

(5) (12) Provide for the establishment of two supermarkets in Sub-precinct B by:

(a) recognising the positive contribution supermarkets make to centre viability and function, and

(b) requiring designs that positively contribute to the streetscape and character of their surroundings.

(13) Ensure that the ground floor of buildings in Area 1, Sub-precinct A do not contain residential activities.

(14) Ensure that food and beverage outlets and dairies are located on the ground floor of buildings so that they contribute to active street frontages in Area 2, Sub-precinct A.

*Built form in Sub-precinct C*
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(15) Manage development along Hobsonville Road and adjacent to Hobsonville Primary School to provide visual amenity for the school and properties on the eastern side of Hobsonville Road.

1603.3.3 Pedestrian access and street quality

(4) (16) Require the provision of safe pedestrian linkages across Hobsonville Road, in accordance with 1603.10.1 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 1 and 1603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2 – Transport plan.

(2) (17) Promote the development of road patterns to support a range of non-residential activities and to create a walkable catchment through and between sub-precincts.

(18) Ensure the interface between roads and any future pedestrian access alongside Rawiri Stream provides for a safe and high amenity environment for pedestrians.

1603.3.4 Infrastructure

(3) (19) Ensure urban growth is sequenced to align with the delivery of infrastructure.

Transport

(4) (20) Manage development so that it does not adversely affect the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.

(5) (21) Require the provision of road connections through sites:

(a) as generally indicated on 1603.10.12 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 12- Sub-precincts A and B and 1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3- Sub-precinct C.

(b) to connect to identified strategic access points indicated in 1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C and with existing roads or road sections in Sub-precinct C.

(c) to provide direct road linkages to and through the precinct as an alternative to using Hobsonville Road and the State Highway network as indicated in 1603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2 – Sub-precincts A and B and 1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C.

(d) to enable the existing road network to be expanded or extended to adjacent land (including aligning with any new proposed connections to or over the state highway) to support safe and efficient movement within the precinct and to and from the surrounding transport network.

(6) (22) Promote require the provision of slip lanes in general accordance with 1603.10.1 4 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 14- Typical design of slip lanes to limit the number of access points on to Hobsonville Road east of the intersection with Brigham Creek Road.

(7) (23) Provide for pedestrian linkages, cycle ways, bus routes, and road networks including identified ‘strategic access points’ shown on 1603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor:
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Precinct plan 42 - Sub-precinct A and B and I603.10.23 Hobsonville Corridor:
Precinct plan 23 - Sub-precinct C that:
(a) integrate with land use activities within the precinct and allow for safe and
efficient movements within and around the precinct;
(b) are designed to promote the maximum use and safety of all transport modes;
and
(c) are designed to promote the use of alternative modes to other than private motor
vehicles.

Stormwater Management

(24) Manage stormwater diversions and discharges to enhance the quality of freshwater
systems and coastal waters.
(25) Provide for stormwater mitigation and passive recreational opportunities by
requiring developments to provide for enhancement of riparian margins, ecological linkages
and instream ecology.
(a) reserves for drainage and stormwater purposes; and
(b) ecological linkages, including through enhancement of the riparian margins and
urban open space in accordance with I603.10.1 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct
plan 1 - Sub-precinct A and B.

(26) Ensure development is consistent with any approved the Waiaroha Stream
catchment network discharge consent and supporting stormwater management plan
integrated catchment management plan including the application of water sensitive design
to achieve water quality and hydrology mitigation, adoption of water sensitive design to
limit, control and treat stormwater at or near its source.

The zone, Auckland-wide and All relevant overlay, Auckland-wide and zone policies apply in
this precinct in addition to those specified above.

I603.4. Activity tables

The provisions in the zone, Auckland-wide provisions and any All relevant overlays, Auckland-
wide and zone activity tables apply in this precinct unless the activity is specifically provided
for by a rule in Activity Table I603.4.1, Activity Table I603.4.2 or Activity Table I603.4.3 below.
otherwise specified below.

Activity Table I603.4.1 Activity table – Sub-precinct A and B and Table I603.4.2 Activity table – Sub-
precinct B and Table I603.4.3 specify the activity status of land use, subdivision and
development activities in the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct pursuant to sections 9(2), 9(3) and
means that the zone, Auckland-wide and overlay provisions apply.

Note 1
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Where ‘NA’ has been included in the activity status column, the activity is not applicable in the particular section of the activity table.

Note 2

Where no activity status has been included in the activity status column, the activity status is to be determined on the basis of the applicable overlay, Auckland-wide or zone activity rules.

Table 1603.4.1 Activity Table – Sub-precinct A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use**

- (A1) Offices | NC | RD
- (A2) Service stations | NC | RD
- (A3) Trade suppliers | NC | RD
- (A4) Food and beverage and dairies up to 200m² gross floor area per site | P | RD
- (A5) Food and beverage and dairies more than 200m² gross floor area per site | NC | NC
- (A6) New roads and pedestrian linkages | RD | RD
- (A7) New vehicle accessways and slip lanes | RD | RD
- (A17) Food and beverage and dairies that are located above the ground floor in Area 2 | NA | NC
- (A18) Dwellings that are located on the ground floor in Area 1 | NC | NA

**Subdivision**

- (A8) Subdivision

- (A19) Subdivision that does not comply with one or more of the standards contained in 1603.6.1 or 1603.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (A6) New roads and pedestrian linkages | RD | RD
| (A7) New vehicle accessways and slip lanes | RD | RD
| (A20) New buildings | | |
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| (A21)  | External alterations and additions to buildings |  |
| (A22)  | Development of new or redevelopment of impervious areas | P | P |
| (A23)  | Development that does not comply with one or more of the standards contained in CDZ3.6.1, CDZ3.6.2, CDZ3.6.3 and CDZ3.6.4. | D | D |

### Table I603.4.2 Activity Table – Sub-precinct B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A9) Dwellings located more than 400m from the intersection of Hobsonville and Clark/Wisely Roads</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A10) Dwellings located within 400m from the intersection of Hobsonville and Clark/Wisely Roads</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A11) Two supermarkets of up to 4000m² gross floor area each, resulting in no more than two supermarkets consented or completed in Sub-precinct B</td>
<td>RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A12) A supermarket when there are already two supermarkets consented or completed in Sub-precinct B. More than two supermarkets</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A13) Any supermarket of more than 4000m² gross floor area</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A14) Roads and pedestrian linkages</td>
<td>RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A15) Vehicle accessways and slip lanes</td>
<td>RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A24) A retail unit, excluding a supermarket, with more than 500m² gross floor area.</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A25) Retail, excluding a supermarket, where the average gross floor area of the retail units proposed is more than 300m²</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subdivision</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A16) Subdivision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A26) Subdivision that does not comply with one or more of the standards contained in CDZ3.6.1 or CDZ3.6.2</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A14) New roads and pedestrian linkages</td>
<td>RO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>New vehicle accessways and slip lanes</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A27</td>
<td>New buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A28</td>
<td>External alterations and additions to buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A29</td>
<td>Development of new or redevelopment of impervious areas</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A30</td>
<td>Development that does not comply with one or more of the standards contained in 1603.6.1, 1603.6.2, 1603.6.3, 1603.6.4 or 1603.6.5</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1603.4.3 Activity Table – Sub-precinct C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31 Subdivision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A32 Subdivision that does not comply with one or more of the standards contained in 1603.6.1, 1603.6.2 or 1603.6.3</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A33 New roads</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A34 New buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A35 External alterations and additions to buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A36 New buildings that have a frontage to Hobsonville Road or are on sites adjoining Hobsonville Primary School</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A37 External alterations and additions to buildings that have a frontage to Hobsonville Road or are on sites adjoining Hobsonville Primary School</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A38 Development of new or redevelopment of impervious areas</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A39 Development that does not comply with one or more of the standards contained in 1603.6.1, 1603.6.2, 1603.6.3, 1603.6.6 or 1603.6.7</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1603.5. Notification

(1) Any application for resource consent for an activity listed in Table 1603.4.1, Activity table—Sub-precinct A and Table 1603.4.2 Activity table—Sub-precinct B and Table 1603.4.3 above will be subject to the normal tests for notification under the relevant sections of the Resource Management Act 1991.

(2) When deciding who is an affected person in relation to any activity for the purposes of section 95E of the Resource Management Act 1991 the Council will give specific consideration to those persons listed in Rule C1.13(4).

1603.6. Standards

The zone, Auckland-wide and All relevant overlay, Auckland-wide and zone standards apply in this precinct to the activities listed in Activity Tables 1603.4.1, 1603.4.2 and 1603.4.3 unless otherwise specified.

All activities listed in Table 1603.4.1, Activity table—Sub-precinct A and Table 1603.4.2 Activity table—Sub-precinct B, Table H11 4.1 and Table 13.4.1 and Table 1603.4.3 except for non-complying activities must also comply with the following Standards 1603.6.1 – 1603.8.9.

1603.6.1. Dwellings

(1) Dwellings in Sub-precinct A—Area 1 must be located above the ground floor.

(2) Activities that do not comply with Standard 1603.6.1(1) are a non-complying activity.

1603.6.2. Retail

(1) Food and beverage and dairies in Sub-precinct A — Area 2 must be located on the ground floor.

(1) Retail in Sub-precinct B must:

(a) not exceed 500m² gross-floor area; and

(b) have a maximum average gross-floor not exceeding 300m².

(2) Activities that do not comply with standards 1603.6.2(1) and (2) are a non-complying activity.

1603.6.3. Future Roads

Purpose: ensure that roads are constructed to serve development in general accordance with 1603.10.1. Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 1.

(1) Any new buildings on a site that contains an indicative future road must make provision for the development of that road in general accordance with 1603.10.1 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct Plan 1 and 1603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor Precinct Plan 2: Transport Plan.
1603.6.1 Standards - subdivision and development

Purpose: ensure that roads are constructed to serve development in general accordance with 1603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2 Sub-precincts A and B and 1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C.

1. Any subdivision or development of a site that contains an indicative future road or a preferred future road alignment must include the development of that road in general accordance with 1603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2 – Sub-precincts A and B, and 1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C.

2. Any subdivision or development of a site that contains the indicative arterial road as shown in 1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C must provide for that new road.

3. No structure will be located within an indicative future road, preferred future road alignment or indicative arterial road as identified in the 1603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2 – Sub-precincts A and B and 1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C, unless an alternative road alignment has been approved by resource consent.

1603.6.2 Standards – New Roads

Purpose: ensure that roads are constructed to serve development in general accordance with 1603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2 Sub-precincts A and B and 1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C.

1. Any new road required under 1603.6.1 above must be designed and constructed to meet its operational and functional requirements.

2. Where the site includes the terminus of an indicative future road or a preferred future road alignment it must be designed to connect to the identified ‘strategic access points’ on 1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C.

3. Any new road or section of road as required in 1603.6.2(1) or (2) above must connect with existing formed section/s and consented alignments on adjacent sites and must be designed to the same standard (to accommodate the same transport modes) as those existing and consented formed section(s) of road that it connects to.

1603.6.3 Standards – Development of new or redevelopment of impervious areas

1. Impervious areas where stormwater runoff is directed to an approved communal stormwater management device designed to achieve 75% total suspended solids removal and extended detention stormwater quality treatment must:
   a. Use inert building materials that do not have an exposed surface made from contaminants of concern to water quality (i.e. zinc, copper, and lead); and
   b. Achieve stormwater quality treatment at-source for all high use roads and high contaminant generating car parks using a filtration device (or similar)
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designed to remove metals and hydrocarbons in accordance with
Technical Publication 10: Design Guideline Manual for Stormwater
Treatment Devices (2003); or

c. Achieve stormwater quality treatment for all impervious areas using a
filtration device (or similar) designed in accordance with Technical
Publication 10: Design Guideline Manual for Stormwater Treatment

(2) All other impervious areas (except inert building materials) must achieve
stormwater quality treatment at-source in accordance with Auckland Council
Technical Publication 10: Design Guideline Manual for Stormwater Treatment
Devices (2003). (Note: the implementation of bioretention devices to achieve
retention in accordance with Table E10.6.3.1.1 Hydrology mitigation requirements
are considered to achieve this standard).

I603.6.4 Standards - New Buildings and external alterations and additions to
buildings fronting Hobsonville Road in sub-precincts A and B

Purpose: ensure buildings define the street edge of Hobsonville Road and contribute to:

- providing an attractive streetscape;
- enhancing pedestrian amenity; and
- making buildings accessible.

(1) A new building on a site fronting Hobsonville Road, or additions or external alterations to
an existing building located at the Hobsonville Road street frontage, must adjoin the
street site frontage for its entire length.

(2) Vehicle access ways areas in accordance with I603.10.1 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct
plan 1 are excluded from the requirements in I603.6.4(1).

I603.6.5 Building frontage height on Hobsonville Road

Purpose: ensure buildings adequately define the street and provide a sense of enclosure.

(3) New buildings or additions or external alterations to an existing building on sites
fronting Hobsonville Road in sub-precincts A and B must have a minimum height of
8.5m or two storeys above the finished level of the street for a minimum depth of 10m
from the frontage.

I603.6.55 Standards – verandahs New buildings and external alterations and
additions to buildings in Sub-precinct B

Purpose: provide pedestrians with weather protection, safety and amenity on the frontages
of sites on Hobsonville Road.

(1) In Sub-precinct B the ground floor of a building fronting Hobsonville Road must
provide a verandah along the full extent of the frontage.

(2) The verandah must:
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(b) be related to its neighbours to provide continuous pedestrian cover of the footpath, excluding vehicle access;

(c) have a minimum height of 3m and a maximum height of 4.5m above the footpath; and

(d) be set back at least 600mm from the kerb.

1603.6.7 Standards for subdivision

(1) Any subdivision of a site that contains an indicative road must make provision for the development of that road in general accordance with the position shown on 1603.10.1 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 1.

(2) The preferred future road as shown on 1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 must be designed as a collector road.

1603.6.6 Standards - New buildings and external alterations and additions to buildings fronting Hobsonville Road in Sub-precinct C

Purpose: manage the adverse effects of development fronting Hobsonville Road on the residential properties on the eastern side of the road.

(1) New buildings and external alterations and additions must have a front yard of 8m.

(2) Front yards must not be used for storage of materials or waste.

(3) The front yard must be planted with a mix of grasses, shrubs and trees for a minimum depth of 3m.

(4) New buildings and additions on sites fronting Hobsonville Road in sub-precinct C must not exceed the following standards, as shown in Figure 1 below:

- a height of 10m above the finished level of the street for a minimum depth of 10m from the building frontage for a minimum of 50% of that frontage.

- 20m above the finished level of the street for the remaining depth of the building.

- Any part of a building that is more than 10m high must be setback by a minimum of 10m from the building frontage.

(5) Buildings must not project beyond a 30 degree recession plane measured from a point 6m vertically above ground level along the boundary of the residential zone, measured at the road boundary, as shown in Figure 1 below.
Attachment B: Proposed Plan Change

Figure 1: Sub-precinct C- Maximum Height and Height in Relation to Boundary standards

1603.6.7 Standards - Development and subdivision on sites adjoining Hobsonville Primary School

Purpose: ensure development adjoining the Hobsonville Primary School mitigates adverse effects on the school.

(1) A landscape buffer of 3m in depth should be provided prior to the construction of the buildings on all sites identified with Landscape Frontage Areas on Precinct Plan 5, to the satisfaction of Council.

(2) The landscape buffer required in 1603.6.7(1) above must be planted in a manner that will mitigate the potential adverse effects of proposed development and activities on the school.

(3) Continuous acoustic fencing must be provided for the entire length of property boundaries with the school, to the satisfaction of Council.

(4) Buildings on sites identified with Landscape Frontage Area A1 on Precinct Plan 5 must be setback by 9 metres from the boundary with Hobsonville Primary School.

(5) A 3 metre wide landscaped area must be provided within the 9 metre building setback required in 1603.6.7(4), to the satisfaction of Council. This is in addition to the landscape buffer described in 1603.6.7(1) above.

(6) Buildings on all sites with Landscape Frontage Area A2 or Landscape Frontage Area B on Precinct Plan 5 must be setback by at least 6 metres from the boundary with Hobsonville Primary School.
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(7) New buildings and external alterations and additions on sites identified with Landscape Frontage Area A1 or Landscape Frontage Area A2 on Precinct Plan 5: Landscape Frontage Areas must be contained within a recession plane of no more than 35 degrees as measured from any relevant point 2.5m vertically above ground level on that boundary.

(8) New buildings and external alterations and additions on sites identified with Landscape Frontage Area B on Figure Precinct Plan 5: Landscape Frontage Areas must be contained within a recession plane of no more than 45 degrees as measured from any relevant point 2.5m vertically above ground level on that boundary.

1603.7. Assessment – controlled activities

There are no controlled activities in this precinct.

1603.8. Assessment – restricted discretionary activities

1603.8.1. Matters of discretion

The Council will reserve its discretion to all of the following matters when assessing a restricted discretionary activity resource consent application, in addition to the matters specified for the relevant restricted discretionary activities in the overlays, zone, Auckland-wide, or zones overlay provisions:

(1) All use, development and subdivision:

(a) location, physical extent and design of stormwater management devices and consistency with the integrated catchment management plan and network discharge consent and its supporting stormwater management plan;

(b) location, physical extent and design of vehicle accessways and slip lanes relative to overall development, including the layout and design of roads, pedestrian linkages, open spaces, earthworks areas and land contours, and infrastructure location;

(c) design, location and scale;

(d) (c) transport;

(e) (d) infrastructure;

(f) (e) the overall development layout, being the layout and design of roads, pedestrian linkages, open spaces, earthworks areas and land contours, and infrastructure location;

(g) (f) the location and design of the open space relative to overall development, including the layout and design of roads, pedestrian linkages, open spaces, earthworks areas and land contours, and infrastructure location; and
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(h)(g) the proposed subdivision layout relative to the overall development, including the layout and design of roads, pedestrian linkages, open spaces, land contours, and infrastructure location.

(g)(h) the staging of construction, and the use of erosion and sediment controls during construction, to reduce sediment entering the environment.

(2) Buildings or development:

(a) the matters of discretion in H.13.8.1(4) and H.11.8.1(4) for new buildings and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for apply.

(b) a building interface with the public realm;

(b) in Sub-precinct C, building interface with residential properties and Hobsonville Primary School

(c) design, location and scale; and

(d) the location, bulk and scale of buildings relative to overall development, including the layout and design of roads, pedestrian linkages, open spaces, and land contours, and infrastructure location.

(3) Roads and pedestrian linkages:

(a) the location and design of the roads and pedestrian linkages relative to overall development, including the layout and design of open spaces, earthworks areas and land contours, and infrastructure location, and consistency with 1603.10.12 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 21- Sub-precincts A and B and 1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3- Sub-precinct C.

(4) Subdivision in Sub-precinct C

(a) location of roads and connections with neighbouring sites

(b) functional requirements of the transport network and different transport modes

(c) site and vehicle access including roads, rights of way, and vehicle crossings

(d) construction of indicative roads

(4) Vehicle accessway and slip lanes:

(a) the matters of discretion in E27.8.1(12) apply; and

(b) the location and design of the vehicle access relative to overall development, including the layout and design of roads, pedestrian linkages, open spaces, earthworks areas and land contours, and infrastructure location.
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1603.8.2. Assessment criteria

The Council will consider the relevant assessment criteria below for restricted discretionary activities, in addition to the assessment criteria specified for the relevant restricted discretionary activities in the zone, overlays, Auckland-wide or zones overlay provisions:

1. Building interface with the public realm in sub precincts A and B
   (a) Buildings should activate the adjoining street or public open space by:
      i. being sufficiently close to the street boundary and of a frontage height that contributes to street definition, enclosure and pedestrian amenity;
      ii. where located on a site which has frontage to requiring buildings on sites adjoining Hobsonville Road, to adjoin the site frontage unless there are exceptional circumstances;
      iii. having a pedestrian entrance visible from the street and located sufficiently close to reinforce pedestrian movement along the street;
      iv. having a floor to floor height that allows for a range of uses;
      v. providing a level of glazing that allows a high degree of visibility between the street/public open space and building interior to contribute to pedestrian amenity and passive surveillance;
      vi. providing pedestrian cover from the weather and wind of a design consistent with the pedestrian focal point role of Hobsonville Road;
      vii. avoiding blank walls at ground level, or when the wall is visible from a road or public place;
      viii. providing convenient and direct entry between the street and building for people of all ages and abilities.
   (b) Vehicle access should be shared between buildings to reduce gaps in the streetscape and service laneways should be provided within urban blocks in accordance with the 1603.10.1 Hobsonville Corridor - Precinct plan 1
   (c) Buildings within the Sub-precinct A - Area 2 should be located and designed to encourage pedestrian movement and the use of public transport support of public transport integration along the Hobsonville Road corridor.
   (d) Buildings, particularly those adjoining Hobsonville Road, should contribute to the consider the effects of any infringement on the appearance and integrity of the streetscape as a whole.

2. Design, location and scale
   (a) Buildings, development and subdivision should be consistent with:
      i. the policies for that particular sub-precinct;
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ii. 1603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 12 Sub-precincts A and B; and

iii. 1603.10.2.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 23 - Sub-precinct C

Transport plan

(b) All development should be well-connected and via a public road system that allows for public transport, vehicle and pedestrian connections.

(c) The extent to which Provision for storm water management and land use must meet the requirements of the integrated catchment management plan – Waiaukia. Development must not cause a non-compliance with the condition of consent for: is in accordance with an approved network discharge consent for Auckland Regional Council Permit 25692.

(d) Development should retain and enhance riparian margins and provide protection through a range of building setbacks and replanting measures.

(e) Site works, including site clearance, should be undertaken in such a way that avoids adverse effects on watercourses, areas of ecological values and neighbouring properties arising from changes in landform.

(f) Buildings, vehicle accesses, car parking and other development should be of a size, location, scale and design that complement the character of buildings and development of adjoining land and sub-precincts and surrounding zones, having regard to the existing and potential use of that adjoining land.

(g) Redevelopment of, or additions or alterations to existing buildings should complement existing development having regard to:

   (i) the architectural elements of the building which contribute to its character, such as cladding and fenestration;

   (ii) the visual appearance of the development from the road; and

   (iii) amenity values and neighbourhood character.

(h) Landscaping should integrate development into the surrounding area and contribute to the site and surrounding area amenity.

(i) Development should provide a good standard of aural and visual amenity, particularly between residential activities and non-residential activities and between residential activities and roads.

(j) Car parking and loading spaces in sub-precincts A and B should be designed to be either:

   (i) located to the rear of the building, in a basement or semi-basement below ground level or within the building at ground level, provided that
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the building must be able to accommodate a non-residential activity between any ground floor parking area and the street which is oriented towards streets rather than parking areas; or

(ii) located according to a perimeter block layout for larger sites, where parking is provided behind or within buildings (except for kerbside parking), and with the active street frontages oriented towards streets rather than parking areas, and/or

(iii) maximise the opportunity for provision of communal parking areas.

Sub-precinct B

(k) Retail activities proposed within Sub-precinct B should be of a scale and nature that serves the neighbourhood catchment.

(l) Development or buildings in sub precinct B where street typologies apply, should contribute to high standards of design, pedestrian amenity, safe and attractive streets and public places including open spaces and stormwater sensitive design features and encourage pedestrian activity through the use of:

(i) modulation, and architectural elements;

(ii) active street frontages through glazing, lighting, balconies on upper floors and the avoidance of blank walls on street frontages; and

(iii) active street frontages and the avoidance of blank walls in the case of large format buildings, and where this is not achieved, buildings should be sleeved with smaller buildings and activities which provide active street frontages.

(m) Retaining walls on the street frontage should be avoided to ensure the continuity of active street frontages, the visual appearance of the street frontage and easy pedestrian access.

(n) Development should incorporate crime prevention through environmental design and universal design principles.

(o) Plazas and seating areas associated with cafes and restaurants should be designed to enhance the streetscape. These should be open to the street with limited use of walls and changes in height to delineate semi-public spaces, so as to maintain a visual connection between the activity and the street.

(p) The two supermarkets provided for in Sub-precinct B should be designed to contribute to the creation of a cohesive local centre.

(q) The provision of a slip lane frontage control (refer to Figure 1 on 603.10.1 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 1- Sub-precincts A and B) should be
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considered applied where buildings are of a design or function that does not require an active interface with the street and where a setback is required to maintain a satisfactory standard of visual amenity for any outlook from residential development directly opposite the site on Hobsonville Road and to avoid individual site access ways off from Hobsonville Road.

Sub-precinct C

(i) The frontage of any proposed development or buildings on sites that front Hobsonville Road or adjoin Hobsonville Primary School should achieve a good standard of visual amenity for the residential properties along Hobsonville Road and for the school through such methods as:

i. design articulation

ii. glazing

iii. selection of trees that will achieve mature heights that will mitigate the bulk and height of buildings and soften the built form of development

3. Transport

(a) All of the following assessment criteria are to be addressed in an integrated transport management plan prepared in consultation with Auckland Transport and the New Zealand Transport Agency to satisfy the assessment criteria below:

Sub-precincts A and B

(b)-(a) The design of roads and the development of adjoining sites should ensure well-connected attractive and safe transport routes, with appropriate provision for vehicle, cycle and pedestrian movements, car parking, infrastructure services, street tree planting and landscape treatment.

(e)-(b) The council may require slip lanes compliance with frontage controls as set out in Attachment 10.4 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 14- Typical design of slip lanes in respect of Sub-precinct B.

(e)-(c) A highly inter-connected public road system should be provided so as to reduce trip distances and to improve local accessibility to community facilities, reserves, public transport facilities and Sub-precincts A and B.

(e)-(d) Any development having access to Hobsonville Road or Brigham Creek Road should be designed to minimise the need for vehicle crossings to Hobsonville Road and Brigham Creek Road and achieve safe access, without compromising the ability of those roads and the Brigham Creek interchange to efficiently function as a strategic network. It is expected that the applicant will
consult with The New Zealand Transport Agency and Auckland Transport in respect of this criterion.

(f) Roads and intersection design should create high quality public spaces, and incorporate quality amenity features such as tree planting and footpath paving.

(g) Stormwater management features such as rain gardens, swales and permeable paving should be incorporated into roading design.

(h) A pedestrian and cycle network should be provided that safely and directly links schools, reserves, commercial areas and passenger transport routes with living areas.

(i) The design and construction of on-site roads should be capable of providing access to the wider movement network.

(j) Traffic generation should not create adverse effects on:

(i) the capacity of roads giving access to the site;

(ii) the safety of road users including cyclists and pedestrians;

(iii) neighbourhood character;

(iv) the sustainability of the primary road network and the frequent network (Note: The New Zealand Transport Agency and Auckland Transport interprets sustainability of the primary roading network as preserving the transport function of the state highway network, and regional arterial roads to maintain the optimum level of speed and capacity for both private vehicles and public transport); and

(k) Good walking and cycle connections should be provided between parks/reserves, town centres and schools.

(l) The design of roads and slip lanes should utilise land efficiently and encourage walkability by using minimal dimensions for carriageways creating safe entry and exit points on the slip lanes and integrating service lines beneath footpaths or parking bays.

(m) Development should achieve:

(i) an overall level of service of ‘E’ (or higher) for interchanges and intersections within and immediately adjacent to Sub-precinct B;

(ii) an overall level of service of ‘E’ (or higher) or a degree of saturation less than or equal to 0.95 for an individual movement along Hobsonville Road and at Brigham Creek interchange;
Attachment B: Proposed Plan Change

(iii) safe and efficient stacking capacity within the intersections and
interchanges shown on the Hobsonville Corridor urban concept transport
plan in 603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2 – Sub precincts A
and B; and

(iv) the mitigation of any adverse transport effects on the roading network,
where practicable.

(n) Provision should be made for public transport facilities, including a public
transport interchange, taxi stops, and bus stops.

(o) Development should be designed to integrate land uses with transport
systems, using an integrated transport assessment methodology, particularly for
major trip generating activities. The integrated transport assessment should
include consideration of public transport within each sub-precinct, and between
Sub-precincts.

(p) Car parking should be designed according to a perimeter block layout
where parking is provided behind buildings, except for kerbside parking, and
with the main activity frontage for buildings oriented towards public streets rather
than parking area.

(q) Parking areas should be secure, well-lit and conveniently accessible for
residents in Sub-precinct B.

(r) Parking areas should be located behind buildings, screened with
landscaping (not visible from street) or be located in semi or full basements.

(s) Development should provide for on-site loading facilities for service
vehicles, delivery vehicles, including furniture removal and delivery, and rubbish
collection vehicles.

(t) Worker or student parking for non-residential activities should be provided
for within a five minute walking distance of land uses, rather than necessarily
adjoining each non-residential activity.

(u) Development should promote a safe environment for pedestrians and
cyclists, including adequate lighting and appropriate location and design of
entrances, windows and driveways.

(v) Driveways, parking areas and roads should provide for safe and efficient
provision for motor vehicles.

(w) A travel plan should be developed for the proposed activity that sets out
how the development will reduce the number of car journeys generated by the
activity and how those on site will be provided with greater transport choices.
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(x) Vehicle accessway and slip lanes - the assessment criteria in E27-6.2(10) apply.

(y) (v) Roads and pedestrian linkages - refer to the objectives and policies for this precinct.

(w) The design and alignment of any new road should not compromise the function of the state highway network

Sub-precinct C

(x) the extent to which any development or subdivision layout:

i. is consistent with and provides for the preferred future road alignments and indicative arterial road shown on the L003–10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C.

ii. complies with the AT Code of Practice or any equivalent standard that replaces it.

iii. provides for the functional requirements of the existing or proposed transport network and different transport modes.

iv. provides for roads to the site boundaries to enable connections with neighbouring sites.

v. minimises vehicle crossings to new existing or planned arterial roads by providing access from a side road, rear lane, or slip lane.

(y) the design and alignment of Westpoint Drive should include consideration of any interface with the planned walkway along Rawiri Stream.

(4) Subdivision

(a) The location of infrastructure servicing the area, and open space, should result in an integrated network that is adequate to meet the needs of the overall development area.

(b) The relationship of the matters requiring consent to activities authorised by other resource consents granted in respect of the precinct or sub-precinct.

(5) Buildings

(a) The proposed building, alteration or addition relative to the location of infrastructure servicing the area and open space should result in an integrated network that is adequate to meet the needs of the overall development area.

(b) The relationship of the matters requiring consent to activities authorised by other resource consents granted in respect of the precinct or sub-precinct.

(6) Public open space
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(a) The location of the open space relative to the location of infrastructure servicing the area and existing open space should result in an integrated network that is adequate to meet the needs of the overall development area.

(b) The relationship of the matters requiring consent to activities authorised by other resource consents granted in respect of the precinct or sub-precinct.

1603.8.2.1 Assessment criteria –

7) Supermarkets in Sub-precinct B

In addition to the assessment criteria for new buildings stated above, the following criteria apply to supermarkets in Sub-precinct B. Where the assessment criterion for new buildings above is inconsistent with any criteria listed below, the criteria below take precedence.

4(a) Building design and interface with the public realm.

(a)(i) The preferred option for development is building up to the street boundary with no car parking to the street.

(b)(ii) Buildings should address public open space, principal parking areas and in particular the street, by bringing visual activity, pedestrian amenity and activity to these edges. One or more of the following techniques should be used in order of importance, having regard to the context of the site.

- i) sleeveing street facing building elevations with smaller scale, active uses, such as retail, provided the use is enabled in the zone;
- ii) providing a significant amount of ground floor glazing, particularly to street facing facades. and/or
- iii) Designing the building to a human scale through facade modulation that visually breaks up upper frontages. This may include use of horizontal and vertical articulation to create a series of smaller elements, structural bays or other similar techniques.

(a)(iii) Frontages should be integrated with the prevailing rhythm and scale of existing or intended future frontages along streets. The stepping of building mass should be used on street frontages where adjoining buildings are of a smaller scale.

(b)(iv) Where alterations and additions are proposed to buildings that are set back from the road with parking in front, the continuation of this form of site layout is acceptable.

2(b) Parking, access and servicing
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(a) (i) Loading bays and site storage should be located away from and/or appropriately screened from public open spaces, pedestrian paths, streets and adjoining residential zones.

(b) (ii) Where loading bays/service areas front a street, with the exception of service lanes, a high standard of design is expected in relation to that facade to contribute to streetscape and pedestrian amenity.

(c) (iii) Where loading bays/service areas are located internal to the site a lesser standard of design may be appropriate for that facade.

(d) (iv) High-quality pedestrian connections should be provided between the main building entrances and the street.

(e) (v) Pedestrian connections through a site should be provided where the site has two or more frontages.

(f) (vi) The development should be designed to provide a high level of pedestrian safety, including movement through the parking area from street frontage to building entrance.

(g) (vii) Parking areas, including parking buildings or at grade parking areas, should be located away from the street frontage, particularly along the street frontage with Hobsonville Road. However, where parking areas are located at or near the street frontage, then that parking building or area should:
  
  i. be designed to contribute to streetscape and pedestrian amenity;
  
  ii. have landscaping, including tree planting, of a scale and amount that visually breaks up the car parking area and as a guide, one tree should be planted every sixth car parking bay; and
  
  iii. be of a depth that minimises building setback from the street.

(h) (viii) Where practicable, delivery vehicles should enter the site by way of a rear lane or access way that leads directly to loading and storage areas.

(i) (ix) Where a site adjoins or contains on its rear or side boundary a service lane or access way (whether private or public ownership) that serves as a significant pedestrian route, that service lane or access way should be considered as a street for the purpose of assessment criteria and in regard to the appropriate level of pedestrian amenity.

(8) Tree selection should give preference to native, eco-sourced, non-deciduous species.
1603.9. Special information requirements

The special information requirements in the underlying zone and Auckland-wide provisions apply in this precinct, unless otherwise specified.

An application for subdivision consent must be accompanied by the following information:

(a) The exact location and design of roads. This includes the location design of all strategic road linkages, indicative future roads, preferred future roads and the indicative arterial road where these roads are shown on the site as identified in Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 42 - Sub-precincts A and B, and Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 23 – Sub-precinct C Transport-plan.

(b) The design of all indicative future roads and preferred future roads where these roads are shown on the site as identified in Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2 – Sub-precincts A and B, Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C.

(b) (c) An indicative layout of proposed sites.

(c) (d) Where changes to site contours are intended, the relationship of those changed site contours to existing and proposed streets, lanes, any adjacent coastal environment, and, where information is available, public open space.

(d) (e) Identification of the main pedestrian routes that provide circulation around each sub-precinct area and between sub-precincts, to parks and community services, showing how they are integrate the proposed subdivision with public transport nodes, routes and bus stops.

(e) (f) Areas to be developed for stormwater treatment and detention purposes consistent with the relevant approved network discharge consent.

(f) (g) The location of stormwater, wastewater and water supply infrastructure.

(g) (h) The indicative location of building platforms.

(h) (i) How each subdivision-precinct is to be staged and the means of managing any vacant land through the staging process.

(i) (j) How the development integrates with other sites within the sub-precinct and neighbouring sub-precincts including details of any development proposals on adjoining sites.

(j) (k) An integrated transport assessment of the effects of the proposal and how the proposal meet standards 1603.6.1 and 1603.6.1 and relevant assessment criteria.

(k) (l) How the subdivision development provides or facilitates adequate transport connections across the precinct and/or sub-precinct, including connections to the surrounding road network.
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An application for development or subdivision must be accompanied by the following information:

(1) Stormwater Management

All applications for development and subdivision must include a plan demonstrating how stormwater management requirements will be met including:

a. Areas where stormwater management requirements are to be met on-site and where they will be met through communal infrastructure;

b. The type and location of all public stormwater network assets that are proposed to be vested in council;

c. Consideration of the interface with, and cumulative effects of, stormwater infrastructure in the precinct.

(2) Permanent and intermittent streams and wetlands

All applications for land modification, development and subdivision must include a plan identifying all permanent and intermittent streams and wetlands on the application site.

(3) Riparian planting plan

An application for land modification, development and subdivision which adjoins a permanent or intermittent stream must be accompanied by a riparian planting plan identifying the location, species, planter bag size and density of the plants.

An application for subdivision or development on sites adjoining Hobsonville Primary School must be accompanied by the following information:

(1) A landscape interface plan, outlining the details for proposed plantings and boundary treatment as outlined in Standard 1903.8.7.
1603.10. Precinct plans

Replace existing diagrams with the following new diagrams:

1603.10.1. Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 1
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1603.10.2. Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2 – Sub-precincts A and B – Transport plan

Refer to Precinct Plan 3

Legend:
- Precincts and Sub-precincts
- Indicative Public Transport Alignment
- Indicative Strategic access point (signals)
- Indicative Strategic access point / key intersections
- Parcel boundary
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1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C
1603.10.4. Hobsonville Corridor: Typical slip lane design
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1603.10.5. Hobsonville Corridor: Landscape Frontage Areas

Legend
- Landscape frontage - Area A1
- Landscape frontage - Area A2
- Parcel boundary

Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) - Hobsonville Corridor Plan Change
Attachment C: Proposed SMAF 1 Control Area and Zoning Changes
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Executive Summary
This report is prepared as part of the evaluation required by Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (‘the Act’) for proposed Plan Change x (the ‘plan change’) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP (OP)).

The plan change is considered an appropriate response to addressing issues within an area adjacent to the operative Hobsonville Corridor precinct. This area is proposed as sub-precinct C in the plan change. Feedback was sought on a draft version of the plan change in 2017 and that process assisted in further refining the proposed provisions.

This report sets out the assessment of the proposed objectives and provisions relating to three key themes:
- Transport
- Urban Design
- Stormwater

The plan change responds to transport issues within sub-precinct C relating to the need for future roads. These include the completion of Westpoint Drive and the protection of the route for a future arterial road connecting Whenuapai to West Harbour. The plan change seeks to include indicative future road alignments, preferred future road alignments, an indicative arterial road, objectives, policies, standards and assessment criteria to address these issues. There will be costs for developers associated with the delivery of Westpoint Drive. The benefits of the provisions requiring the road include providing alternative routes and thereby lessening traffic congestion on Hobsonville Road. This has positive effects on the safety of Hobsonville Road and opportunities for bus, cycle and walking modes of transport. Providing for the indicative arterial route will ensure that development does not preclude this road’s future delivery.

The urban design issues in sub-precinct C relate to the interface of buildings within the Light Industrial Zone with residential properties on the south side of Hobsonville Road and Hobsonville Primary School. The scale of development permitted within the Zone has the potential to create dominance and shading effects on these properties. The plan change seeks to add maximum height, height in relation to boundary and landscaping standards for Light Industry Zoned properties in these locations. These standards will work together to reduce the shading and dominance effects of future developments.

Stormwater issues relate to managing effects of development on hydrology mitigation and water quality. The plan change seeks to apply the SMAF control to the precinct to address hydrology mitigation. It also proposes an additional standard relating to stormwater quality. Both of these proposals reflect current requirements in the Waiaroha Stream network discharge consent (NDC). They are proposed to retain these levels of protection in light of the unknown outcome of the future Auckland-wide NDC which will supersede the current NDC.

This report also provides an overview of additional and consequential changes to the precinct provisions. These changes do not address any new issue or seek to achieve any new outcomes. They are therefore not assessed as part of this report.
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1. Introduction

This report is prepared as part of the evaluation required by Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (‘the Act’) for proposed Plan Change X (the ‘plan change’) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP (OP)).

Section 32 Evaluation

Section 32 of the Act requires that before adopting any objective, policy, rule or other method, the Council shall carry out an evaluation to examine:

- The extent to which each objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act, and
- Whether, having regard to their efficiency and effectiveness, the policies, rules or other methods are the most appropriate for achieving the objective.

The evaluation must also take into account:

- The benefits and costs of policies, rules, or other methods; and
- The risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the policies, rules or other methods.

Overview of the plan change

The plan change area

The Hobsonville Corridor Precinct (the ‘precinct’) is located approximately 20 kilometres northwest of central Auckland. The existing Hobsonville Corridor Precinct in the AUP (OP) is bordered by Memorial Park Lane, Hobsonville Road, Brigham Creek Road and State Highway 18. The surrounding area consists of the residential communities of West Harbour and Hobsonville Point, as well as the future growth area of Whenuapai.

The proposed Hobsonville Corridor Precinct Plan Change (the plan change) extends the boundary of the precinct to Rawiri Stream in the southwest. The area of land that is proposed to be added to the precinct is referred to as Sub-precinct C (the sub-precinct) and is approximately 70 hectares in size.
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Figure 1: Aerial of the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct area

The types of land use and the level of activity within the plan change area are in transition, with a number of developments recently completed and currently underway. Development of sub-precincts A and B is generally more advanced than sub-precinct C. Parts of the future road network throughout the precinct have been constructed, stormwater ponds have been formed and services installed.

Recent developments within the precinct include retail, light industrial, commercial and residential developments. These types of activities currently sit alongside the more established land uses including Hobsonville Primary School, produce stores, a garden centre, and a drive through coffee shop.

Recent subdivisions within the sub-precinct have created sites of variable sizes. There is potential for further subdivision of the larger sites and the sites that have not been subdivided to date.

Land within the existing precinct area is zoned Local Centre and Mixed Use in the AUP (OP). Land within the sub-precinct is zoned Light Industry, as shown below:
The purpose of the plan change

This purpose of this plan change is to ensure the delivery of urban design, stormwater and transport outcomes for both the existing Hobsonville Corridor precinct area as well as for the new proposed sub-precinct C. It also seeks to amend the operative precinct provisions to better align them with the AUP(OP) and to make changes for the purposes of consistency, clarity and to keep the provisions up to date.

The evaluation approach

This section outlines how this plan change has been evaluated. The rest of this report will follow the evaluation approach described in Table 1 below. In accordance with section 32(6) of the RMA and for the purposes of this report:

i. the ‘proposal’ means this plan change
ii. the ‘objectives’ means the proposed objectives of the Proposed Hobsonville Corridor Precinct
iii. the ‘provisions’ means the proposed policies, standards and other methods that implement the objectives of the Proposed Hobsonville Corridor Precinct.

This section 32 evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.
### Table 1: Evaluation approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 2</th>
<th>Resource Management Act 1991</th>
<th>This section sets out the RMA purpose and principles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>National and Local Planning Context</td>
<td>This section provides strategic context for this plan change by providing an overview of relevant statutory and non-statutory planning documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4</td>
<td>Development of the plan change</td>
<td>This section provides information on how the plan change was developed and includes an evaluation of the options and therefore the reasons for the plan change. The options considered are in relation to the overall approach of the plan change, rather than for each individual resource management issue. However, some issue specific commentary is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Sections 5, 6 and 7 cover the following matters for each topic area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• resource management issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• desired outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• current planning provisions relating to the issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• proposed planning response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6</td>
<td>Urban Design</td>
<td>• evaluation of the objectives to examine the extent to which they are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA (under section 32(1)(a) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• evaluation of the provisions and whether the provisions are the most appropriate way of achieving the objectives of the plan change is provided (under sections 32(1)(b) and 32(2) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7</td>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>Section 8 Other proposed changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This section describes the other changes proposed to the precinct provisions, which are not the subject of a detailed section 32 assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>This section is the conclusion for this report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) provides a legislative framework for the sustainable management of natural and physical resources in New Zealand. The purpose of the Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety.

The principles of the RMA are stated in sections 6, 7 and 8 of the Act. An assessment against Part 2 of the RMA is provided in the evaluation of objectives for each topic in Sections 5 to 7 of this report.

Section 6 of the RMA contains the matters of national importance that are required to be recognised and provided for:

In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall recognise and provide for the following matters of national importance:

(a) The preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development;

(b) the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development;

(c) the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna;

(d) the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes, and rivers;

(e) the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga;

(f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development;

(g) the protection of protected customary rights;

(h) the management of significant risks from natural hazards.

Section 7 of the RMA contains other matters which shall be given particular regard to:

In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall have particular regard to—

(a) kaitiakitanga;

(aa) the ethic of stewardship;

(b) the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources:
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(ba) the efficiency of the end use of energy;
(c) the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values;
(d) intrinsic values of ecosystems;
(e) [Repealed]
(f) maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment;
(g) any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources;
(h) the protection of the habitat of trout and salmon;
(i) the effects of climate change;
(j) the benefits to be derived from the use and development of renewable energy.

The principles of the Treaty of Waitangi must also be taken into account under section 8 of the RMA, which states:

In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi).

Section 4 of this report describes the involvement of mana whenua in the development of this plan change.
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3. National and Local Planning Context
A number of strategic and statutory planning documents have informed the plan change process. This section provides a summary of those documents.

National policy documents
National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity
The National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (NPSUDC) came into effect on 1 December 2016. It recognises the national significance of urban environments and provides direction to decision-makers on planning for urban environments. The NPS on Urban Development Capacity seeks to ensure there is sufficient development capacity for housing and business with a suite of objectives and policies to guide decision-making in urban areas. There is an emphasis on integrated planning of land use, development and infrastructure provision.

Policy PA1 of the NPSUDC sets out housing and business land development capacity that local authorities are required to provide in the short, medium and long-term.

This plan change proposes to retain the Local Centre, Mixed Use and Light Industry zonings in the precinct area. Together the area will provide opportunities for new business developments. A key objective of the precinct, and this plan change, is to provide for such development in a way that is integrated with infrastructure, most notably through requiring a new road network. A second objective is to manage amenity value effects on existing residential development along and around Hobsonville Road.

National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management
The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2011 (NPSFM) sets a national policy framework for managing freshwater quality and quantity. The NPSFM was updated in August 2017 to incorporate amendments from the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Amendment Order 2017. The amendments came into effect on 6 September 2017 and include provisions that seek to improve fresh water quality with a target to increase the proportion of rivers and lakes suitable for primary contact to 90 per cent by 2040. There are also new provisions that enable the use of freshwater for economic wellbeing.

Section 7 of this report addresses stormwater management, and is relevant to the NPSFM.

Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000
The Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 (HGMMA) applies to the Hauraki Gulf, its islands and catchments. This includes any area of land where the surface water drains into the Hauraki Gulf. As the plan change area drains into the Upper Waitematā Harbour within the Hauraki Gulf, the HGMMA is a relevant consideration.

Sections 7 and 8 of the HGMMA are treated as a national policy statement and a New Zealand coastal policy statement. Section 7 of the HGMMA recognises the national significance of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands and catchments, while section 8 of this Act outlines the objectives of the management of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands and catchments.
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The objectives are intended to protect, maintain and where appropriate enhance the life-supporting capacity of the environment of the Gulf and its islands.

Section 7 of this report addresses stormwater management, and is relevant to the HGMPA.

Auckland Plan 2012

The Auckland Plan is the Council’s key strategic document which sets the council’s social, economic, environmental and cultural objectives. A key component of the Auckland Plan is the Development Strategy¹ which sets out how future growth will be accommodated up to 2040. The Development Strategy aims to provide for up to 70 per cent of growth within existing urban areas and up to 40 per cent outside of urban areas including greenfield areas, satellite towns and rural and coastal towns. Map D.2: Development Strategy Map (Urban Core) shows the Hobsonville Corridor as a major business area.

The Auckland Plan requires provision and development of an integrated transport network that enables people and goods to move freely and efficiently, while respecting the need for place-making. The network comprises motorways, roads and streets, public transport (ferries, buses and trains), footpaths and cycle-ways, ports and airports.

The residential and business growth provided for within the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct will contribute towards the delivery of the growth strategy. In addition, this plan change seeks changes that will enable a more efficient and integrated transport network alongside development within the precinct area.

Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part)

The AUP (OP) is the primary statutory planning document for Auckland. It is comprised of the regional policy statement, regional coastal plan, regional plan and district plan. The AUP (OP) provides the regulatory framework for managing Auckland’s natural and physical resources while enabling growth and development, and protecting matters of national importance.

Of particular relevance to this plan change are the existing operative Hobsonville Corridor Precinct provisions, as well as those relating to the Mixed Use, Local Centre, Light Industry and Open Space– Informal Recreation Zones. In addition, area-wide provisions relating to matters such as subdivision and transport, as well as overlay provisions relating to Stormwater Management Area Flow 1 (SMAF 1) control are relevant.

Plan Change 14 to the Waitakere District Plan

Plan Change 14 to the former Waitakere District Plan (PC14) was part of Waitakere’s Growth and Transportation Integration Programme – a response to the Local Government (Auckland) Amendment Act 2004 and the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy.

PC14 modified the Human Environments (activity areas or zones) and Natural Areas Rules (earthworks, vegetation clearance) for Hobsonville Village, re-identifying land from rural Countrysides Living to urban Living Environment. The plan change was designed to help Hobsonville grow and develop in an integrated way by providing for four distinct areas of land use: industry, mixed uses, open space and a school.

¹ Chapter D, Auckland Plan
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In addition to providing for a range of land uses, PC14 identified an internal road network, including a collector “spine” road through the industrial area. The benefits of these roads included the reduction of freight traffic using Hobsonville Road. Instead freight traffic would access industry via the collector road which provides direct access to SH18 via Brigham Creek Road.

The former Waitakere City District Plan provided that as the land in Hobsonville was subdivided, the indicative internal road network shown in the plan provisions (introduced by PC 14) would be provided. As noted earlier some subdivision and development has occurred under these provisions; and parts of the internal network have been formed.

The plan change also identified areas of riparian margins consistent with the Waiarhoia Integrated Catchment Management Plan prepared for the whole Hobsonville Peninsula catchment to support the change in the metropolitan urban limit. The areas of riparian margin were excluded from the Council’s modelling of impermeable surfaces. The areas were intended to fulfil both a storm water management purpose and provide potential for passive recreation.

Supporting Growth Programme
Auckland Council, Auckland Transport (AT) and the NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) are working together to develop transport networks to support Auckland’s new housing and business areas over the next 30 years.

The programme will begin delivering some of the key priorities laid out in the Auckland Transport Alignment Project, which is a collaboration between Auckland Council and the New Zealand Government to improve alignment on a long-term strategic approach to transport in Auckland.

Currently AT is seeking to confirm funding for local road network development and improvements in Whenuapai and other urgent live-zone or ‘next-in-line’ areas. The proposed arterial road addressed in this Plan Change, from Spedding Road (Whenuapai) over SH18 to Marina View Road (West Harbour) is identified in Supporting Growth programme.
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4. Development of the plan change

Background
The area referred to as sub-precinct C in this plan change was included as sub-precinct A in the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct in the proposed version of the Auckland Unitary Plan (PAUP).

The submissions on the PAUP included 43 submission points seeking relief in relation to the precinct. The submissions for sub-precinct C included points relating to:

- the activity table
- building height for buildings on Hobsonville Road
- assessment criteria and the focus on urban design outcomes
- car-parking requirements
- the landscape interface requirements with the school.

Council accepted the recommendations of the Independent Hearings Panel to remove this sub-precinct. This was because it was considered that its provisions were adequately addressed through the Light Industry zone provisions.

Subsequent to the Auckland Unitary Plan becoming Operative in Part, issues have become apparent relating to the removal of sub-precinct C from the Hobsonville Corridor precinct. These issues relate to the delivery of the future road network through the area and the interface between industrial developments and the residential properties along Hobsonville Road and Hobsonville Primary School.

Options
The following overall options were identified to address the issues discussed above:

- **Option 1**: Status quo – rely on the relevant AUP (OP) provisions and the limited access road status for Hobsonville Road.

- **Option 2**: Add the area as a new sub-precinct within the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct, and introduce new sub-precinct provisions to address local issues.

- **Option 3**: Develop a bespoke precinct to address the issues for this area.

Further description and analysis of these options is provided in Table 2 below.

It is noted that there are also options specific to transport and urban design issues. These options are discussed in Sections 5 and 6 of this report.
### Table 2: Evaluation of options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Option</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1</strong> Status Quo (do nothing)</td>
<td>The reliance on the operative planning provisions is not considered to be effective in addressing the local issues relating to urban design, transport and stormwater.</td>
<td>When pursuing design options, the status quo is not efficient for developers as it does not clearly set out road requirements to incorporate into site layout options. Developers may have to rework plans subsequent to discussions with AT about the implications of the limited access status.</td>
<td>There are no requirements for developments to provide for the preferred future road alignment and as such they may not be delivered. This would lead to increasingly significant transport issues on and around Hobsonville Road. This would likely reduce desirability of this area and undermine the delivery of business and employment growth in the area. It will also affect the walking, cycling and public transport functions of Hobsonville Road.</td>
<td>Economic benefits for Council given there are no plan change costs. Benefits to landowners as development potential would not be limited by further planning restrictions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To address transport issues the status quo would rely on the limited access' status of Hobsonville Road to manage issues relating to the road. For stormwater issues, the status quo would rely on the existing NDC and the future anticipated Auckland wide NDC. There is a risk that...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A new sub-precinct within the Hobsonville Corridor precinct</strong></td>
<td><strong>A bespoke precinct</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake a plan change to the existing Hobsonville Corridor precinct, retaining operative provisions where appropriate and including a new sub-precinct for the Light Industry zone.</td>
<td>Undertake a plan change for a new precinct. This includes new objectives, policies, rules and other methods to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A precinct approach would be effective in addressing locally specific issues in an integrated way.</td>
<td>A precinct approach would be effective in addressing locally specific issues in an integrated way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the operative precinct to achieve integrated land use, development and transport outcomes is the same as for the Light Industry area. It would be efficient to make use of the operative provisions to include a new sub-precinct. This would avoid the need to prepare a whole new set of objectives policies and methods unnecessarily.</td>
<td>While this option provides an approach that is consistent with the established planning framework, it requires the development of new provisions (objectives, policies, rules and methods). This is not efficient given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There will be costs associated with the plan change process.</td>
<td>There will be costs associated with the plan change process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A precinct approach would provide certainty for the community and support good transport, stormwater and urban design outcomes. This includes certainty that roads will be delivered and that the interface between industrial developments and the schools and residential properties will be assessed. This approach also provides an opportunity to update the existing precinct provisions</td>
<td>A precinct approach would provide certainty for the community and support good transport, stormwater and urban design outcomes. This includes certainty that roads will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guide subdivision and development in this area.</td>
<td>that there is an existing precinct in the area with the same purpose as would be anticipated for any separate precinct for the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Rationale for the chosen option
Option 2 has been chosen as the preferred option as it will enable the local issues to be addressed in an integrated and efficient manner.

It is considered the most appropriate option as it recognises the local circumstances which warrant a precinct approach while also making efficient use of existing precinct provisions. It also provides an opportunity to seek improvements to the operative precinct provisions for the purposes of clarity and consistency.

The plan change process to date
This section describes the process that has been undertaken to date for the development of the proposed plan change. In doing so it also summarises the key inputs for the proposed changes, including feedback from the public and iwi as well as specialist advice. The details of these inputs are further summarised in Sections 5–7 in relation to each of the resource management issues.

A draft plan change was prepared in 2017 to consider the issues for the area and potential options for addressing them within the precinct provisions. The draft plan change incorporated the following amendments to the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct:

- The addition of a new sub-precinct C for the area bounded by Brigham Creek Road, Hobsonville Road, Rawiri Stream and State Highway 18 to the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct.
- A preferred future road alignment to connect to strategic access points at Brigham Creek Road and Hobsonville Road
- A future road from Whenuapai to show the section of the arterial road that would connect through sub-precinct C to connect Whenuapai and West Harbour
- Standards requiring development and subdivisions within sub-precinct C to provide for the preferred future road alignment and the future arterial road from Whenuapai.
- Restricted Discretionary activity status for buildings along Hobsonville Road and adjacent to Hobsonville Primary School.
- Height in relation to boundary standards for buildings adjacent to Hobsonville Primary School
- A series of assessment criteria for buildings along Hobsonville Road and adjacent to Hobsonville Primary School.
- Minor changes to the provisions for sub-precincts A and B for the purposes of clarity and consistency.

Consultation was held between 6 and 20 November 2018. It involved two public drop-in sessions, a meeting with the Upper Harbour Local Board, letters to landowners, fliers to local residents and a meeting with iwi which was held on 27 November 2018. Key themes of the feedback included:

- Strong support for the need for buildings along Hobsonville Road to apply for resource consent, along with:
  - concern about the appearance and height of development along Hobsonville Road, including its shading effects on residential properties opposite
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- plantings to screen buildings along Hobsonville Road
- concern about the effects of development on Hobsonville Primary School
- notification of applications for buildings along Hobsonville Road
- ensuring the efficient use of industrial land
- considering the use of standards rather than criteria to achieve better design outcomes

- Support in approximately one third of responses for the future roads, and:
  - concern about the high level of traffic on Hobsonville Road, with particular mention of trucks
  - the need for more details about the roads
  - comments about the need for public transport
  - concern about safety around the school
  - the need for interchange improvements

- Ensuring future development enables the planned improvements to the Rawiri stream area, including the stream environment and the provision of walking and cycling access.

- Changes to the wording and format of provisions to ensure their intentions are delivered.

Alongside public and iwi feedback, internal specialist advice has been utilised to develop the proposed provisions. This has included advice from:

- Auckland Transport and their consultants FLOW
- Healthy Waters (stormwater) team, Auckland Council
- Auckland Design Office, Auckland Council
- Practice and Training Team, Western Resource Consents

Summary of the Proposed Plan Change
The Proposed Plan Change built on the draft version to reflect public feedback and specialist inputs. In addition to the changes proposed in the draft (listed above) the proposed plan change includes:

- New objectives and policies relating to:
  - buildings on sites adjoining the school and with frontages along Hobsonville Road in sub-precinct C
  - stormwater
  - transport

- Standards relating to:
  - the design of new roads
  - Height in relation to boundary, yard, fencing and landscaping standards for buildings adjacent to Hobsonville Primary School
  - building height, height in relation to boundary, yards, landscaping for buildings along Hobsonville Road
  - water quality

- Assessment criteria relating to:
  - transport matters for sub-precinct C
  - stormwater quality
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- Application of the SMAF 1 Control to the precinct
- Additional changes to the provisions for sub-precincts A and B for the purposes of updating zone boundaries, clarity and consistency
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5. Transport
This section provides an analysis of the:

- transport issues for Hobsonville Corridor
- desired outcomes for transport within Hobsonville Corridor
- current planning provisions relating to transport issues
- proposed planning response
- the appropriateness of the proposed objectives to meet the purpose of the Act (Section 32(1)(a) of the Act)
- appropriateness of the proposed provisions to achieving the proposed objectives (Sections 32(1)(b) and 32(2) of the Act).

Issues
The overarching transport issue for the precinct is the expected increase in traffic on Hobsonville Road and the related need for additional roads to achieve an integrated transport network within and around the precinct area. These additional roads firstly include the completion of Westpoint Drive, to serve as an alternative route between the western end of Hobsonville Road and SH16. Secondly it involves a future arterial road connecting Whenuapai to West Harbour. The issues and opportunities relating to these two roads are discussed below.

There is also additional commentary below, about the issue of the lack of suitable provisions in the AUP(OP) to ensure the delivery of these roads.

Westpoint Drive

A future road network was identified in Plan Change 14 to the Waiakere District Plan and included a ‘spine road’ to provide an alternative route to Hobsonville Road. Sections of this spine road, Westpoint Drive, have been completed within the proposed sub-precinct C.

The benefits of Westpoint Drive are outlined in the report titled Hobsonville Corridor Precinct: Technical Transportation Assessment June 2017 (Flow Transportation Specialists, Attachment A). These are noted in the assessment of costs and benefits below.

Development in the area was previously subject to planning provisions that required the delivery of this road. However, this sub-precinct is not part of the AUP (OP) and development and subdivision activities are only subject to the relevant zone and Auckland-wide provisions.

The absence of plan provisions to require a new internal road network, in conjunction with more permissive plan provisions in the AUP, results in the a risk that Westpoint Drive will not be completed. The provision of a connected internal road network is reliant on the ability of the Council to advocate for new road connections between existing formed roads or on developers working together to deliver further sections of the network. Due to sites within the precinct being in multiple ownerships, with assumed varied development aspirations, there is a risk that the remaining sections of the road will not be completed.
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In addition to this, there is also potential for new building(s) over the potential alignment of the preferred route for Westpoint Drive as a permitted activity. This will affect and potentially lose the ability to deliver the road.

It is noted that in other parts of Auckland the absence of directive policy and supporting criteria has resulted in formed sections of road (such as Soljan Drive, Henderson as shown in Figure 3) being left unconnected. In Westgate, it has resulted in a Certificate of Compliance being issued for a building in a location which was previously overlaid with an indicative road (between Northside Drive and Kaikano Road) as shown in Figure 4 below.

Figure 3 Soljan Drive, Henderson

Figure 42 Northside Drive, Westgate

An incomplete Westpoint Drive would result in Hobsonville Road being the main access for freight traffic to serve the industrial area. There is potential for this to adversely affect impact negatively on the safe and efficient movement of walkers, cyclists and public transport along Hobsonville Road. The growth of development, business and residential activities within the precinct as well as in neighbouring areas would then occur without the appropriate transport infrastructure to manage effects.

A future arterial road connecting Whenuapai and West Harbour

The planned road network for the Hobsonville Corridor area also includes an arterial road from Whenuapai to West Harbour. Council is rezoning large areas of Whenuapai for housing and business development consistent with the Whenuapai Structure Plan. The Whenuapai Structure Plan anticipates a future arterial road extension from Maina View Road to Speeding Road to the north of SH18. This incorporates a future connection to Westpoint Drive extension within the proposed sub-precinct C area, therefore providing an additional connection between Hobsonville Road and Westpoint Drive. It also provides a quicker route between the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct and the West Harbour Ferry Terminal.

Similar to the completion of Westpoint Drive, there is a need to ensure that future development within the proposed sub-precinct C provides for this new road.
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Desired outcomes
The key transport-related outcomes that are sought through this plan change are:

- Development and subdivision processes consider the form of the road, alignment of the future roads, the connections to access points on Hobsonville and Brigham Creek Roads and its relationship to the vested riparian areas along Rawiri Stream.
- Development and subdivision within sub-precinct C deliver sections of Westpoint Drive so that (over time) it is completed to provide road users with a safe and efficient alternative route to Hobsonville Road. This delivers the benefits listed above under ‘Westpoint Drive’
- The route for the future arterial road connecting Whenuapai and West Harbour is protected
- The adverse effects of future development on Hobsonville Road are reduced
- The relationship of the future spine road with the area of riparian margin owned by council is managed so that the potential for the land to be used for passive recreation is achieved.

This section of the report outlines the current provisions within the AUP(OP) that relate to the transport issue, being the delivery of roads, within sub-precinct C. It also addresses the limited ability of these provisions to deliver the planned road, which is outlined above as a key issue.

Zone and Auckland-wide provisions
This section considers the provisions in the Light Industry zone and Transport sections of the AUP(OP).

None of the zone objectives and policies is focused on achieving development that will result in an effective and efficient road network (new or existing). The only requirement related to roads is that all proposed sites must be provided with legal and physical access to a road (E38.6.2. Access and entrance strips).

The zone has a number of permitted activities that could generate high volumes of traffic, and while there are rules in E27 Transport related to parking requirements and trip generation, many of the permitted activities in the zone will not be managed by the development thresholds of Table E27.6.1.1. This is due in part to the combination of the thresholds specified in E27.6.1.1 with the potential for small sites to be created under the E38 Subdivision provisions for the Light Industry Zone. In addition the zone allows for a significant level of development, including up to 20m of building height. Together this means that there is the potential for a high number of freight and vehicle movements along Hobsonville Road as assessed by Flow Transportation Ltd in Attachment A.

Attachment B contains a list of permitted activities that may not trigger the assessment required in E27.6.11.
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Subdivision provisions

The subdivision provisions in E38 Subdivision-Urban of the AUP (OP) provide limited opportunity for the Council to ensure an integrated and connected road network for this land.

The assessment matters that the Council will consider in relation to subdivision around existing buildings and development; and subdivision in accordance with an approved land use resource consent are set out in E38.12.2(6). The only criterion that the Council could potentially rely on if a subdivision prevented delivery of new roads or extension of existing road sections is set out in (a)(ii). This relates to whether there is appropriate provision made for infrastructure. However, case law (attached in Attachment C) highlights that there are legal limits to Council’s ability to require an application to address the appropriateness of connections to the road network.

Subdivision occurring after a building has been constructed is unlikely to be declined on the basis that there is no appropriate provision for infrastructure, as the existing building will have already included conditions of resource consent that manage the effects. In addition Council cannot include a consent condition requiring land to be provided to form a new road (or a section of new road) or for an applicant to pay for a new road unless it can be shown that the requirement is fair and reasonably related to the subdivision. If a building is permitted without the need for a road, requiring the applicant to provide a road when the land is subdivided is likely to be considered to be unlawful.

The assessment criteria for subdivision of vacant sites and subdivision in accordance with approved land use are set out in E38.12.2 (7) for all other restricted discretionary activity subdivisions. These matters include:

(a) the effect of the design and layout of sites to achieve the purposes of the zone or zones and to provide safe legible and convenient access to a legal road

(e) the effect of the layout, design and pattern of blocks and roads in so far as they contribute to enabling a liveable, walkable and connected neighbourhood

(g) the effects arising from any significant increase in traffic volumes on the existing road network

Policies E38.3 (10), (12), (15), (16) and (17) are relevant; however the Light Industry zone’s description, objectives and policies are not focused on achieving development that will result in an effective and efficient road network. As a result, it may be possible for an applicant to argue that:

- providing safe legible and convenient access to a legal road can be achieved without providing a new road or an extension to the sections of Westpoint Drive that have already been formed and vested in Council
- there is no significant increase in traffic volumes
- the layout of the block and road in enabling a liveable, walkable and connected neighbourhood is not relevant for a light industry area and/or
- the land is zoned without a precinct overlaying it, meaning that there are no characteristics / values that need to be considered or given priority
Evaluation of the proposed objectives
This section of the report fulfils Section 32(1) (a) of the Resource Management Act, which requires an examination of the extent to which the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. It assesses whether the objectives are relevant, achievable and acceptable.

The plan change introduces the following objective relating to transport:

l603.2 (5) Transport linkages within the precinct provide direct, alternative routes to using Hobsonville Road and the State Highway network.

Relevance
Objective l603.2 (5) will meet the purpose of the Act by providing for new road networks. This will ensure the potential of physical resources to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations and avoid or mitigate adverse effects of development on the environment. It is also particularly related to the ‘efficient use and development of natural and physical resources’ under section 7(b) of the Act.

The proposed objective will contribute to the objectives of the regional policy statement in the AUP (OP) relating to a connected transport network and achieving a quality compact urban growth and form, in particular objective B2.2.1(1):

A quality compact urban form that enables all of the following:
(a) a higher-quality urban environment;
(b) greater productivity and economic growth;
(c) better use of existing infrastructure and efficient provision of new infrastructure;
(g) reduced adverse environmental effects.

The proposed objective is also relevant to the objectives of the NPS on Urban Development Capacity, the Supporting Growth programme and the Auckland Plan.

It is also directly relevant to, and will support the following purpose and objectives within the operative precinct provisions:

- the purpose of the Hobsonville Corridor precinct being to deliver an integrated land use and transport outcomes
- Objective 2: transport and land use patterns are integrated, particularly around the Brigham Creek interchange to achieve a sustainable, liveable community
- Objective 5: Pedestrian linkages are promoted through the sub-precincts

Acceptability
The proposed objective provides additional detail to the operative objectives for the precinct. In doing so, it reflects the outcomes sought in the operative precinct, which were tested through planning processes and were concluded to be consistent with the purpose of the Act. The level of development potential, as well the transport effects of development, remain key transport issues as they were though these earlier processes. The proposed objective
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also reflects feedback provided on the draft version of the plan change. For these reasons it is considered to be acceptable.

Achievability

The proposed objective is considered to be achievable through the suite of provisions proposed within the plan change for sub-precinct C, as outlined below. It also will be achieved through operative provisions for sub-precincts A and B.

Proposed planning response

This plan change proposes the following new and amended provisions relating to transport:

Policy

1603.3-(6) (21) Require the provision of road connections through sites.

(a) as generally indicated on 1603.10.12 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 42- Sub-precincts A and B and 1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3- Sub-precinct C.

(b) to connect to identified strategic access points indicated in 1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C and with existing roads or road sections in Sub-precinct C.

(c) to provide direct road linkages to and through the precinct as an alternative to using Hobsonville Road and the State Highway network as indicated in 1603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2 – Sub-precincts A and B and 1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C.

(d) to enable the existing road network to be expanded or extended to adjacent land (including aligning with any new proposed connections to or over the state highway) to support safe and efficient movement within the precinct and to and from the surrounding transport network.

Activities

The proposed provisions indicate a Discretionary activity status for development of subdivision that does not comply with one or more of the standards contained in 1603.6.1 or 1603.2 (discussed below).

Standards

1603.6.1 Standards - subdivision and development

Purpose: ensure that roads are constructed to serve development in general accordance with 1603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2 Sub-precincts A and B and 1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C.

(1) Any subdivision or development of a site that contains an indicative future road or a preferred future road alignment must include the development of that road in general accordance with 1603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2 – Sub-precincts A and B-, and 1603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C.
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(2) Any subdivision or development of a site that contains the indicative arterial road as shown in I603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C must provide for that new road.

(3) No structure will be located within an indicative future road, preferred future road alignment or indicative arterial road as identified in the I603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2 – Sub-precincts A and B and I603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C, unless an alternative road alignment has been approved by resource consent.

**1603.6.2 Standards – New Roads**

Purpose: ensure that roads are constructed to serve development in general accordance with I603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2 Sub-precincts A and B and I603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C.

(1) Any new road required under I603.6.1 above must be designed and constructed to meet its operational and functional requirements.

(2) Where the site includes the terminus of an indicative future road or a preferred future road alignment it must be designed to connect to the identified ‘strategic access points’ on I603.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C.

(3) Any new road or section of road as required in I603.6.2(1) or (2) above must connect with existing formed section(s) and consented alignments on adjacent sites and must be designed to the same standard (to accommodate the same transport modes) as those existing and consented formed sections(s) of road that it connects to.

**Matters of Discretion**

(1) Subdivision in Sub-precinct C

(a) location of roads and connections with neighbouring sites

(b) functional requirements of the transport network and different transport modes

(c) site and vehicle access including roads, rights of way, and vehicle crossings

(d) construction of indicative roads

**Assessment Criteria**

I603.6.2 (w) The design and alignment of any new road should not compromise the function of the state highway network

Sub-precinct C

(x) the extent to which any development or subdivision layout:
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i. is consistent with and provides for the preferred future road alignments and indicative arterial road shown on the ISG3.10.3 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 3 – Sub-precinct C.
ii. complies with the AT Code of Practice or any equivalent standard that replaces it
iii. provides for the functional requirements of the existing or proposed transport network and different transport modes
iv. provides for roads to the site boundaries to enable connections with neighbouring sites
v. minimises vehicle crossings to on existing or planned arterial roads by providing access from a side road, rear lane, or slip lane.

(y) the design and alignment of Westpoint Drive should include consideration of any interface with the planned walkway along Rawiri Stream.

Diagrams

The plan change incorporates the following transport related changes to the diagrams:

a) A new Precinct Plan 3, which includes the following items for Sub-precinct C:
   • Preferred future road alignment
   • Indicative arterial road
   • Strategic access point locations along Brigham Creek Road and Hobsonville Road

b) Changes to Precinct Plan 2 (which contains information formerly shown on precinct plans 1 and 2):
   • Revision of the locations of strategic access points along Brigham Creek to reflect current circumstances and for consistency with the new Precinct Plan 3.
   • Removal of the indicative bus, pedestrian and cycle routes (discussed further in section 8 of this report).

Assessment of the proposed provisions
This section provides an evaluation of the proposed provisions as required by Section 32 of the Act. This assessment includes:

- the risks of acting or not acting and whether the provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the objective,
- any other options available to achieve the outcomes, and
- the costs, benefits, efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed provisions

Risk assessment
Section 32(2)(c) requires an assessment of the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the plan change. This s32 evaluation process includes a transportation assessment (Flow report, Attachment A), which has been prepared
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to understand the effects of the plan change. Based on this assessment, it is considered that sufficient information has been gathered to justify proceeding with the proposed plan change and that the risk of acting on this information is less than not acting and adopting a reactive approach to development within the plan change area.

Assessment of other options

As discussed in Section 4 above, in considering options for the transport issues in the area, the option to designate the land required for road purposes was considered. In the case of the preferred future road alignment in sub-precinct C this option is not considered an appropriate method to achieve the objectives. This is because Auckland Transport does not designate Local roads or have funding in place for Westpoint Road. In addition, the delivery of the road has been undertaken by developers to date and it is therefore considered most appropriate to continue this form of delivery through provisions relating to private development and subdivision.

The land for the future arterial road will be progressed through a future designation process. At this stage, its inclusion in this precinct is for information and development that takes cognisance of this will act to protect this route.

Assessment of efficiency and effectiveness

Effectiveness

The proposed provisions will be effective in ensuring that the objective will be met. Together they require the delivery of the preferred future road alignment and the protection of the future arterial route. The provisions include these requirements through diagrams and standards. The proposed provisions will ensure that the roads are effective in terms of function and design. The provisions require a Discretionary assessment if standards are not met, and include appropriate policies to guide this assessment. The assessment criteria will also be effective in managing the transport effects of proposed developments.

Efficiency

The proposed provisions reflect an efficient approach to realising the stated objective. They will work together to ensure the roads are delivered in an integrated and therefore efficient manner as opposed to relying on advocacy on a site by site and development by development basis.

Assessment of costs and benefits

The following table provides an assessment of the proposed provisions as required by Section 32(b) of the Act.

Note: Section 32(2) (b) of the RMA requires costs and benefits to be quantified where practicable. The costs relating to transport are unable to be quantified as they relate to the complexity and scale of delivering the road on specific sites as well as the unique costs relating to consent costs, stormwater requirements and design objectives for each developer. The table below instead provides a description of the types of costs associated with the proposed transport provisions.
### Table 3: Costs and Benefits of Transport Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>The planned road connections will result in improved network resilience; improved connectivity; reduced traffic on Hobsonville Road; improved opportunities for bus priority measures on Hobsonville Road; improved walking and cycling environment on Hobsonville Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased impervious area within the precinct.</td>
<td>Encourages connectivity to the wider transport network including the State Highway network and Whenuaapai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stormwater from new roads will be captured and passed through stormwater treatment devices that remove the majority of contamination from the roads and are sized, designed and provided as part of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internalising some of the noise from additional traffic into the sub-precinct. Noise from traffic using the spine road or the new arterial road within the precinct is not considered to be an issue. The adjoining land has a noise limit of 65dB L_{Aeq}.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Cultural</td>
<td>There are social benefits related to all of the environmental benefits listed above. These include access to a variety of modes of transport, and an enhanced environment along Hobsonville Road to encourage walking and cycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less flexibility for developers with regard to locating development and constructing the proposed spine road.</td>
<td>Westpoint Drive will also deliver benefits to the school community by reducing traffic on Hobsonville Road, and thereby providing more opportunities for safe crossings. This will reduce the severance of the school to its residential catchment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty about the final alignment on adjacent sites could affect the ease by which some landowners can plan for future development of their site.</td>
<td>The new road network has the potential to reduce travel times across the wider transport network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any application will go through a restricted discretionary activity application</td>
<td>The new road network would reduce the pressure for additional vehicle crossings to Hobsonville Road to serve new development. This will reduce the adverse effects of crossings on its arterial function, thereby enhancing the multi-modal functions of the Hobsonville Road corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The provisions include the need to develop the road in ‘general accordance with the road locations on the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Process and may be declined.</th>
<th>Benefits arising from the accessibility and visibility of industrial premises fronting Westpoint Drive.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of some land on some development sites to provide for the roads.</td>
<td>Delivery of the new roads and stormwater infrastructure as part of the subdivision/development design process for sites means that the developer will be able to respond to a range of land-use, visual, environmental, technical, construction, operation and maintenance considerations that will result in a more integrated and cost-efficient outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs to developer of constructing sections of Westpoint Drive, including required stormwater management.</td>
<td>While costs associated with the provision of additional infrastructure to service growth will be primarily borne by developers, it is noted that it is common for developers to provide internal road networks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of traffic signals at new road intersections will be a cost for developers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites fronting Hobsonville Road will have less opportunity to take advantage of direct access for passing traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6. Urban Design
This section provides an analysis of the:

- Urban design issues for Hobsonville Corridor
- desired urban design outcomes for Hobsonville Corridor
- current planning provisions relating to urban design
- appropriateness of the proposed objectives to meet the purpose of the Act (Section 32 (1)(a) of the Act)
- proposed planning response
- proposed provisions and how they will achieve the proposed objectives (Sections 32(1) (b) and 32(2) of the Act).

Issues
There are emerging issues relating to the interface of development within the Light Industry zone in the proposed sub-precinct C area, and the surrounding residential and school land uses. The scale of development that is possible under the Light Industry zone provisions has the potential to dominate and shade the residential properties on the eastern side of Hobsonville Road. It also has the potential to adversely affect the amenity of the school, residents and users of Hobsonville Road.

Dominance effects
Developments within the Light Industry Zone have potential dominance effects on residential properties, Hobsonville Primary School and the street environment. These effects include an overshadowing built form, when compared to the difference in scale of development in the existing residential environment. This scale will result in visual effects, by restricting views and the sense of spaciousness for the residential and school environments.

Development under the Light Industry provisions has a maximum permitted height of 20 metres and a front yard requirement of 2m. Standard H17.6.2 within the Light Industry Zone sets out a height in relation to boundary requirement for developments located across the road from residential zones. There are no side/rear yards or height in relation to boundary controls on the school boundaries as the school is zoned Light Industry rather than Special Purpose– School Zone.

Recent development along Hobsonville Road demonstrates the dominance effects. These photos below were taken in October 2017 and illustrate these effects in relation to the recently constructed storage unit facility located at 110 Hobsonville Road. It should be noted that with an approximate height of 15m and a 5m front yard, this development does not represent the full extent of the development permitted in the zone.
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Figure 5 - Photo taken from the eastern side of Hobsonville Road

Figure 6 - Photo taken from Suncrest Drive, showing the roofline of Hobsonville Road properties and the storage facility behind.
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Figure 7: Photo taken from Westpoint Drive, showing the storage facility (left) in relation to the Hobsonville primary school (right).

Shading effects

An assessment has been undertaken to demonstrate the shading effects of buildings designed to the maximum extent of the permitted height and yard standards.

The following diagrams show that the extent to which the residential properties opposite the Light Industry zone will be in shade by 3pm during winter and the September equinox, and by 5pm in summer. It should be noted that this analysis has not incorporated any change in gradient, but that there is no significant change in gradient between the two sides of Hobsonville Road. A full set of shading diagrams is included as Attachment D.

Figure 6: Shading effects of a building designed to maximise height and coverage under the operative Light Industry Zone provisions at 3pm in Winter.
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Figure 7: Shading effects of a building designed to maximise height and coverage under the operative Light Industry Zone provisions at 6pm in summer.

Figure 8: Shading effects of a building designed to maximise height and coverage under the operative Light Industry Zone provisions at 3pm at the September equinox.

The shading diagrams show that there is potential for significant shading effects on the residential properties from development within the Light Industry zone.

**Desired outcomes**

The desired outcomes for urban design relate to the interface between Light Industry and residential and school properties and include:

- a good standard of visual amenity for residential and school properties,
- reducing the shading effects of Light Industry development on the residential and school properties, and
- reducing the dominance effects of Light Industry development on the residential and school properties
Current planning provisions
The operative planning provisions for the Light Industry zone and which relate to the interface between this zone and neighbouring residential and school activities include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Light Industry Zone Standards</th>
<th>When a site is opposite residential zone on Hobsonville Road</th>
<th>When a site is adjacent to Hobsonville Primary School (which is not zoned as Special Purpose School zone)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum height</td>
<td>20m</td>
<td>20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height in relation to boundary</td>
<td>6m plus 35 degree recession plane from the residential boundaries</td>
<td>No relevant standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard</td>
<td>2m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side and rear yards</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping of yards</td>
<td>The full extent must be planted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage and screening</td>
<td>Outdoor storage or rubbish areas must be screened with landscaping or a solid 1.5m high wall/fence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of the proposed objectives
This section of the report fulfils Section 32(1) (a) of the Resource Management Act, which requires an examination of the extent to which the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. It assesses whether the objectives are relevant, achievable and acceptable.

The plan change introduces the following objective relating to urban design within sub-precinct C:

Sub-precinct C

(13) Development along Hobsonville Road and adjacent to Hobsonville Primary School provides a good amenity interface with the residential properties on the opposite side of Hobsonville Road as well as with the school.

Relevance

Objective 13 is considered the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. It particularly relates to the management of physical resources in a way that enables people to provide for their social wellbeing and health. It also directly relates to the 'maintenance and enhancement of amenity values' as listed in Section (7) of the Act.
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This objective also relates to, and reflects, the following objectives of the Light Industry Zone:

- Development avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the amenity of adjacent public open spaces and residential zones
- Adverse effects on amenity values and the natural environment, both within the zone and on adjacent areas, are managed.

Objective 13 is directly relevant to the issues relating to the interface between industrial development and neighbouring residential and school land uses.

Achievability

Objective 13 is achievable through the assessment of applications on sites adjacent to the school and along Hobsonville Road. The plan change proposes a restricted discretionary status for developments on these sites. It proposes a suite of policies, standards and criteria to deliver this objective. These are described and assessed below.

Sub-precinct C has significant un-met development potential, including along Hobsonville Road and around the primary school. This enhances the achievability of this objective, as future development proposals will be subject to the precinct provisions.

Acceptability

Objective 13 reflects the approach that was developed as a plan change to the legacy Waitakere District Plan. It therefore has been previously tested by planning processes including expert advice and scrutiny, submissions and hearings.

Recent feedback received on the draft version of this plan change has reinforced the need for, and therefore the acceptability of, such an objective for development in these two interface areas.

Proposed planning response

This plan change proposes the following provisions relating to urban design in sub-precinct C:

I603.3 Policies

Built form in sub-precinct C

(15) Manage development along Hobsonville Road and adjacent to Hobsonville Primary School to provide visual amenity for the school and properties on the eastern side of Hobsonville Road.

I603.4 Activity Table

The following activities are proposed within the activity table for Sub-precinct C:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A34</th>
<th>New buildings that have a frontage to Hobsonville Road or are on sites adjoining Hobsonville Primary</th>
<th>RD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A35)</td>
<td>External alterations and additions to buildings that have a frontage to Hobsonville Road or are on sites adjoinig Hobsonville Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A36)</td>
<td>Development that does not comply with one or more of the standards contained in L603.6.1, L603.6.2, L603.6.4, L603.6.6 or L603.6.7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standards

**L603.6.6 Standards - New buildings and external alterations and additions to buildings fronting Hobsonville Road in Sub-precinct C**

**Purpose:** Manage the adverse effects of development fronting Hobsonville Road on the residential properties on the eastern side of the road.

1. **New buildings and external alternations and additions must have a front yard of 8m.**
2. **Front yards must not be used for storage of materials or waste.**
3. **The front yard must be planted with a mix of grasses, shrubs and trees for a minimum depth of 3m.**
4. **New buildings and additions on sites fronting Hobsonville Road in sub-precinct C must not exceed the following standards, as shown in Figure 1 below:**
   - A height of 10m above the finished level of the street for a minimum depth of 10m from the building frontage for a minimum of 50% of that frontage.
   - 20m above the finished level of the street for the remaining depth of the building.
   - Any part of a building that is more than 10m high must be setback by a minimum of 10m from the building frontage.
5. **Buildings must not project beyond a 30 degree recession plane measured from a point 5m vertically above ground level along the boundary of the residential zone, measured at the road boundary, as shown in Figure 1 below:**
Figure 1: Sub-precinct C - Maximum Height and Height in Relation to Boundary standards

I603.6.7 Standards - Development and subdivision on sites adjoining Hobsonville Primary School

Purpose: ensure development adjoining the Hobsonville Primary School mitigates adverse effects on the school.

(1) A landscape buffer of 3m in depth should be provided prior to the construction of the buildings on all sites identified with Landscape Frontage Areas on Precinct Plan 5, to the satisfaction of Council.

(2) The landscape buffer required in I603.6.7(1) above must be planted in a manner that will mitigate the potential adverse effects of proposed development and activities on the school.

(3) Continuous acoustic fencing must be provided for the entire length of property boundaries with the school, to the satisfaction of Council.

(4) Buildings on sites identified with Landscape Frontage Area A1 on Precinct Plan 5 must be setback by 9 metres from the boundary with Hobsonville Primary School.

(5) A 3 metre wide landscaped area must be provided within the 9 metre building setback required in I603.6.7(4), to the satisfaction of Council. This is in addition to the landscape buffer described in I603.6.7(1) above.
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(6) Buildings on all sites with Landscape Frontage Area A2 or Landscape Frontage Area B on Precinct Plan 5 must be setback by at least 5 metres from the boundary with Hobsonville Primary School.

(7) New buildings and external alterations and additions on sites identified with Landscape Frontage Area A1 or Landscape Frontage Area A2 on Precinct Plan 5: Landscape Frontage Areas must be contained within a recession plane of no more than 35 degrees as measured from any relevant point 2.5m vertically above ground level on that boundary.

(8) New buildings and external alterations and additions on sites identified with Landscape Frontage Area B on Precinct Plan 5: Landscape Frontage Areas must be contained within a recession plane of no more than 45 degrees as measured from any relevant point 2.5m vertically above ground level on that boundary.

Matters of Discretion

(2) Buildings or development:

(b) in sub-precinct C, building interface with residential properties and Hobsonville Primary School

Assessment Criteria for restricted discretionary activities

Sub-precinct C

(r) The frontage of any proposed development or buildings on sites that front Hobsonville Road or adjoin Hobsonville Primary School should achieve a good standard of visual amenity for the residential properties along Hobsonville Road and for the school, through such methods as:

i. design articulation

ii. glazing

iii. selection of trees that will achieve mature heights that will mitigate the bulk and height of buildings and soften the built form of development

Precinct Diagrams

The proposed plan change proposes the following new Precinct Plan 5: Landscape Frontage Areas
Assessment of the proposed provisions

Risk assessment

Section 32(2) (c) requires an assessment of the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the plan change. There is information to support the proposed urban design provisions, including from public feedback and from analysis of the current planning provisions, as discussed in relation to the urban design issues above. The risks of acting are considered to outweigh those of not acting and as such it is considered appropriate to proceed with the proposed urban design provisions.

Assessment of other options

In considering options to address the urban design issue, the option of rezoning land within sub-precinct C was considered. Given that the issues relate to the interface between the Light Industry zone development and residential properties and the school, this option was considered specifically for the properties within the Light Industry zone that have those interfaces.

It is anticipated that the General Business zone could deliver better urban design outcomes for the interface areas, given that this zone permits 16.5m height (Standard H14.6.1) and has a specific Height in Relation to boundary standard (H14.6.2) for residential interface areas. However, the activities permitted within this zone would effectively spread the types
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of activities also anticipated in the Local Centre and Mixed Use zones further south along Hobsonville Road. This would not support the objectives for sub-precincts A and B. These objectives seek to focus these types of activities in these two sub-precinct areas in order to develop a defined centre for local residents. Furthermore, Light industry land is in short supply across Auckland and therefore it is important that this zone be retained for the land within sub-precinct c.

Assessment of costs, benefits, efficiency and effectiveness

The following table provides an assessment of the proposed provisions (outlined in Section 6.5.1 above) as required by Section 32(b) of the Act. This assessment considers whether the provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the objective.

Note: Section 32(2) (b) of the RMA requires costs and benefits to be quantified where practicable. The costs relating to the proposed provisions are unable to be quantified as they relate to the complexity and scale of each proposal and site.
### Table 4: Assessment of the Proposed Urban Design Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The standards may reduce the overall volume of development able to be achieved on the site.</td>
<td>Retains the Light Industry zone, contributing towards the city-wide lack of such land.</td>
<td>Retains status quo of maximum overall height, and therefore largely consistent with Light Industry zone controls.</td>
<td>Using a standard will provide greater certainty of outcome than only relying on assessment criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| There will be additional costs for developers to deliver the landscaping requirements | The provisions:  
- provide for a “human scale” building frontage, which is a more appropriate interface for residential neighbours and the school community.  
- provide greater amenity by way of stepped building envelope along Hobsonville Road  
- allow for design of generous 2-3 storey office, entrance or similar frontage along corridor  
- reduce the dominance of built form by increasing distance between residential activities and larger built forms in the LI zone  
- minimise shading onto residential properties (refer to Attachment 4)  
- do not prejudice car parking in front of development  
- allow for design of a legible street front entrance  
- seek to achieve good amenity and attractive streetscape for the Hobsonville Road corridor | The proposed standards only apply to those sites where development will most affect residential and school activities. They therefore work to reduce dominance and shading effects in a way that minimises the reduction of development capacity within the area. | Standard is clear, simple to understand, apply, administer |
| | | The reduction of maximum height only applies to the first 10 m of building, and therefore is more cost efficient in terms of ensuring development capacity than applying this restriction to the whole site. | Managing the placement of buildings on site is one of the most effective ways of mitigating adverse environmental effects. |
| | | The use of standards allows for certainty in the assessment of resource consent applications. | Front yard controls are proven methods of reducing building dominance for taller buildings. |
| | | The standards are consistent with the current consent notice applying to several properties next to the school. | Landscape requirements are an effective way to soften/reduce effects of building bulk |
| | | | Minimising heights will have direct effect on reducing shading and dominance. |
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7. Stormwater Management

This section firstly sets out some background information relating to the current and proposed stormwater management approaches in the Hobsonville Corridor area. It then provides an assessment of the plan change in relation to the two key stormwater issues of hydrology mitigation and water quality.

The following analysis is provided for each key issue:

- A description of the issue
- desired outcomes
- current planning provisions relating to the issue
- the proposed planning response
- the appropriateness of the proposed objectives to meet the purpose of the Act
  (Section 32 (1)(a) of the Act)
- the appropriateness of the proposed provisions to achieving the proposed objectives
  (Sections 32(1) (b) and 32(2) of the Act).

Background

The Hobsonville Corridor Precinct discharges to the Waiaroha Inlet which a tributary of the Upper Waitemata Harbour. There is no direct discharge of stormwater to the Waiaroha Inlet as the Brigham Creek interchange of SH18 cuts off direct access. The Hobsonville Corridor Precinct has undergone some development already with consents granted under previous planning regimes and some communal devices (wetlands) were installed to manage stormwater.

The approach to stormwater management has changed since consents for communal stormwater devices were granted and the new approach is embodied in the AUP(OP). The new approach directs for on-site reduction of contaminants and water quality treatment as close to source as possible be applied. An on-site approach enables greater flexibility in use of the land and achieves greater water quality than large scale communal devices can provide.

The Hobsonville Corridor Precinct is subject to the Waiaroha Stream Network Discharge Consent (the ‘NDC’). The NDC was varied in December 2016 to reflect the direction of the AUP (OP), changing land use and stormwater management requirements to protect the Waiaroha Stream receiving environment. It applies a higher level of water quality treatment to the Hobsonville Corridor area than required by the region wide rules of the AUP (OP).

The NDC will be superseded in the future by the Auckland Wide Network Discharge Consent. The standards in that consent may or may not be the same as is currently expressed in the NDC. In light of this, the proposed precinct provisions outlined below reflect the specific requirements of the NDC. This approach is taken to ensure that the current approach to both hydrology mitigation and water quality treatment is retained within the precinct regardless of changes to network discharge consents.
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Hydrology mitigation

Issues
Development within the precinct has and will change the natural hydrology. Development contributes to changes in stream base flows, groundwater levels and increased erosion in the receiving environment. It can also increase flooding risk by increasing the volume of water that flows into drains and streams during rain events.

Desired outcome
The desired outcome is to reflect the ‘retain and detrain’ approach to hydrology mitigation that the current Waiaroha Stream NDC requires. This will ensure that changes to hydrology are minimised, in order to minimise the effects of greater water volumes into the receiving environment (including erosion) and to maintain groundwater levels.

Current planning provisions
Policy E1.3.8(c) of the AUP (OP) directs that impacts on hydrology are minimised or mitigated. However it does not provide specific guidance on how this should be achieved in greenfield sites.

Other provisions in the AUP (OP), particularly Policies E1.3.10 and E1.3.13 encourage quality and quantity management at source. However, how this may be achieved depends on site specific factors such as soil type and anticipated land use.

Proposed planning response
This plan change seeks to apply the Stormwater Management Area Flow 1 (SMAF 1) control to the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct area to address the issue of hydrology mitigation. This is the same requirement as in the existing NDC. The SMAF 1 control is currently applied to brownfield sites which contain streams sensitive to increased stormwater flow and volume.

SMAF 1 is an approach to hydrology mitigation which takes into account factors such as soil type and infiltration rates. It works by retaining a portion of the stormwater runoff and detaining the rain event for slow release into the environment. The SMAF 1 control requires retention of the first 5mm of runoff (which is the volume reduction) and detention of the 95th percentile of a 24 hour rain event.

The combined effect of this retention and detention is to reduce the volume of water that discharges into streams and estuaries thus reducing erosion and maintaining more consistent base flows. The full technical explanation for SMAF 1 is described in detail in Technical Report 2013/35 - Auckland Unitary Plan stormwater management provisions: Technical basis of contaminant and volume management requirements. An extract from the Executive Summary explains this rational and is included as Attachment E to this report.

Evaluation of the proposed objectives
This section of the report fulfils Section 32(1) (a) of the Resource Management Act which requires an examination of the extent to which the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. It assesses whether the objectives are relevant, achievable and acceptable.
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The plan change replaces the operative precinct objective relating to stormwater, with text as follows:

603.2 (7) Stormwater management and treatment mitigates adverse effects of development on the receiving environments.

This is a high-level objective that relates to both of the key issues (hydrology mitigation and water quality) discussed below.

Relevance

Objective 7 is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. It clearly sets out the objective of managing stormwater to mitigate its effects. It contributes to achieving the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and therefore the purpose of the Act. It also directly relates to the ‘matter of national importance’ (a), as well as the ‘other matters’ (d), (f) and (g) of the Act, as listed in Sections 6 and 7 of the Act:

Section 6
(a) the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development;

Section 7
(d) intrinsic values of ecosystems
(f) maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment
(g) any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources

Achievability

Objective 7 is achievable through the operative Auckland-wide provisions relating to the management of stormwater, as well as through the proposed provisions for the precinct, outlined below.

Acceptability

The proposed Objective 7 is considered acceptable given that it aligns with the objectives within the Auckland-wide provisions and that it does not alter the intent of the precinct objective.

An assessment of the proposed provisions

This section considers whether the provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the objective.

The application of the SMAF 1 control in the precinct provides the same level of requirement as within the Waiaurhoa Inlet NDC. SMAF 1 is therefore considered an appropriate way to reflect the retention and detention requirements for hydrology mitigation that are set out in the NDC.
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It is also considered the most appropriate option for ensuring that the objective is met, for the reasons discussed below:

- The precinct is developing into an urbanised catchment for which SMAF 1 was designed.
- The soil type is suitable for the retention and detention approach. The 5mm retention volume and 95th percentile runoff detention specifications in the NDC mirror that of the SMAF 1 control.
- SMAF 1 is applied in neighbouring catchments south and north of the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct.
- Devices used to meet SMAF requirements can, with minor modification, be designed to meet the water quality treatment proposed for this precinct.
- Where stormwater is designed to a communal device SMAF controls require the retention of 5mm runoff which is the volume reduction part of the SMAF control.

Risk assessment

Section 32(2) (c) requires an assessment of the risk of not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the plan change. The existing NDC for this area considered the local issues and requirements and the requirements proposed within this plan change reflect the NDC. This NDC is considered to be information to support this plan change. In addition, there is uncertain information as to the details of the future Auckland wide Network Discharge consent and whether it will provide the same level of protection for the receiving environment. Given this, the risks of not acting outweigh the risks of acting and it is considered appropriate to proceed with the plan change in respect of the proposed stormwater provisions.

Assessment of costs, benefits, efficiency and effectiveness

The table below provides an analysis of the application of SMAF within the precinct, as required by Section 32(a) of the Act:

Note that Section 32(2) (b) of the RMA requires costs and benefits to be quantified where practicable. The costs relating to the application of SMAF 1 overlay are unable to be quantified as they relate to the specifics of each site and proposal. However, as stated below these costs are not expected to be higher than those associated with current consent requirements.

Table 5: Costs and Benefits of Proposed Provisions for Hydrology Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

47
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| The proposed approach is not expected to impose additional cost to land owners over and above that required by the current NDC | This approach will make the stormwater requirements clear and certain in the precinct provisions. Should the Waiaoraha NDC be superseded in the future, the stormwater management approach will be retained without causing confusion for developers and land users. | This approach is no different to what is already required under the Waiaoraha NDC and therefore is efficient in terms of not unnecessarily developing new landowner requirements to meet the provisions. | Applying the ‘retention and detention’ approach via the SMAF 1 control results in greater visibility on the application of retention and detention, as opposed to relying on compliance with the connection standards of an NDC. |

Water quality treatment

Issues
Stormwater can convey contaminants into receiving environments. Any stormwater infrastructure designed now will have an effect on the receiving environment for decades into the future. Contaminants of concern for the Auckland region identified in Technical Report 2013/35 - Auckland Unitary Plan stormwater management provisions: Technical basis of contaminant and volume management requirements (TR2013/35) were sediment, heavy metals and nutrients.

Policy B7.4.2 (8) of the AUP(OP) is to “Progressively improve water quality in areas identified as having degraded water quality through managing subdivision, use, development and discharges,” with the Waiaoraha Stream and Upper Waitemata Harbour being identified as degraded due to human activities (see Figure B7.4.2, AUP(OP). However, long term ecological monitoring of the area where the Waiaoraha Stream discharges into the Upper Waitemata ranks the Waiaoraha Stream as green in the Environmental Response Criteria. Trends since 2005 are that fine sediment is increasing, most notably in the last two years of monitoring, while heavy metal contaminants are slowly decreasing.

The AUP (OP) directs that “freshwater systems are enhanced unless irreversibly degraded by land use” (Policy E1.3 (3)). The information from the long term sampling sites near Waiaoraha Stream supports that all effort should be made to prevent further degradation to the receiving environment and enhance it over time.
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 Desired outcome
 The desired outcome is for a high level of at source water quality treatment in order to enhance the sensitive receiving environment of the Waiarohia Inlet, and prevent further degradation.

 Current planning provisions
 Water quality policies are found in E1.3 (2), 1.3(3), 1.3 (8), 1.3(10) – (14) of the AUP (CP).

 Chapter E9 defines high contaminant generating activities, which includes high use roads and car parks and use of certain building materials. Specific treatment guidelines are given in E9 if the triggers for high contaminant generating activities are met.

 Chapter E8 addresses discharges and diversions to the stormwater network, which are permitted if standards are met. Chapter E8 does not address the water quality treatment of the discharge, which is what the proposed precinct standard seeks to address.

 Proposed planning response
 The proposed plan change inserts the following regional plan activity and standard into the precinct provisions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A22), (A29)</th>
<th>Development of new or redevelopment of impervious areas</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

i603.6.3 Development of new or redevelopment of impervious areas

(1) Impervious areas where stormwater runoff is directed to an approved communal stormwater management device designed to achieve 75% total suspended solids removal and extended detention stormwater quality treatment must:

a. Use inert building materials that do not have an exposed surface made from contaminants of concern to water quality (i.e. zinc, copper, and lead); and

b. Achieve stormwater quality treatment at-source for all high use roads and high contaminant generating car parks using a filtration device (or similar) designed to remove metals and hydrocarbons in accordance with Technical Publication 10: Design Guideline Manual for Stormwater Treatment Devices (2003); or


(2) All other impervious areas (except inert building materials) must achieve stormwater quality treatment at-source in accordance with Auckland Council Technical Publication 10: Design Guideline Manual for Stormwater Treatment Devices (2003). (Note: the implementation of bio-retention devices to achieve retention in accordance with Table E10.6.3.1.1 Hydrology mitigation requirements are considered to achieve this standard).
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Evaluation of the proposed objectives
As discussed above, the proposed plan change proposes changes to objective 7. As this objective relates to all of the stormwater topics in this report, refer to the section above relating to hydrology mitigation for the analysis of this objective as required under the Act.

An assessment of the proposed provisions
The precinct standard requires a higher level of treatment than the Auckland-wide rules. It achieves a higher level of treatment for all contaminant generating impervious areas and ensures that all road surfaces are treated. This recognises the risk that contaminants generated on roads pose to the environment and that cumulative effects are significant to already degraded receiving environments. The standard has been drafted to reflect the water quality treatment aspects of Condition 3 in the NDC and to ensure that there is no duplication with existing region wide rules in the AUP(OP). Standard (1) requires additional treatment above 75% TSS to address contaminants from industrial/commercial activities.

The precinct standard will take precedence over the regional E9 rules and as such the activity tables in the precinct are proposed to be amended to make reference to including a regional standard.

Risk assessment
Section 32(2) (c) requires an assessment of the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the plan change. The existing NDC for this area considered the local issues and requirements and the requirements proposed within this plan change reflect the NDC. This NDC is considered to be information to support this plan change. In addition, there is uncertain information as to the details of the future Auckland Wide Network Discharge Consent and whether it will provide the same level of protection for the receiving environment. Given this, the risks of not acting outweigh the risks of acting and it is considered appropriate to proceed with the plan change in respect of the proposed stormwater provisions.

Assessment of costs, benefits, efficiency and effectiveness
This assessment considers whether the provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the objective. The table below provides an analysis of the proposed provisions, as required by Section 32(b) of the Act.

Costs
Section 32(2) (b) of the RMA requires costs and benefits to be quantified where practicable. The costs relating to the proposed provisions are unable to be quantified as they relate to the specific development requirements that manage stormwater generated by each site.
### Table 6: Costs and Benefits of Proposed Provisions for Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The level of treatment proposed is higher than the current AUP region wide rules as it captures all impervious surface stormwater. This will have additional costs for developers; however this requirement is already in place under the existing NDC. Also, depending on the site it is possible that stormwater devices to achieve hydrology mitigation will also meet the water quality treatment standards.</td>
<td>The high level of treatment identified in the NDC will be retained for the area. The standard will ensure that stormwater quality treatment includes a biological component in all circumstances to provide a high level of treatment performance for the types of contaminants that are typically sourced from light industrial land uses (i.e. metals, sediment, hydrocarbons) and from road use. This is in recognition that the Waiaroha Inlet is a sensitive receiving environment that has some degradation and increased sedimentation over time but is still has relatively good Environmental Response Criteria scores for contaminants.</td>
<td>These provisions utilise and reflect the details of the NDC.</td>
<td>By requiring water quality treatment for each site, the Standards will be effective in reducing the cumulative effects of untreated stormwater runoff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Other Proposed Changes

In addition to the proposed changes discussed in sections 6 to 9 above, this plan change seeks to amend the operative provisions for the purposes of clarity, consistency and to reflect current circumstances. These changes take advantage of the opportunity to update the precinct provisions and are identified as underlined text and strike-throughs in the proposed plan change document. They include editorial changes, corrections, zoning changes based on changes in land ownership and changes to the layout of information within the precinct to reflect the new template for precincts, including:

- Rezoning 19 Westpoint Drive from Light Industry to Open Space - Informal Recreation Zone (Attachment F)
- Updating the Mixed Use zone to align with property and designation boundaries for State Highway 18 and amending the precinct boundary accordingly (Attachment F)
- Rezoning along Rawiri Stream to Open Space-Conservation Zone (Attachment F)
- Categorising operative provisions to make clear where they only apply to sub-precincts A and B
- Moving controls that are currently written as standards into the activity table where those standards refer to an activity status.
- Revising and removing provisions and map details relating to public transport, walking and cycling where they are not directly controlled or delivered through the precinct provisions. This is consistent with the approach for other precincts.
- Making reference to the objectives of the Rawiri Stream project, within the objectives, policies and assessment criteria.
- Replacing the mapping of riparian margins within the precinct plans with a special information requirement.
- Correcting the provisions in light of the Environment Court’s declaration of Framework Plans (Decision No. [2016] NZEnvC 056).

These changes do not address any new issue or seek to achieve any new outcomes. They are therefore not assessed as part of this report.

9. Conclusions

The purpose of this plan change is to address issues relating to transport, urban design and stormwater in the proposed sub-precinct C area.

As assessed in sections 5 to 7 of this report, the proposed objectives within the plan change, when considered in conjunction with relevant existing AUP (OP) objectives, are the most appropriate way to address the resource management issues identified and to achieve the purpose of the RMA. The proposed objectives also reflect the overall objective for the precinct, relating to integrated transport and land use outcomes.

Sections 5 to 7 of this report also demonstrate that the proposed policies, rules and other methods are efficient and effective in achieving the objectives.
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Attachment A: Hobsonville Corridor Precinct: Technical Transportation Assessment June 2017 (Flow Transportation Specialists)

This report is attached separately
Attachment B: Activities not subject to E27.6.11

Permitted activities subject to E27.6.11 that due to individual site size may not trigger assessment include:

- Wholesaler (10,000m² GFA trigger)
- Storage and lock-up facilities (20,000m² GFA trigger)
- Industrial activities (10,000m² GFA trigger)

Other permitted activities in the zone are shown below. Those identified with a * are expected to be captured under E27.6.11:

- Dairies up to 100m² gross floor area
- Workers accommodation – one per site
- Drive-through restaurant*
- Food and beverage up to 120m² gross floor area per site
- Garden centres (as there is no Business – Heavy Industry zoned land nearby)*
- Marine retail (as there is no Business – Heavy Industry zoned land nearby)
- Offices that are accessory to the primary activity on the site and:
  (a) the office gross floor area does not exceed 30 per cent of all buildings on the site; or
  (b) the office gross floor area does not exceed 100m²

- Retail accessory to an industrial activity on the site, where the goods sold are manufactured on site and the retail gross floor area does not exceed 10 per cent of all buildings on the site
- Service stations*
- Show homes*
- Trade suppliers*
- Emergency services
- Tertiary education facilities that are accessory to an industrial activity on the site
- Animal breeding or boarding
- Horticulture
Attachment D: Section 32 (RMA, 1991) Evaluation Report

Attachment C: Case Law

Reuters Homes Limited v Wanganui District Council (CIV-2016-483-278)

Reuters Homes Limited owns a relatively large block of land in suburban Wanganui, adjoining two substantial properties owned by Presbyterian Support Services (“PSS”) and Hospice Wanganui (“Hospice”). Reuters developed a subdivision proposal for its land, in consultation with PSS and Hospice, that created 35 small residential sites accessed by a cul-de-sac off the main road, Virginia Road. The intention was to create small units for elderly occupants in a quiet and secure living environment.

Reuters responded by explaining that the concept plan had been under development for two years in negotiations with PSS, and that providing a through road would require significant changes in design involving yet further negotiations with PSS. Reuters advised that in light of the adverse financial implications and adverse effect on the character that Reuters and PSS were hoping to create, the request for road connectivity was unreasonable.

The Council then followed up with a request for further information under s92 of the RMA, seeking “a revised roading layout and configuration showing the connections required.” Reuters responded, objecting to the request, and explaining why it was neither desirable nor feasible to provide the roading connection. The Council considered it was left with no option, but to fully notify the proposal under s95C of the RMA.

Reuters judicially reviewed the Council’s decision to notify, seeking orders that the request for further information was unlawful, the decision to publicly notify was unlawful, and that the Council had acted in abuse of its powers. In essence, Reuters claimed that the context in which the Council resorted to s92 as a device to force it to introduce a significant change contrived a misuse of the power to request information in relation to an application, leading to an unlawful exercise of the default power under s95C to require public notification on account of the perceived inadequacy of the information.

The Court agreed. It held:

“On any view of the proposal, the transformation of the roading servicing it from a relatively small cul de sac, to a through road, would substantially transform the proposal. Reuters sought to develop a community that was complementary to two existing uses on its boundaries, with both PSS and Hospice supporting the cul de sac formation and being opposed to any through road.

WDC’s request did not seek information enabling it to better understand the traffic consequences of the cul de sac proposed. Rather, WDC sought to ensure the developer to transform its proposal into one that would address WDC’s objectives for a much wider area, in terms of roading development.”

The Court agreed with Reuter’s legal analysis that:

Power will be abused if it is invoked for a purpose that is inconsistent with, or goes beyond, the purpose for which the statute has created the power;
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A purpose will be improper if it goes beyond the purposes for which the statute has created the power.

The Court held that Council officers had clearly misconstrued the scope of the power available to them under s92 as the request required Reuters to recast, in a substantial manner, the detail and scope of its application. This did not constitute a request for information on the application as lodged, but instead sought to transform that application. The Court noted:

“in other situations, requests for further information that might contemplate rearrangement of details, or inclusion of alternatives for some details, of a proposed development could be justified. Within the present context, the difference is so significant as to require the developer to transform the proposal into a different development.”

Reuters was successful, with the Court making declarations that:

The Council could not require the provision of an amended plan addressing its own road connectivity aspirations pursuant to an information request under s92; and

The Council had erred in law in treating Reuters’ refusal as a sufficient refusal to provide further information for the purpose of the default power to notify in section 95C.

A request under s92 must be for information that relates to the application, which is required to enable the Council to be satisfied as to the nature, scope and extent of the application and its actual or potential effects. This recent decision of the High Court makes it clear that s92 requests cannot be for the purpose of “transforming” the application into something else.

Applicants should take care before responding to s92 requests that appear to be somewhat cut on a limb, particularly when the request involves providing a significantly different “alternative” to that applied for. Otherwise, the Council may elect to grant consent to the “alternative” provided in a further information request, instead of to the application before it.
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#### Attachment D: Shading Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Light Industry provisions</th>
<th>Proposed Provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equinox 12 noon</strong></td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equinox 3pm</strong></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 12 noon</strong></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 3pm</strong></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer 6pm</th>
<th>Winter 12 noon</th>
<th>Winter 3pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“There are two aspects of flow management that are considered in the report. The first assesses the requirements for hydrology mitigation having regard to the aims and benefits of mitigation and the restoration of more natural hydrologic processes, the current approach of managing peak flows, an extensive review of international approaches to flow management and an assessment of rainfall and runoff characteristics in Auckland.

This leads to the derivation of hydrology mitigation requirements that incorporate both detention (peak flow attenuation) for the 95th percentile, 24 hr storm event runoff volume and retention (reduced volume) of 10 min of the design event. The report concludes that this approach will mitigate the adverse hydrologic effects of development such as reduced infiltration and increased surface runoff more successfully than the current approach to peak flow management.

An assessment of the implementation of the retention and detention requirements concludes that the required performance can be met using standard TP10 designs with some minor modifications, although some commonly used devices such as ponds and wetlands are unable to meet retention (volume loss) requirements. Importantly, volume loss can be achieved for a single site redevelopment and enable small developments to mitigate the effects of their development where previously mitigation was not possible. Volume reduction is a good fit for intensification expected through implementation of the Unitary Plan. Large greenfield development will go through more extensive structure planning processes to derive a comprehensive and integrated approach to stormwater management.

The second aspect of hydrology management is the identification of streams and their associated subcatchments that are particularly susceptible to the adverse effects of increased stormwater runoff, in which hydrology mitigation requirements are necessary to prevent further degradation of the stream and its values.

This involved the application of three primary criteria for determining stream sensitivity to increased stormwater flows (slope, catchment imperviousness and Macroinvertebrate Community Index score), which were then applied to the catchments within the Rural Urban Boundary (RUB) to derive a consolidated numerical score along the stream and its contributing sub-catchments. The initial score was then “moderated” using a combination of factors and knowledge of the catchments to identify those sub-catchments where hydrology mitigation of impervious surfaces would be beneficial to minimise the adverse effects of further development on the stream.

These areas have been identified in the Unitary Plan in the Stormwater Management Area: Flow (SMAF) Overlay – which is a spatially applied set of requirements for the development and redevelopment of impervious areas.”
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Attachment F: Proposed changes to zoning, precinct boundaries and SMAF 1 control

Hobsonville Corridor Precinct
Proposed changes to Zones, Precinct and Stormwater Management Area Control
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To make operative Plan Changes 1 and 2 to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part).

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Plan Change 1 involved the rezoning of eleven land parcels from either Open Space and road to typically residential which were surplus to requirements. Plan Change 2 involved the rezoning of a portion of Aotea Square to facilitate the redevelopment of the former Civic Administration Building. The plan changes were requested by Panuku Development Auckland. Both plan changes have been resolved with no appeals against the decisions of the respective commissioners.

3. Under Section 86F of the Resource Management Act 1991, a rule in a proposed plan must be treated as operative (and any previous rule as inoperative) if the time for making submissions or lodging appeals on the rule has expired and, in relation to the rule –
(a) no submissions in opposition have been made or appeals have been lodged.

4. Clause 17(1) of Schedule 1, states that a local authority shall approve a proposed policy statement or plan (other than a regional plan coastal).

5. Clause 20(1) of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 states that an approved policy statement or plan shall become an operative policy statement or plan on a date which is to be publicly notified.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Planning Committee:

a) agree to make operative Plan Changes 1 and 2 to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part).

b) request that the General Manager – Plans and Places, carries out the necessary steps required under First Schedule to the Resource Management Act, to make Plan Changes 1 and 2 to the Auckland Unitary Plan operative.

Horopaki / Context

6. Plan Changes 1 and 2 were the first notified changes to the Auckland Unitary Plan. Submissions received on the plan changes have been heard and the council has released its decisions. The period for lodging any appeals in the Environment Court has closed and no appeals have been lodged. The plan changes can now be made operative.
7. The relevant provisions in the Resource Management Act for finalising plan changes are as follows.

8. Section 86F - When rules in proposed plans must be treated as operative
   (1) A rule in a proposed plan must be treated as operative (and any previous rule as inoperative) if the time for making submissions or lodging appeals on the rule has expired and, in relation to the rule,—
   (a) no submissions in opposition have been made or appeals have been lodged; or
   (b) all submissions in opposition and appeals have been determined; or
   (c) all submissions in opposition have been withdrawn and all appeals withdrawn or dismissed.

9. Clause 17(1) of Schedule 1, states that a local authority shall approve a proposed policy statement or plan (other than a regional plan coastal) once it has made amendments under clause 16 or variations under clause 16A (if any).

10. Clause 20(1) of Schedule 1, states that an approved policy statement or plan shall become an operative policy statement or plan on a date which is to be publicly notified. Clause 20(2) requires the local authority to publicly notify the date on which the policy statement or plan becomes operative at least five working days before the date on which it becomes operative.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Plan Change 1

11. Proposed Plan Change 1- “Rezoning of Auckland Council Owned Properties That Have Been Cleared for Sale” involved rezoning eleven Council owned parcels of land currently zoned either open space or shown as road (roads are not zoned under the Auckland Unitary Plan) which were surplus to requirements and have been cleared for disposal.

Plan Change 2

12. Proposed Plan Change 2- “Aotea Square Partial Zone Change” involved rezoning a 334 square metre portion of Aotea Square from Open Space – Civic Spaces Zone to Business – City Centre Zone to facilitate the redevelopment of the former Civic Administration Building at 1 Greys Ave, Auckland Central.

Timeline

13. Key dates associated with the plan changes were:
   • The plan changes were publicly notified on 3 August 2017.
   • The hearings took place on 4 December 2017.
   • The decisions were publicly notified and sent to submitters on 18 January 2018.
   • The appeal period closed 30 working days from the 18 January 2018 (2 March 2018) or the date the submitter received the letter, whichever was the later, to lodge any appeal with the Environment Court.

Finalising the Plan Changes

14. No appeals were received to either plan change and therefore they can be made operative.

15. The Auckland Unitary Plan (text and maps) Schedule of Modifications identifies which parts of the plan are subject to a plan change. As plan changes are finalised the annotation can be removed. A resolution of the Planning Committee is required to formalise this process as this is not a matter that has been delegated to council staff.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
16. The relevant local boards were involved in both plan changes prior to notification but local board views were not sought for this report as making plan changes operative is a procedural matter.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement
17. Mana Whenua were consulted on both plan changes.
18. Te Akitai Waiohua Waka Taua Incorporated were a submitter to Plan Change 1. They sought that a section of the properties at 8R Gee Place and 70R Tidal Road, Mangere not be subject to the plan change and retain their open space zoning to enable appropriate signage or some other physical acknowledgement of the northernmost section of Pūkaki portage.
19. The commissioners were of the view that the position and outlook of these two land parcels did not add value to the acknowledgement of the historic significance of this portage route. They believed that the issue raised in the submission was better dealt with through a research project outside of Plan Change 1.
20. For Plan Change 2, there were no submissions by iwi. The Mana Whenua Working Group established by Panuku were however involved in the preparation of the Civic Quarter Masterplan and included representatives from Ngāi Tai ki Tamaki, Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Paoa, Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngaati Whanaunga, Te Akitai Waiohua and Ngāti Whatua o Kaipara. Panuku held a hui in September 2016 and a second hui was held on 7 November 2016 where mana whenua were generally supportive of the Whare Tapere building, but a design of the building was not agreed.
21. Panuku held a third hui on 12 June 2017 where the proposed plan change was discussed as being necessary to enable the development of the Whare Tapere building. Mana whenua remain supportive of the Whare Tapere building. Panuku are committed to work with mana whenua going forward to allow the design decisions for the building to be more considered to Māori history, context, knowledge, tikanga and reo.
22. The final step in making both plan changes operative is a procedural matter only and does not affect the content of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part).

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
23. There are no financial implications associated with making the plan changes operative.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
24. There are no risks associated with making the plan changes operative.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
25. The Planning Technicians in the Auckland-wide Planning Team implement the final step in making plan changes operative by publicly notifying that the plan changes are operative and removing the plan change annotations.
There are no attachments for this report.
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Managing and protecting trees in Auckland

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide the committee with a summary of regulatory and non-regulatory techniques used to manage and protect trees in Auckland.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The council's recently-adopted Urban Forest Strategy provides a comprehensive approach to maintaining and enhancing (through regulatory and non-regulatory techniques) trees and vegetation in Auckland’s urban area.

3. The council’s principal regulatory technique for managing and protecting trees is the Auckland Unitary Plan. The Auckland Unitary Plan is supported by a suite of non-regulatory council and private initiatives that contribute to the management and protection of trees.

4. Following amendments to the Resource Management Act in 2012 that prevented the use of general (or blanket) tree protection, the council's regulatory focus has been on managing and protecting:
   - 'scheduled' trees
   - trees within specifically identified ‘significant ecological areas’
   - trees in riparian and coastal areas
   - street trees and trees on reserve land.

5. At this point in time, the key regulatory options available to the council for tree management and protection are:
   - rely on the existing provisions contained in the Auckland Unitary Plan and carefully monitoring their effectiveness before making any changes
   - prepare a plan change to add trees to the ‘schedule of notable trees’ contained within the Auckland Unitary Plan.

6. A cross-council approach is required to ensure Auckland’s trees are appropriately managed and protected. The vehicle for this is the Urban Forest Strategy.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) endorse the council’s current approach to managing and protecting trees in Auckland as set out in the agenda report.

Horopaki / Context
7. At its meeting on 10 October 2017, the Planning Committee requested a report back to the Environment and Community Committee, Planning Committee and Regulatory Committee on regulatory and other techniques used and/or available to council to protect trees in Auckland. This was in response to concerns raised by the community about the loss of tree cover in the region. The respective chairs of the committees were satisfied that the report be received by the Planning Committee only.
Tree protection within legislation and national direction

8. Prior to 2015, general (or blanket) tree protection rules meant that property owners had to apply for a resource consent to remove large native and exotic trees in most parts of Auckland. An amendment to the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) prevented the use of general tree protection, resulting in limited ability for the council to impose rules for the removal of urban trees other than specifically identifying them on a schedule.

9. The RMA still enables the council to protect ‘significant ecological areas’ and other ‘groups’ or trees, however they must be specifically described and identified in the Auckland Unitary Plan (or the Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan).

Auckland Council’s strategic approach to tree protection

10. The council’s Urban Forest Strategy provides a clear framework for maintaining and enhancing Auckland’s urban ngahere (urban forest). The strategy outlines the current policy context for urban ngahere and lists the policies, plans and guidelines in place to manage the ngahere, including the Auckland Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan.

11. Research was undertaken as part of the strategy on the extent and distribution of tree cover in Auckland, and the current protection regimes in place to manage and protect it. The Urban Forest Strategy was approved by the Environment and Community Committee on 20 February 2018.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

The Urban Forest Strategy

12. As part of the Urban Forest Strategy, the level of protection afforded to Auckland’s urban ngahere was assessed. The Urban Forest Strategy recognises the numerous policies, plans and guidelines with multiple operational and strategic drivers that address urban ngahere both explicitly and implicitly. The principal aim of the Urban Forest Strategy is to consolidate and strengthen the numerous directives that support Auckland’s ngahere and to increase overall canopy cover in the urban environment. It recognises the pressure on Auckland’s ngahere, not only due to the amendments to the Resource Management Act, but also because of population growth and intensification, pressure on water infrastructure, and the ongoing threats from pests, diseases and climate change.

13. LiDAR (light detecting and ranging) data from 2013 indicates that urban Auckland has approximately 18 per cent tree cover distributed unevenly throughout the urban area. The majority is located on private land (60%), with the remaining 40% on public land (parkland and road corridors, for example). Canopy cover is also unevenly distributed between local board areas. Kaipātiki and Puketāpapa local board areas have the greatest canopy cover, while Ōtara-Papatoetoe and Māngere-Otāhuhu have the least.

14. Approximately half of Auckland’s urban trees have some degree of formal protection (through regulatory techniques) and the other half do not.

15. The Urban Forest Strategy provides three clear themes under which the high-level actions to increase Auckland’s ngahere are to be delivered. These are:
   - ‘knowing’ actions – having better data and understanding
   - ‘growing’ actions – increasing the canopy and leveraging partnerships
   - ‘protecting’ actions – direct and indirect ways to better protect trees.
Auckland Council’s current regulatory techniques for tree protection

16. General tree protection was removed from the Resource Management Act in 2012. The intent behind the change was to reduce the large number of resource consents required as a result of general tree protection in urban environments. As a result, district plan rules relating to tree protection must comply with specific criteria and must be specifically described either individually or as a group.

17. The principal regulatory technique by which Auckland’s trees are managed and protected is through the Auckland Unitary Plan. The Regional Policy Statement chapter of the Auckland Unitary Plan contains a number of objectives and policies relating to the natural environment, including trees. It recognises the importance of Auckland’s distinctive natural heritage and the numerous elements that contribute to it, with trees being an integral component.

18. The rules in the Auckland Unitary Plan that manage and protect trees are summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>what it protects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation management and biodiversity</td>
<td>Vegetation within 30 metres of urban lakes management areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vegetation within 20 metres of mean high water spring (includes coastal pohutukawa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vegetation located on certain cliffs or slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vegetation located on natural stream management area overlay or within 10 metres of urban streams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlays</td>
<td>Significant Ecological Areas overlay (SEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vegetation located on outstanding natural features, outstanding natural landscapes and high natural landscape overlays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage extent of place (often includes vegetation/trees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Zones</td>
<td>Most trees over 4 metres in height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees in roads</td>
<td>Most trees over 4 metres in height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of Notable Trees</td>
<td>Approximately 3000 scheduled items representing &gt;6000 trees or groups of trees throughout Auckland (the majority are within the urban environment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Significant Ecological Areas (SEA) within the urban environment are afforded a high level of protection. There are currently 3,666.8 hectares of SEAs within the urban area.

20. Auckland Transport is subject to the Auckland Unitary Plan provisions relating to trees in roads. A Service Level Agreement between Auckland Transport and Auckland Council sets out the maintenance agreement for green space management which includes the planting and maintenance of street trees, and works under and around the root zones of existing trees. Auckland Transport is developing a policy on street trees through the draft Transport Design Manual.

21. A plan change to amend errors and inconsistencies in the Schedule of Notable Trees is currently being drafted. The anticipated date of notification is mid-2018. The plan change will clarify ambiguity in the existing schedule and maps, but will not ‘open up’ the schedule for new nominations or re-evaluations. A plan change to do this is not included in the Plans and Places Department work programme for 2018. Currently, those property owners wishing to nominate a tree or trees for the schedule can complete a nomination proposal which is held in a database for consideration as part of a future plan change.
22. Covenants are another regulatory technique (sometimes imposed through the subdivision process) which formally protect trees. There are numerous properties with covenants across the region (approximately 7,000 totalling around 25,000 ha, with additional covenants being created on a regular basis), representing a significant biodiversity asset across the region. The council’s Biodiversity team has an active covenant-monitoring programme, and since 2012 has carried out a covenant monitoring and landowner engagement programme involving more than 700 properties containing covenants. More than half were found to be in good condition in terms of biodiversity health. While the majority of covenanted areas are outside of the Rural Urban Boundary, some covenanted areas of trees/vegetation are located within the Rural Urban Boundary.

The draft Regional Pest Management Strategy

23. The 2007 Regional Pest Management Strategy is currently being reviewed to ensure compliance with the Biosecurity Act 1993. As this document provides a framework for the management of animal, plant and pathogen pest species in Auckland, it provides an indirect and important factor in the overall picture of tree protection. The current level of pest management on council parkland will result in canopy loss and degradation of biodiversity over time. The Regional Pest Management Strategy proposes a number of implementation programmes for the control of various pest species, which will have the benefit of improving and protecting overall biodiversity.

Resource Consents data

24. It is currently difficult to extract quantitative or qualitative resource consent data on activities related to trees. Staff from the Plans and Places and Resource Consents departments are working through potential solutions to this issue to ensure that robust information is available to assist the council in carrying out its monitoring requirements under the Resource Management Act.

Current non-regulatory techniques for tree management and protection

25. As the Urban Forest Strategy identifies, non-regulatory techniques that manage and protect Auckland’s ngahere are wide-ranging. The Urban Forest Strategy refers to the following key documents, all of which include non-regulatory techniques for tree management or protection:
• Local Board Plans
• Greenway Plans
• the Parks and Open Space Action Plan (2013)
• the “Million Trees programme”
• Auckland Growing Greener
• Indigenous Biodiversity Strategy,
• Low Carbon Auckland (2014)
• Sports and Recreation Strategic Action Plan (2014)
• Auckland Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision
• Vegetation in the Road Corridor Guidelines (draft).

26. The majority of Local Board and Greenway Plans specify outcomes and initiatives that are relevant to the management and protection of trees. These are summarised in Attachment A.

Options available for regulatory tree management and protection

Option 1 - Status quo
27. The status quo option would rely on the current Auckland Unitary Plan provisions for tree management and protection and the continued use and monitoring of covenants. Apart from the proposed administrative plan change to amend errors and inconsistencies in the Schedule of Notable Trees, no changes would be made to the Auckland Unitary Plan at this point in time. The effectiveness of the current approach would be monitored, and if appropriate, changes made at a later date.

28. The benefit of the status quo option is that there would be no additional cost to the council other than the ongoing business costs associated with administering the current rules. This approach would allow time for the current provisions to be implemented, so that a robust analysis of their effectiveness can be undertaken at a future date as part of the council’s overall monitoring programme for the Auckland Unitary Plan.

29. The costs of the status quo include a potential minor reduction in Auckland’s tree cover, however, this could potentially be offset by the various non-regulatory approaches set out in the Urban Forest Strategy.

Option 2 - Adding new trees to the Schedule of Notable Trees
30. The most cost-effective way to add trees to the Schedule of Notable Trees contained in the Auckland Unitary Plan would be to notify a region-wide plan change after calling for nominations. There are currently approximately 40 public nominations to include additional trees on the schedule. These nominations are held in a database for future consideration.

31. The cost of this option is very hard to estimate. On average, individual tree assessments cost approximately $500. Assuming 500 nominations were received, the cost would be approximately $250,000 up to the point of the conclusion of the assessment process. Additional costs would be incurred in preparing the plan change and associated section 32 report, responding to submissions, conducting a hearing, preparing the council’s decision and responding to any appeals to the Environment Court. The actual cost of responding to 500 nominations could in excess of $500,000 approximately, and may result in only a relatively small number of trees meeting the council’s criteria for scheduling. The council has not currently set aside a specific budget to undertake this work.

32. The benefit of this approach would be the protection of some additional trees that meet the notable tree criteria in the Auckland Unitary Plan.
Option 3 – Request the Government to consider changes to the Resource Management Act to enable the council to reinstate general tree protection

33. General tree protection applied variously throughout the region prior to the amendments to the RMA (i.e. certain species over a certain height and girth were protected and a managed approach to their alteration and removal was provided for in respective legacy District Plans.) This was removed in 2015.

34. The main benefit of general tree protection as a regulatory technique is that it provides for retention of all trees that meet a height/girth threshold, representing a large proportion of trees across the region. A resource consent would be required for removal or significant alteration of those trees, allowing for mitigation planting in the case of removals, and the ability to enforce rules rather than relying on public goodwill in terms of tree retention. It also promotes a precautionary approach to removal of, or significant alteration to, trees when particular information about a tree’s qualities is not known.

35. The costs of tree protection include the additional expense to property owners (or the council if it waived resource consent fees) through the processing of consents, monitoring and enforcement. Whether or not general tree protection is successful in terms of retaining large numbers of trees over a longer timeframe is also questionable.

Conclusion

36. In summary, while additional regulatory options to protect the region’s existing tree cover are available for consideration, it is important that they are considered in the context of the existing regulatory techniques for managing and protecting Auckland’s trees, principally the Auckland Unitary Plan, which only recently became operative in part. It would be important to consider them in the context of the recently adopted Urban Forest Strategy and its strategic context of knowing, growing and protection.

Options for future non-regulatory techniques for tree and vegetation management and protection

37. As has been discussed previously in this report, the initiatives for tree and vegetation planting and protection are wide-ranging across the region and contribute both directly and indirectly to the comprehensive picture of Auckland’s ngahere.

38. The Urban Forest Strategy identifies a suite of non-regulatory actions for knowing, growing and protecting urban ngahere. In summary these are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowing</th>
<th>Growing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate 3-yearly LiDAR surveys in council work programmes</td>
<td>Increase canopy cover in road corridors, parks and open spaces to support an average of 30% canopy cover across Auckland’s urban area with no local board having less than 15% canopy cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create database for existing assets within 2 years</td>
<td>Identify and prioritise locations for future planting on public land in partnership with mana whenua and local boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate scientific knowledge with matauranga Maori in partnership with mana whenua of the urban ngahere</td>
<td>Use science and ongoing engagement with local boards, mana whenua and communities to inform decisions in relation to types of planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantify values and benefits</td>
<td>Identify key pressures and risks in partnership with mana whenua and local boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine survival rates of new council plantings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Increase the capacity of nursery programmes (including maraes) to increase the supply of eco-sourced plants**  
**Leverage partnerships established through existing initiatives (e.g. the Mayor’s Million Trees programme)** | 
| **Protecting** | 
**Increase landowner grants and incentive programmes (e.g. heritage tree fund for private property owners)**  
**Address current and future pressures to Auckland’s ngahere and protection**  
**Raise public awareness of the values and benefits of the urban ngahere**  
**Raise arboricultural maintenance programme from 2 to 5 years or until new plantings are well established (survival rate 70-80 %)**  
**Establish a labelling programme for protected trees within 12 months (e.g. species, age and benefits)** |

39. Progress with these actions will be managed through the Environment and Community Committee.

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views**

40. The important role of local boards in tree protection is recognised, particularly at the non-regulatory community level. As part of this report, advice was sought from all local boards in terms of their current and proposed initiatives relating to trees.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

41. The protection of trees and vegetation is an issue important to many Māori. No specific consultation has been undertaken with Māori in relation to this report, however most Mana Whenua groups were actively involved in the development of the Auckland Unitary Plan. The Urban Forest Strategy was also developed in collaboration with Mana Whenua. Te Ao Māori principles were applied to its design and implementation. Several workshops were held and attended by Ngāti Whanaunga, Ngāti Paoa, Te Ākitai Waiohua and Ngāti Tamaoho, with a separate meeting held with Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki. Overall support was expressed. The strategy also identifies the importance of ongoing engagement with Mana Whenua.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications**

42. The status quo option for regulatory techniques for managing and protecting Auckland’s trees and vegetation can be managed within existing council budgets. Introducing new techniques or adding to the Schedule of Notable Trees contained within the Auckland Unitary Plan would require additional funds to be made available.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

43. The main risk associated with the approach recommended in this report is a potential reduction in Auckland’s tree cover. This is potentially offset by other council and private initiatives relating to trees, and would be carefully monitored. If appropriate, changes could be made to the Auckland Unitary Plan at a later date.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

44. The key next steps for the recommended approach are to continue with the implementation of the Urban Forest Strategy and to carefully monitor the effectiveness of the council’s current regulatory approach to tree management and protection.
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<tr>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>Local Board plan outcome/s relevant to enhancement of the natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>Objective for ‘Enhanced natural environment’ which includes managing the current urban tree cover, planting more trees and shrubs and promoting their benefits, and piloting approaches that better protect our notable trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>Outcome 2: community facility as a community garden. Outcome 6: We would like to increase knowledge of our special natural heritage areas and involve our community in looking after them. We will continue to protect these landscapes through our existing parks restoration programmes. Outcome 7: Prioritise increasing biodiversity throughout park development planning, ecological restoration programmes, and stream enhancement. Our unique environment is protected and enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Outcome 2: Protect and enhance our natural environment which includes community led streamside restoration, planting programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Outcome 1: enhance, protect and maintain our diverse natural environment and make sure it’s able to be enjoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>Outcome: Our environment is protected and enhanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>Outcome 1: A network of vibrant and loved urban neighbourhoods, which includes community street tree and general planting to foster a sense of identity and place. Objective 6: Natural spaces are valued and restored, increasing biodiversity by promoting private native planting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>Outcome: our community enjoys access to quality parks, reserves and facilities for leisure, sport and recreation. Protect, maintain and improve access. Outcome 5: A protected and enhanced environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>Outcome 4: Identify, preserve and protect natural features, historic places, property and relic. Outcome 5: our people are active and healthy which creates a new urban forest park on former landfill site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Outcome 2: Our natural environment is protected for future generations to enjoy by parks and reserves to be treasures and met and protect and enhance natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Orāhuhu</td>
<td>Outcome 3: Protecting our natural environment and heritage, with initiatives of keeping their area clean and green through restoration planting, weeding and tree planting to increase shade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>Outcome 3: well-connected and easy to move around, continues to develop Local Paths (Greenways) plan. Outcome 4: our environment is a source of pride and enjoyment for the community, protecting local environment and biodiversity for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Outcome 2: a community that cares about its environment, starts a tree planting programme demonstrating environmental leadership and support community sustainability initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Outcome 1: Local parks and open space areas are valued and enjoyed but progressively enhancing the Stonefields-Heritage Trail with appropriate planting while working with the Maungakekie-Tāmaki Local Board. Outcome 4: The natural environment is valued, protected and enhanced by our communities. Fostering restoring on the reserves and protecting and enhancing the pohutukawa along Tamaki Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>Outcome 4: Healthy natural environment. Promoting planting around water bodies to improve the water quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papakura</th>
<th>Appendix 2: Local environment management responsibility to provide leadership and support to protect and conserve the region’s natural environment; also discussed in Outcome 5: Treasured for its environment and heritage.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa</td>
<td>Encourages and supports natural heritage and local character of cultural diversity by neighbourhood identity such as community gardens. Outcome: to treasure and enhance the natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Outcome: Harbours, waterways and environment are cared for, protected and healthy. Provide funding and support for community efforts to improve our environment such as planting so that unique environment is well managed and thrives. Promote riparian planting and environmental planting networks within the community to improve water quality of receiving environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>Outcome 5: our environment is valued, protected and enhanced, preserve and protect our native ecosystems and habitats through recognising north-west wildlink including restoration planting of the Lucas Creek catchment and Rewiri Stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitāke</td>
<td>Outcome 3: Waitāke’s environment is treasure by restoring and protecting their natural environment in partnership with the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>Outcome 1: actively protect the Waitākere Rangers Heritage Area. Outcome 2: unique natural habitats are protected and enhanced, with fighting against Kaun detack and supporting local projects that make a positive difference in their environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitāmatā</td>
<td>Outcome 1: Inclusive communities that are vibrant, healthy and connected by empowering community initiatives such as gardens. By ensuring our parks, open spaces meet the needs of the current and future by implementing current and future development plans. Outcome 3: the natural environment is valued, protected and enhanced by regenerating natural areas to enhance biodiversity and increase the urban forest and enhance biodiversity. This would see local initiatives to increase tree planting and develop a local strategy to increase urban forest in line with a regional urban tree strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To receive a summary and provide a public record of memos or briefing papers that have been distributed to committee members.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. This is a regular information-only report which aims to provide greater visibility of information circulated to committee members via memo/briefing or other means, where no decisions are required.
3. The following information items are attached:
   - Planning Committee work programme (Attachment A)
   - Schedule of workshops May 2018 (Attachment B)
   - National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity Quarterly Monitoring Report February 2018 (Attachment C)
4. The following workshops/briefings have taken place:
   - 1 March 2018 – Confidential Briefing on Auckland Housing Programme (Housing New Zealand/HLC) (no attachment)
   - 8 March 2018 – Confidential Joint Workshop with Finance and Performance Committee Long-Term Plan and Auckland Plan feedback, Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum (no attachment)
   - 14 March 2018 – Confidential Joint Workshop with Finance and Performance Committee Long-Term Plan and Auckland Plan feedback, transport and infrastructure regional stakeholders (no attachment)
   - 15 March 2018 – Confidential Joint Workshop with Finance and Performance Committee Long-Term Plan and Auckland Plan feedback, Mana Whenua entities (no attachment)
   - 21 March 2018 – Confidential Joint Workshop with Finance and Performance Committee Long-Term Plan and Auckland Plan feedback, regional stakeholders session 1 (no attachment)
   - 21 March 2018 – Confidential Joint Workshop with Finance and Performance Committee Long-Term Plan and Auckland Plan feedback, advisory panels (no attachment)
   - 27 March 2018 – Confidential Joint Workshop with Finance and Performance Committee Long-Term Plan and Auckland Plan feedback, regional stakeholders session 2 (no attachment)
5. This document can be found on the Auckland Council website, at the following link: http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/
   - at the top of the page, select meeting “Planning Committee” from the drop-down tab and click ‘View’;
   - under ‘Attachments’, select either the HTML or PDF version of the document entitled “Extra Attachments”.
6. Note that staff will not be present to answer questions about the items referred to in this summary. Committee members should direct any questions to the authors.
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:
a) receive the Summary of Planning Committee information memos and briefings – 3 April 2018.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Planning Committee forward work programme 3 April 2018</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Schedule of May Planning Committee workshops <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity Quarterly Monitoring Report February 2018 <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kalinda Gopal - Senior Governance Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Jim Quinn - Chief of Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PLANNING COMMITTEE FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME 2018

This committee guides the physical development and growth of Auckland through a focus on land use planning, housing and the appropriate provision of infrastructure and strategic projects associated with these activities.

**Priorities for the second 12 months are:**
- Auckland Plan refresh
- Strategic infrastructure planning
- City Centre and Waterfront development

#### Lead | Area of work | Reason for work | Planning Committee role (decision or direction) | Budget/ Funding | Expected timeframes Highlight financial year quarter and state month if known

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar</td>
<td>Apr-Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 Feb</td>
<td>3 Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Mar</td>
<td>5 Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27 Nov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### HOUSING

**Auckland Council**

- Auckland Housing Accord monitoring and National Policy Statement requirements

  All decisions on Special Housing Areas have been completed in the last council term. This relates to ongoing monitoring of the outcomes of the Housing Accord and the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.

  **Direction**
  - Completion of Housing Accord obligations and assessment of effectiveness of interventions.

  **Progress to date**
  - Review and update of Housing Accord Aug 2017 PLA/2017/32
  - Update on affordable housing in Special Housing Areas Oct 2017 PLA/2017/32
  - National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity initial assessment results PLA/2017/156 and high-level findings of housing capacity assessment reported Nov 2017 PLA/2017/157

  **Q3** Q4 **Q1** **Q2**

**Auckland Council**

- Implementation of Housing Taskforce

  The Housing Taskforce is led by His Worship the Mayor. The taskforce is likely to recommend actions to council and some of these actions may fall under the Planning Committee remit. Actions may include strategic overview and spatial outcomes of council’s role in housing.

  **Direction**
  - Provide strategic direction and oversight of council’s role in housing to ensure the remedying of any impediments to effective housing supply

  **Q3** **Q4** **Q1** **Q2**

#### REGIONAL LAND USE AND INFRASTRUCTURE

**Auckland Council**

- Auckland Plan Refresh

  The Auckland Plan was approved in 2012 and a commitment made to a refresh within 8 years. A refresh will ensure that the Auckland Plan remains current and will inform Long-term Plan prioritisation and budget decisions.

  **Direction and Decision**
  - Approval and oversight of processes and content, The Governing Body will approve the final version of the Plan.

  **Progress to date**
  - 22 direction-setting workshops Feb – Nov 2017
  - Engagement approach and proposed options approved Mar 2017 PLA/2017/30
  - Feedback on consultation and approval of strategic framework Aug 2017 PLA/2017/89 and

  **Refresh generally within existing budget. Any additional budget requirements will be considered as reprioritisation of operational budgets or through the Finance and Performance Committee. Consideration as**

  **Q3** **Q4** **Q1** **Q2**
### Attachment A

**Item 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Transport</th>
<th>Auckland Transport Alignment Project implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Auckland Transport Alignment Project recommended strategic approach was released in September 2016 and adopted by Council in September 2016. Any consideration of transport should be for the purpose of informing future Long-term Plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Council</th>
<th>Auckland Unitary Plan appeals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Auckland Unitary Plan is Operative in Part until all current appeals are resolved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAA2017/92</th>
<th>Proposed monitoring framework approved Sep 2017 PLA/2017/112</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback from local boards considered Oct 2017 PLA/2017/122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback from targeted engagement received and draft content for Transport and Access and Belonging and Participation approved Nov 2017 PLA/2017/139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of draft plan for public consultation Nov 2017 PLA/2017/150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation period and Have Your Say events Mar 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshops to consider feedback and resultant changes to the plan May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Plan 2050 presented for approval June 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direction**

Regional strategy and policy relating to infrastructure, land use and housing. Auckland Transport and Central Government have decision-making responsibilities. Financial recommendations made to Finance and Performance Committee.

**Progress to date**

AT Board/Governing Body workshop April 2017
Auckland Smarter Transport Pricing Project delegation agreed Jul 2017 PLA/2017/74
Phase One project report received Feb 2018 PLA/2018/7

**Funding decisions to be made through the Long-term Plan process.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Auckland Unitary Plan changes</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria to determine the appropriateness of any private plan changes during the two years post 15 November 2018 endorsed Mar 2017 [PLA/2017/37]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of engagement with mana whenua and landowners for sites of significance Mar 2017 [PLA/2017/39]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of errors to produce the first administrative plan change Mar 2017 [PLA/2017/40]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of Plans and Places Department Statutory work programme Jul 2017 [PLA/2017/78]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notification of proposed administrative plan change approved Sep 2017 [PLA/2017/117]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private plan change request: Awha B1 accepted and notification approved Sep 2017 [PLA/2017/114]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Hobsonville Corridor Plan Change approved for pre-notification public comment Oct 2017 [PLA/2017/129]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notification of Proposed Plan Change – Historic Heritage Schedule (Errors, Anomalies and Information Update) approved Nov 2017 [PLA/2017/144]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private plan change request: 814-816 Great South Road, Ellerslie accepted and notification approved Nov 2017 [PLA/2017/153]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private plan change request: Mangere and Hospital Road accepted and notification approved Nov 2017 [PLA/2017/154]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council District Plan (Hauraki Gulf Islands Section) 2013 made fully operative Feb 2018 [PLA/2018/12]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Transport</th>
<th>Mass transit - airport</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic direction relating to infrastructure and land use. Auckland Transport has responsibility for the provision of public transport in Auckland.</td>
<td>Workshops held Apr, Jun and Oct 2017 and Feb 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2
### Attachment A

#### Item 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Transport</th>
<th>Mass transit – light rail</th>
<th>Elected member site visits of key locations along proposed route Mar and Apr 2018&lt;br&gt;Workshop scheduled 18 April 2017</th>
<th>Direction&lt;br&gt;Strategic direction relating to infrastructure and land use. Auckland Transport has responsibility for the provision of public transport in Auckland.</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>City Rail Link (public realm)</td>
<td>Provide direction to Auckland Transport on the public realm works associated with the City Rail Link.</td>
<td>Direction&lt;br&gt;Strategic direction relating to infrastructure and land use. CRL Company has responsibility for the delivery of the City Rail Link. Auckland Transport has responsibility for the road corridor</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Additional Waitemata Harbour Crossing</td>
<td>Provide strategic direction to Auckland Transport as it considers the Additional Waitemata Harbour Crossing project.&lt;br&gt;Provide strategic direction to the New Zealand Transport Agency as it develops the Additional Waitemata Harbour Crossing project.</td>
<td>Direction&lt;br&gt;To Auckland Transport relating to public transport options&lt;br&gt;Decision&lt;br&gt;Approve Auckland Council’s submission on the consent applications made by New Zealand Transport Agency</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Active Transport (Walking and Cycling)</td>
<td>Delivery of active transport initiatives</td>
<td>Direction&lt;br&gt;Feedback to Auckland Transport on the plans and programmes</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Supporting growth&lt;br&gt;Delivering transport networks</td>
<td>Delivery and route protection phase of the former Transport for Future Urban Growth process jointly undertaken by Auckland Council/Auckland Transport and New Zealand Transport Agency</td>
<td>Direction&lt;br&gt;Reporting on project progress</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Technical Guidance Programme</td>
<td>To deliver a programme of technical guidance documents to facilitate development to comply with the Unitary Plan and Auckland Council’s infrastructure standards</td>
<td>Decision&lt;br&gt;Approval of some documents</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLACE-BASED LAND USE AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Council</th>
<th>Spatial Planning Work Programme</th>
<th>Spatial Planning is an important placemaking tool that enables the integration of land use aspirations with the identification of the necessary supporting infrastructure.</th>
<th>Decision&lt;br&gt;Approve the proposed spatial planning work programme</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date</strong>&lt;br&gt;Approval of additional place-based planning projects and preparation of structure plans&lt;br&gt;Formation of Political Reference group&lt;br&gt;Aug 2017 PLA/2017/98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Planning Committee members</td>
<td>Item 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whenua plan change</strong></td>
<td>The Whenua plan was approved under the previous council. This plan change is the first in a series of plan changes to amend the Auckland Unitary Plan zones to give effect to this Structure Plan.</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> Approve the public notification of the plan change and the final decision. <strong>Progress to date</strong> Decision to undertake pre-notification engagement on the draft plan change Mar 2017 PLA/2017/39 Public notification of proposed plan change Whenua approved Sep 2017 PLA/2017/115</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paerata structure plan</strong></td>
<td>The Paerata Structure Plan will provide specific spatial planning of this area and assist with infrastructure investment decisions.</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> Approve the Paerata Structure Plan</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Port Future Study</strong></td>
<td>The Port Future Study was recommended to this council by the previous council. In conjunction with the Governing Body this committee will need to decide the next steps with this study.</td>
<td><strong>Direction</strong> Likely to recommend actions to the Governing Body for decision <strong>Progress to date</strong> Workshop held Aug 2017 Decision to undertake further scoping work on an alternative port location and identifying related triggers/constraints PLA/2017/128</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Centre and Waterfront development</strong></td>
<td>A refresh of the 2012 City Centre Master Plan will ensure that it remains current and will inform Long-term Plan prioritisation and budget decisions. Panuku is leading the refresh of the spatial planning for the Wynyard Point area in Wynyard Quarter and a refresh of the Central Wharves strategy which was deferred while the Port Future Study was undertaken.</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> Approve the City Centre Master Plan refresh <strong>Direction</strong> • Strategic direction relating to key moves, infrastructure and land use. Panuku has responsibility for the delivery of the Waterfront Plan and Wynyard Quarter. • Strategic direction relating to interim cruise infrastructure and longer term strategy. Panuku has responsibility for the delivery of the Waterfront Plan and preparation of the Central Wharves strategy. <strong>Progress to date</strong> Decision to update the City Centre Master Plan Mar 2017 PLA/2017/31 In principle approval of Queens Wharf inner dolphin Mar 2017 PLA/2017/32 Decision to approve updated implementation of City Centre Master Plan and Waterfront Plan Sep 2017 PLA/2017/111</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PANUKU

**Tamaki redevelopment**

Panuku leads council’s involvement in the Tamaki redevelopment programme. There are some decisions of council required from time to time. This is part of the Spatial Priority Area programme.

**Decision**
Regional strategy and policy relating to infrastructure, land use and housing.

> Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2

**Direction**
Feedback on the Framework Plan and priorities for Manukau. Panuku has responsibility for the delivery of Transform Manukau.

> Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2

### LEGISLATION/CENTRAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAMMES

**Auckland Council**

**Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018**

The Government released the draft document for consultation in February 2018. This document informs the Regional Land Transport Plan and the Council’s Long-term Plan.

**Decision**
Approve Auckland Council submission.

**Progress to date**
Political reference group appointed to consider submission on draft policy statement Mar 2018 PLA/2018/24

> Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2

**Auckland Council**

**National Planning Standards**

The Resource Legislation Amendment Act 2017 introduced a new national planning standards to improve the consistency of resource management plans and policy statements under the Act. Council will have the opportunity to make a formal submission in April 2018.

**Decision**
Approve Auckland Council Submission.

**Progress to date**
Endorsement of feedback on National Planning Standards discussion papers Aug 2017 PLA/2017/67

> Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2

**Auckland Council**

**National Environmental Standards**

Decision/Direction
As required

> Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2

**Auckland Council**

**National Policy Statements**

Decision/Direction
As required

> Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2

**Auckland Council**

**Resource Management Act reforms**

Decision/Direction
As required

> Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2

### COMPLETED

**Auckland Council**

**Future Urban Land Supply Strategy refresh**

Regional strategy and policy relating to greenfield infrastructure, land use and housing. Financial and Infrastructure Strategy recommendations made to Finance and Performance Committee

**Decision**
Adopt the refreshed Future Urban Land Supply Strategy Jul 2017 PLA/2017/73

**Auckland Council**

**Manurewa/Takanini/Papakura Integrated Area Plan**

The Manurewa/Takanini/Papakura Integrated Area Plan is part of the Spatial Priority Area programme. It provides specific spatial planning of the area and assists with infrastructure investment decisions.

**Decision**
Endorse the Manurewa/Takanini/Papakura Integrated Area Plan Nov 2017 PLA/2017/153

**Panuku**

**Transform Onohanga**

Panuku completed the High Level Project Plan for Transform Onohanga in 2017 (slightly delayed because of the East West Link project).

**Decision**
Adopt the High Level Project Plan for Transform Onohanga Mar 2017 PLA/2017/34
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panuku</th>
<th>Unlock Henderson</th>
<th>Panuku completed the High Level Project Plan for Henderson which outlines the delivery of initiatives for the Henderson metropolitan centre.</th>
<th>Decision to adopt the Unlock Henderson High Level Project Plan May 2017 PLA/2017/23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panuku</td>
<td>Unlock Papatoetoe</td>
<td>Panuku completed the High Level Project for Papatoetoe which outlines redevelopment projects and the delivery of initiatives in Papatoetoe.</td>
<td>Decision to adopt the Unlock Papatoetoe High Level Project Plan Jul 2017 PLA/2017/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panuku</td>
<td>Unlock Panmure</td>
<td>Panuku completed the High Level Project Plan for Panmure which outlines the delivery of initiatives for the Panmure metropolitan centre.</td>
<td>Decision to endorse the Unlock Panmure High Level Project Plan Mar 2018 PLA/2018/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panuku</td>
<td>Unlock Avondale</td>
<td>Panuku completed the High Level Project Plan for Avondale which outlines the delivery of initiatives for the Avondale town centre. This is part of the Spatial Priority Area programme.</td>
<td>Decision to endorse the Unlock Avondale High Level Project Plan Nov 2017 PLA/2017/1425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Seachange – Tai Timu Tai Pari</td>
<td>The marine spatial plan for the Hauraki Gulf – Seachange Tai Timu Tai Pari – was completed by the independent stakeholder working group in November 2016. Staff reported on implications of the plan and options for Auckland Council implementation.</td>
<td>Decision to establish a political reference group to provide direction to council on how to implement the plan, propose a work programme of activities and collaborate with other agencies. Further reporting referred to the Environment and Community Committee. May 2017 PLA/2017/750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Unit Titles Act review</td>
<td>The Government released the Unit Titles Act discussion document in December 2016. Auckland Council submission March 2017 on regional strategy and policy relating to infrastructure, land use and housing.</td>
<td>Decision to approve Auckland Council submission Mar 2017 PLA/2017/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>