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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
- Activities of the following Council Controlled Organisations:
  - Panuku Development Auckland
  - Auckland Transport
  - Watercare Services Limited

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**

Apologies from Cr D Simpson and Cr L Cooper have 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, 4 June 2019, including the confidential section, as a true and correct record.

4 **Petitions**

At the close of the agenda no requests to present petitions had been received.

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: Boopsie Maran – Input on Road Closures for Town Centre throughout the Auckland Region**

**Te take mō te pūrongo**

**Purpose of the report**

1. Boopsie Maran will speak to the committee about road closures for town centres throughout the Auckland region and how we can better facilitate and support this process for various wards working with Auckland Transport in this process.

**Ngā tūtohunga**

**Recommendation/s**

That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the public input from Boopsie Maran regarding road closures for town centres throughout the Auckland region and thank her for her attendance.
5.2 Public Input: Heart of the City - City Centre Masterplan

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Viv Beck, Chairperson Heart of the City will be in attendance to speak to the committee regarding the City Centre Masterplan.

Ngā tutohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) Thank Viv Beck, Chairperson Heart of the City for her presentation regarding the City Centre Masterplan and thank her for her attendance.

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.”
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from Planning Committee to proceed to public consultation on the City Centre Masterplan refresh.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report seeks approval from Planning Committee to begin public consultation on the refresh of the Auckland City Centre Masterplan (CCMP).
3. This is the culmination of the actions approved at Planning Committee on 27 November 2018 (PLA/2018/121), which unanimously requested the production of a digital document which would permit rolling updates. Throughout 2019, Council has engaged with the Planning Committee in a series of workshops in March, May and June to shape the structure, direction and content of the refreshed CCMP. The intention is now to seek public input on the high-level outcomes, transformational moves and content of the CCMP, incorporating the Waterfront Plan.
4. If the recommendation of this report is approved, an eight-month period of consultation will begin. Targeted engagement with Council group and external stakeholders would occur in July to shape and refine consultation material prior to wider public engagement.
5. Public consultation on the high-level content, outcomes and transformational moves is proposed for six weeks from mid-August to late September.
6. The planned approach will indicate the level of public support and, along with the feedback already gathered from various internal and external stakeholders, inform the contents and development of the new digital CCMP in early 2020.
7. To make it accessible to as many people as possible, information on the consultation will be available online and in hard copy in local board areas.
8. Feedback will be gathered from written responses in addition to the targeted stakeholder engagement.
9. A critical element of the CCMP refresh is the consideration and application of Te Ao Māori and Māori perspectives as part of the refresh process. Engagement will take place with mana whenua and mataawaka before and during the consultation period.
10. Following the consultation period, a summary of the feedback received will be communicated widely to all submitters and stakeholder groups involved in the process.
11. This input will shape the development of the refreshed digital CCMP. The programme allows time for further targeted engagement as necessary from October to January. The complete digital CCMP will be presented to Planning Committee in February 2020.
**Ngā tūtohunga**

**Recommendation/s**

That the Planning Committee:

a) approve for public consultation the refresh of City Centre Masterplan content set out in paragraphs 36-61 of this report, starting in mid-August 2019

b) delegate to the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Planning Committee and an Independent Māori Statutory Board member the power to correct any identified errors or minor edits, and to give effect to changes requested by the Committee at this meeting.

c) approve the proposed approach to public consultation from mid-August to late September 2019 on the City Centre Masterplan refreshed as outlined in Attachment A of the agenda report.

d) note that a refreshed City Centre Masterplan which will reflect public consultation, will be reported to the Planning Committee for adoption in early 2020.

**Horopaki Context**

12. The City Centre Masterplan and Waterfront Plan were both adopted in 2012. In line with Council’s other high-level strategies such as the Auckland Plan they need to be kept up to date and relevant.

13. CCMP and Waterfront Plan refresh work has been ongoing for more than two years. Work to update the CCMP Implementation Strategy began in early 2017. This approach avoided the need for a full refresh while the Auckland Plan refresh was itself underway. Three areas of work were proposed: Downtown, Midtown and Queen Street, all underpinned by existing CCMP transformational moves.

14. At a Planning Committee meeting on 28 March 2017, elected members resolved (PLA/2017/31) to support this approach. The targeted refresh of the Waterfront Plan was also noted (PLA/2017/32).

15. In September 2017, Planning Committee approved (PLA/2017/111), the updated implementation of the City Centre Masterplan and Waterfront Plan to incorporate:
   i) Downtown
   ii) Waterfront corridor
   iii) Midtown streets
   iv) Central wharves
   v) Wynyard Quarter

16. The remaining area of work from March 2017 (Queen Street) led to the development of the Access for Everyone (A4E) concept in 2018 as a way to maintain access in the city centre during mass rapid transit (MRT) construction and operation while delivering wider wellbeing benefits.

17. During 2018, the scope of the CCMP refresh was confirmed as a light-touch digital document, integrating the Waterfront Plan into the CCMP and incorporating rolling updates. At the Planning Committee meeting on 27 November 2018, elected members gave unanimous support to this approach and for including the following new workstreams: Māori Outcomes, Grafton Gully Boulevard and A4E (PLA/2018/121).
18. The extent of engagement and support from wider stakeholders was also in evidence that day. Supporting statements were provided by:
   - Pippa Coom, Waitematā Local Board chair (PLA/2018/118)
   - Viv Beck, Auckland City Centre Advisory Board (ACCAB) chair and Heart of the City chief executive (PLA/2018/116), with support from the City Centre Residents Group, Generation Zero, Greater Auckland, Urban Auckland, and Walk Auckland.

19. In 2019 the CCMP has been developed based on these resolutions and thorough engagement with Planning Committee. A4E was the subject of a Planning Committee workshop on 26 March, receiving broad support. Consultation timing during the election period was also discussed.

20. Refreshed CCMP Outcomes were discussed at a Planning Committee workshop on 16 May 2019. As a result of informal feedback that day, greater reference is now made to Auckland's multiculturalism and diversity and the need for the city centre to be child-friendly.

21. The final Planning Committee workshop in this series took place on 12 June 2019 which focused on transformational moves, Waterfront Plan integration, Grafton Gully and Māori Outcomes. This has shaped the direction and content of this material.

22. This work is thus the latest step in a continuous thread of Planning Committee engagement over the past two years. It has received considerable input from other representative bodies, in particular Waitematā Local Board and Auckland City Centre Advisory Board. The material has been updated to reflect the level of stakeholder engagement to date and we would now like to seek public feedback.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Overview of Communication and engagement approach

23. Extensive face-to-face consultation has already taken place with city centre partners, stakeholders, reference groups, local boards and Council family. This will continue prior to wider public consultations and throughout the drafting process. This mahi tahi has been key to the development of the plan and we acknowledge the value it has added to the process.

24. Consultation will be opened to allow the general public to have their say on the high-level content: Outcomes, Transformational Moves, A4E and Low Emissions City Centre.

25. The proposed period for public consultation is from mid-August to late September 2019. It is proposed that the consultation period runs for six weeks. In order to support Aucklanders to be able to provide feedback in a way that suits them best, all information will be provided online and will consider making available in hard copy on request.

26. All relevant information and documentation will be available online at [https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/have-your-say](https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/have-your-say). Members of the public will be able to read through this information and provide their feedback here.

27. A hard copy of the relevant information will be made available in libraries, local board offices and service centres upon request.

28. Written feedback will be gathered through forms (online and hard copy), emails, letters and proformas etc.

29. Submitters who gave feedback for the previous consultations on the CCMP, Auckland Plan 2050 (in the areas relevant to the CCMP), relevant Local Board Plans and provided their email addresses will be directly contacted and asked if they wish to comment. In addition to the targeted stakeholders, this gives access to submitters who are already engaged and wishing to be kept informed of the consultation process.
30. The 36,000 People’s Panel members and 12,000 members of the Auckland Conversations database will also be contacted and asked for their feedback. We will also consider how to engage with the diverse communities in the city centre.

31. The submitter databases and stakeholder lists will be cross-referenced to avoid duplication.

**Targeted stakeholder activity**

32. Following the 2 July Planning Committee meeting, a programme of targeted engagement will take place with parties who have shaped the content to date including (but not limited to) Council-Controlled Organisations (CCOs), local boards, Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum, business associations and city centre representatives. This will provide an opportunity to update these parties. It will also enable them to shape the consultation material and ensure that there is consistent knowledge of the CCMP refresh process across Council groups.

**Digital activity**

33. In addition to the various emails to targeted groups, the consultation will be promoted via Council’s official digital channels:
   - Auckland Council and the 21 Local Board Facebook pages
   - OurAuckland online
   - Auckland Council LinkedIn and Auckland Council Twitter

**CCMP Outcomes, Transformational Moves, A4E and ACAF**

34. The proposed consultation material is centred on the following components:
   - 10 Outcomes
   - 8 Transformational Moves (incorporating Māori Outcomes, Grafton Gully and Waterfront Plan Integration)
   - Access for Everyone (this is the remaining content from 27 November 2018 that is not confined to a Transformational Move)
   - Auckland Climate Action Framework (ACAF)

**CCMP Outcomes**

35. The 2012 CCMP contains 10 city centre-wide Factors. These shape the CCMP projects. For 2020, the Factors are to be updated and re-cast as Outcomes. The text describing the Outcomes has been drafted by subject matter experts within Council groups and external organisations.

36. Changes proposed to the Factors are limited. Almost all the 2012 Factors have a 2020 Outcome equivalent as set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 CCMP Factor</th>
<th>2020 CCMP Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Celebrating our culture</td>
<td>1. Tāmaki Makaurau: Our place in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Access to and within the</td>
<td>2. Accessible city centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inclusiveness and child-</td>
<td>3. Inclusive, engaging and child-friendly city centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Value of open space</td>
<td>4. Green city centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Public life</td>
<td>5. Public life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Quality built form</td>
<td>7. Quality built form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The importance of heritage</td>
<td>8. Heritage-defined city centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. **Outcome 1 Tāmaki Makaurau: Our place in the world:** This outcome has been prepared with direct involvement of the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum. It includes aspirations and specific initiatives that the Forum have identified as core components of an authentic and thriving Māori identity and culture within the city centre. These include Māori enterprise, innovation and investment, a prominent, authentic and active mana whenua presence in the city and a Tāmaki Makaurau design approach founded on Māori design.

38. **Outcome 2 Accessible City Centre:** This outcome envisages continuation of the remarkable mode shift in city centre access towards walking, cycling, micro-mobility and public transport. Major investment in CRL and MRT will bring thousands more people into the city centre each morning. Auckland Council’s Access for Everyone concept will create a roadmap to reorganise the traffic network, provide more space for more efficient transport modes, make transport more inclusive and create more space for people to enjoy.

39. **Outcome 3 Inclusive, Engaging and Child-Friendly City Centre:** The city centre should be relevant, engaging and accessible to all who call Tāmaki Makaurau home, as well as the thousands of annual visitors, irrespective of age, ethnicity, gender or disability. Auckland's diversity is one of its greatest strengths. We need to support this and enable full participation in the city centre, applying principles of universal design that safeguard access for all.

40. **Outcome 4 A Green City Centre:** Access to green space – both green open spaces such as parks, waterfronts and reserves and the urban greening of streets and public spaces – is highly valued by Aucklanders. This outcome recognises the importance of increasing access to green space as the city centre continues to grow. It also acknowledges its positive impact on ecosystems, air and water quality and mental health.

41. **Outcome 5 Public Life:** This is an update of the existing outcome. It envisages better public space in Auckland’s postcard locations as well as everyday streets within the city centre. It acknowledges continued growth in the level and diversity of public life and reflects greater understanding of the multiple benefits of high-quality public space.

42. **Outcome 6 Liveable City Centre:** This outcome acknowledges the growth in city centre population and formally recognises the importance of the city centre as a place to live. It provides direction around housing affordability, homelessness, safety and public space, highlighting the need for social infrastructure in the city centre.

43. **Outcome 7 Quality Built Form:** This outcome links the City Centre Masterplan to statutory planning and design tools in Auckland. These include the Unitary Plan, the Auckland Urban Design Panel and the refreshed Auckland Plan to deliver a well-designed and planned city centre.

44. **Outcome 8 Heritage-Defined City Centre:** This outcome envisages increased understanding, protection and conservation of city centre heritage places, landscapes and stories. City centre development will reinforce our unique cityscape, streetscapes and heritage.

45. **Outcome 9 Sustainable City Centre:** This outcome is centred on the forthcoming Auckland Climate Action Framework (ACAF) and Outcome 5 of the Auckland Plan. It shapes Council’s approach to transport, air quality and water quality in the city centre.

46. **Outcome 10 Prosperous City Centre:** Auckland city centre generates 7.4% of New Zealand’s GDP and accommodates a uniquely rich mix of functions in a relatively compact area. The Masterplan sets out practical interventions for how we develop the city centre to continue to flourish as an economic centre and cater for the different needs of its cosmopolitan population.
CCMP Transformational Moves

47. The 2012 CCMP contains eight place-specific Transformational Moves (“the moves”). These show where city centre projects are envisioned to take place and inform subsequent design, development and delivery. A similar approach is proposed for 2020.

48. Changes proposed to the moves reflect wider changes to Auckland city centre over the past seven years. Every 2012 moves has a 2020 equivalent; there is also a brand-new move: Māori Outcomes, which addresses a specific gap in the 2012 CCMP. The moves are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 CCMP Transformational Move</th>
<th>2020 CCMP Transformational Move</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Harbour Edge Stitch</td>
<td>1. Māori Outcomes NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The East-West Stitch</td>
<td>2. East and West Stitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Engine Room</td>
<td>3. Queen Street Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Innovation Cradle</td>
<td>4. Innovation Cradle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Public life</td>
<td>5. Rapid Transit-Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Green Link</td>
<td>6. The Green Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. City to the Villages</td>
<td>7. City to the Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Water City</td>
<td>8. Harbour Edge Stitch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49. **Move 1 Māori Outcomes:** This new move proposes nine interventions through the city centre and waterfront to reflect the aspiration for a Māori identity that is Tāmaki Makaurau’s point of difference in the world. The Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum has approved text and mapped preliminary concepts for further development to deliver this outcome. The concepts will be refined and further developed over the next six months and will then inform the CCMP refresh.

50. **Move 2 East and West Stitch:** Land at both the east and west edges of the city centre is under-used and under-valued, cut off by major roads. This move proposes interventions to stitch the sides of the city centre together, enabling high-density, high-quality, high-value development. The Eastern Transformation proposes to complete SH16 to Tāmaki Drive, improving access from the Port to the motorway and from Parnell to the city centre. It is also essential for A4E.

51. **Move 3 Queen Street Valley:** The arrival of Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) in Queen Street will transform city centre access. This move envisages a pedestrian-friendly design for Queen Street, with access and movement coordinated via A4E. Queen Street valley will become a zero emissions area as per the Auckland Climate Action Plan. Albert Street will become a complementary commercial address to Queen Street, supported by City Rail Link (CRL).

52. **Move 4 Innovation Cradle:** The city centre university campuses are two of the city centre’s most important economic assets, with many undergraduate and postgraduate students, highly-respected faculties and significant commercial arms. This updated move seeks to leverage the value and prominence of the Universities and improve connections between the city centre and inner-city campuses.

53. **Move 5 Rapid Transit Supported Growth:** CRL and MRT will concentrate access and activity in the city centre along the Waihorotiu Queen Street Valley. CRL and MRT station / stop areas in close proximity at Britomart (downtown), Aotea Quarter (midtown) and Karangahape Road (uptown) will become key development areas, accessible by CRL, MRT, bus and, in Britomart’s case, ferry. Further out in the city fringe, the proposed Dominion Road Junction MRT station, supported by the nearby Mt Eden CRL station, will become similarly connected High levels of footfall across the day will make these areas viable, 24-hour, mixed-use locations.
54. **Move 6 Green Link:** Updating the 2012 move, a growing city centre needs to maintain and enhance access to green spaces. This move delivers a connected network of green parks and street spaces from the Auckland Domain through to Albert Park, Victoria Park, Wynyard Quarter and the future headland park. It improves east-west pedestrian connectivity and provides new public open space across midtown.

55. **Move 7 City to the Villages:** Updating the 2012 move, this reflects changes such as city centre population growth and improvements such as Te Ara I Whiti / The Lightpath. Better connections to the city fringe are needed to provide access to multiple destinations that are missing from or complement the offering in the city centre.

56. **Move 8 Harbour Edge Stitch:** This new move is a combination of TM1 (Harbour Edge Stitch) and TM8 (Water City) from the 2012 CCMP and integrates the Waterfront Plan into the CCMP. The waterfront axis from Harbour Bridge Park in the west to Teal Park in the east is transformed into a high-quality harbour edge pedestrian-friendly space. Regeneration of Wynyard Quarter continues, with planning underway for the extended linear park and headland open space. Street connections north-south across the axis will stitch harbour edge public spaces and destinations back into the city.

57. As port operations consolidate to the east and long-term cruise berths are developed, Queens Wharf becomes part of the ‘golden T’ people place from lower Queen Street and along Quay Street. Running parallel with the waterfront axis will be intimate mid-block east-west laneways as part of the Laneway Circuit as well as an upgraded vehicle and public transport movement corridor – Fanshawe Street, Custom Street, Beach Road and the Strand.

**Access for Everyone (A4E)**

58. **A4E** is a strategy to provide more space for people by reorganising transport circulation and street operations in Auckland’s city centre. It aims to future-proof the city centre to accommodate its growing population and leverage transformational transport investments.

59. **A4E** divides the city centre into 11 separate low-traffic neighbourhoods, including one expansive pedestrian priority zone across the Queen Street Valley. General traffic would access individual neighbourhoods from the city’s edge. This traffic circulation and street concept would unlock city centre space for people walking, people cycling, emergency services, mobility access, business services and deliveries. An initial concept has been developed and further work will be required with AT, the NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) and city centre stakeholders to see how best to progress the outcome.

**Auckland Climate Action Framework (ACAF) – Low Emissions City Centre**

60. Auckland Council unanimously declared a Climate Emergency on 11 June 2019. One of the five flagship actions from the 2019 Auckland Climate Symposium in March was to: ‘Establish a zero carbon, resilient city centre’. The refreshed CCMP will contribute to this by creating a low-emissions area in the Queen Street Valley and favouring zero-emissions transport modes. This is consistent with A4E and CCMP Transformational Move 3. It also supports the delivery of the Mayor of Auckland’s commitments to the C40 Cities Fossil-Fuel-Free Streets declaration. The CCMP team will be working with the ACAF team as it progresses to ensure appropriate alignment.

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views**

61. This work has entailed constant input from CCOs, particularly Panuku and AT. Content development has taken place with frequent input and counsel from strategy and operational departments within AT. Other council departments have helped to map the relationship between the CCMP outcomes and moves, Auckland Plan outcomes and business case frameworks. This has ensured a high degree of internal coordination with Council group strategies, plans and processes. It has also shaped ongoing projects, for example engagement with AT Network Management regarding city centre bus network development.
62. A policy mapping exercise has been undertaken to map CCMP outcomes to the Auckland Plan outcomes. This exercise has shown a high level of consistency between the two levels of outcomes. Each CCMP outcome delivers at least three Auckland Plan outcomes and that two CCMP outcomes deliver all six. This shows the CCMP's ability to apply the Auckland Plan outcomes to a specific area of the city.

63. A similar exercise was carried out mapping the moves to the Auckland Plan outcomes, directions and focus areas. This again shows a constant policy thread between the politically-endorsed statutory plan for the city, the spatial plan for its centre and detailed, area-based proposals for its implementation.

64. The outcomes and moves also embed the five waterfront goals from the 2012 Waterfront Plan including the Mana Whenua goals adopted by the Panuku Mana Whenua Governance Forum.

65. The Port Future Study (2015-2016) consensus working group recommended council establish a port relocation option for freight (with cruise remaining in the Waitematā waterfront) which would likely be needed 30-50 years from 2016. The group made recommendations for investigating locations and for monitoring at the current port site to determine timing of any necessary move.

66. The Ports of Auckland Ltd 30-year master plan caters for Auckland's growing freight needs until 2050. The Port Future Study and the Port’s master plan are broadly in alignment in that the eventual move of the port operations is likely in the next 30-50 years, in which case investments in the port here on the Waitematā and surrounding land use decisions should be not preclude redevelopment of this space over the long-term time horizon (30-50+ years).

67. In addition, the Government has appointed a Working Group to undertake the Upper North Island Supply Chain study. The Study will provide recommendations to government for priorities for investment in the upper North Island supply chain infrastructure. The working group’s work includes a feasibility study to explore moving the location of the Ports of Auckland, with serious consideration to be given to Northport. The group’s interim report was published in May 2019 with two further reports to Cabinet due in June and September 2019.

68. While the time horizons for this work is 30-50 years in the future, over that period there will be decisions made about individual wharves and their functions, with impacts on surrounding land use. There is a high degree of community interest in wharves and the surrounding land use potential. Community views will be sought to inform council decisions and to ensure integration with the CCMP which may need to be updated at the appropriate time.

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe**

**Local impacts and local board views**

69. Auckland city centre sits entirely within the Waitematā Local Board area. A workshop on 31 July 2018 introduced the Board to the proposed components of the CCMP refresh. Feedback from this workshop informed the material approved at Planning Committee in November 2018. At this meeting, a supporting statement was provided by Pippa Coom on behalf of Waitematā Local Board (PLA/2018/118).

70. Engagement was offered to all local boards in December 2018. This offer was taken up by Waitematā and Ōrākei Local Boards. Workshops were undertaken with both local boards in February 2019 and this feedback has shaped the development of content and subsequent engagement. The opportunity for further engagement with all local boards will be re-offered throughout the update.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

71. The Auckland Plan Māori Identity and Wellbeing outcome identifies that: “A thriving Māori identity is Auckland’s point of difference in the world – it advances prosperity for Māori and benefits all Aucklanders.” The objective is that the city centre reflects this aspiration. This has shaped the CCMP refresh.

72. The greatest changes around the CCMP are centred on the Māori Identify and Wellbeing outcome in the Auckland Plan 2050. This has resulted in both a new outcome and a new transformational move in the CCMP. The CCMP refresh team has actively supported the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum (MWKF) Culture and Identity pou over the past year in developing this content.

Outcome 1 Tāmaki Makaurau: Our place in the world envisages contemporary Māori life and culture and Mana Whenua having a prominent, authentic and active presence in the city centre. Through working closely with Mana Whenua, a range of unique initiatives and developments will provide all Aucklanders and visitors with a deeper understanding of Mana Whenua histories, associations and aspirations within the City Centre and Waterfront.

Transformational Move 1 Māori Outcomes: This new move proposes nine interventions through the city centre and waterfront, based around the following goals:

- Tāmaki Makaurau – Our Place in the World;
- Te Taiao – The Environment;
- Tapuwa - Cultural Footprint

73. In support of the goals expressed above, the MWKF has approved text and mapped preliminary concepts for further development over the next six months.

74. Transformational Move 2 considers the east and west edges of the city centre. This includes Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei landholdings in the area around Quay Park and the Strand. Since July 2018, Auckland Design Office (ADO) representatives have worked with Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei to develop a concept that is compatible with Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei’s long-term plans for the area. This addresses Directions 1 and 3 and Focus Area 4 in the Auckland Plan’s Māori Identity and Wellbeing outcome.

75. The CCMP outcomes and transformational moves have both been mapped against the Auckland Plan Māori Identity and Wellbeing outcome. In both cases, the degree of alignment is substantial. All 10 CCMP outcomes address the directions and factors of Māori Identity and Wellbeing.

76. CCMP content will continue to be developed in partnership with the MWKF.

77. It is also important for Council to engage with mataawaka to share the material produced to date and discuss how the team updating and revising the City Centre Masterplan can engage with Māori and Māori communities who use, live and work in the city centre.

78. It will also be informed by the Independent Māori Statutory Board’s Schedule of Issues of Significance. Additional advice will be provided by Auckland Council’s Māori Design subject matter experts.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

79. The consultation costs for the CCMP Refresh are estimated at up to $70,000. This includes allowances for hui, consultation and engagement analysis, consultation reporting and production of consultation material as necessary.

80. The CCMP will shape future inputs and submissions to the Long-Term Plan (LTP), starting from 2020.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

81. Timing: The CCMP refresh has been designed to be fully-complete by Q1 2020 in order to inform the 2021-24 LTP process. A delay to the CCMP refresh process would thus have knock-on effects on the funding of city centre and waterfront programmes and projects.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

82. Proceed with internal and public engagement as outlines in the proposed consultation approach as outlined in Attachment A.

83. Develop structure and content for digital masterplan, informed by engagement.

84. Present digital CCMP for Planning Committee consideration and approval in February 2020 prior to wider release.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>CCMP Consultation and Engagement Plan</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>CCMP Project Timeframe Diagram</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Authorisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Weeks - Principal Urban Design</td>
<td>Ludo Campbell-Reid – General Manager - Auckland Design Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Megan Tyler - Chief of Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City Centre Masterplan Refresh

Consultation and engagement plan

21 06 2019
## Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications objectives</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement strategy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications tools and methods</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks &amp; mitigation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Purpose**

The purpose of this document is to set out the consultation and engagement approach for the City Centre Masterplan (CCMP) refresh work to be led by Auckland Design Office (ADO) between July 2019 and March 2020.

It will outline how the CCMP project team will collaborate and engage with community and industry partners, subject matter experts, city centre reference groups, elected members and the wider public.

**Background**

In 2012 the CCMP and Waterfront Plan were published, setting out a bold vision for the heart of Auckland.

While it is consistent with the statutory Auckland Plan 2050, the CCMP is itself a non-statutory document. It is designed to set out a vision for the city centre, directing and coordinating decision-making and influencing billions of dollars’ worth of investments. As with Council’s other high-level strategies, such as the Auckland Plan, the CCMP needs to be kept up to date and relevant to shape city centre and positively impact the public realm. It also needs to excite and enthuse stakeholders such as:

- Council groups and Cross-Council Organisations (CCOs)
- Investors
- Property developers
- Residents
- Businesses
- Visitors
- Elected members
- Iwi

The Planning Committee specified the importance of taking a collaborative approach to the CCMP refresh in 2018.

**Planning Committee Resolution PLA/2018/121 (para. e) states that the Planning Committee:**

...e) consider an indicative programme of a rolling review of the City Centre Masterplan by July 2019, ensuring the development of the programme and vision is undertaken collaboratively across the council family and with external stakeholders.

This plan sets the direction for consultation and engagement to support the CCMP refresh. It provides a framework and direction for targeting messaging, engagement and feedback collection. The purpose is to inform Aucklanders about the progress to refresh the CCMP and provide an opportunity to contribute their views on its development, as well as continue with focused, targeted engagement with key community groups and individuals to incorporate their input to help co-design specific aspects of the plan.
Communication objectives

- Ensure all directly and indirectly affected stakeholders, the local community, commuters and users of the City Centre are informed of the proposals and have a chance to understand them and comment, should they wish
- Ensure the public and stakeholders are well-informed on the project
- Clearly communicate benefits and vision
- Provide an open communications flow across the council whanau
- Refine a well-informed approach to messaging, media and communications
- Ensure that the general public are aware that they can feed into the consultation via Have Your Say

Approach

To develop and refine content, the CCMP refresh team intends to use a combination of targeted stakeholder engagement and public engagement. This process has three distinct phases taking place over eight months.

Phase 1: July 2019 to August 2019
- Targeted engagement with stakeholders, partners and subject matter experts (SMEs)

Phase 2: August 2019 to September 2019
- Public engagement via Have Your Say following targeted engagement

Phase 3: February 2020 to March 2020
  i. Planning Committee scrutiny and approval of digital CCMP
  ii. Close the loop feedback report

A timetable is provided on page 14

In our first phase, we will engage directly with stakeholders and identify opportunities to engage with the community to shape the high-level structure of the refreshed CCMP. This material will then be released for wider public input to shape and inform the development of the refreshed plan. Where appropriate, comments and feedback received will be used to shape and inform the CCMP refresh.

Between September 2019 and February 2020 the refreshed CCMP will be produced as a digital document, with its direction and content shaped by this feedback. This in turn will shape the content which will be submitted to the Planning Committee for publication in February 2020.

Phase 1: Targeted engagement; early engagement and feedback (July 2019 – August 2019)
The CCMP project team recognises that different methods of communication and engagement will be required to ensure that elected members, partners, stakeholders, representative bodies and affected parties are informed of the proposed refresh.

Extensive face-to-face consultation has already taken place with city centre partners, stakeholders, reference groups, local boards and Council family. This will continue prior to wider public consultations and throughout the drafting process. This mahi tahi has been key to the development of the plan to date and we acknowledge the value it has added to the process.

Early targeted engagement will enable the CCMP to reflect the expertise of partners, stakeholders and SMEs. Following the 2 July Planning Committee meeting, a programme of targeted engagement will take place with parties who have shaped the content to date including (but not limited to) Council-Controlled Organisations (CCOs), local boards, Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum, business associations and city centre representatives (see p. 7).

This will provide an opportunity to update these parties. It will also enable them to shape the consultation material and ensure that there is consistent knowledge of the CCMP refresh process across Council groups.

The targeted engagement is aimed at harnessing specialist knowledge to produce material that is as good as possible for public consultation, maximising quality and minimising risk.

**Phase 2: Public engagement and feedback (August 2019 – September 2019)**

In order to improve public understanding, knowledge and buy-in to the CCMP refresh, a programme of engagement will inform the public of the refresh process, provide details of proposed content and collect feedback.

The proposed period for public consultation is from mid-August to late September 2019. It is proposed that the consultation period runs for six weeks. In order to support Aucklanders to be able to provide feedback in a way that suits them best, all information will be provided online and will consider making available in hard copy on request.

In addition to the various emails to targeted groups, the consultation will be promoted via Council’s official digital channels:

- Auckland Council and the 21 Local Board Facebook pages
- OurAuckland online
- Auckland Council LinkedIn
- Auckland Council Twitter

The consultation and engagement approach will allow individuals and organisations the chance to say as little or as much as they would like via Have Your Say. This will aid understanding of the opportunities, perceptions and risks of CCMP refresh proposals. The CCMP refresh team will use this material to refine this material, increasing support and adoption.

Have Your Say will ask people for their levels of support, offer them the chance to highlight priorities and seek detailed comments to help refine the plan and prioritise actions. Respondents will be able to make suggestions for city centre development. Attachments will be allowed.
Material submitted in Phase 2 will be subjected to rigorous analysis to ensure that the CCMP is developed as a genuinely representative vision for the heart of Auckland.

Following the conclusion of Phase 2 engagement, analysis of responses will be undertaken to inform content creation for the digital CCMP.

Ongoing engagement will take place with individual submitters as required.

Phase 3:
The structure and content of the digital CCMP is planned for completion in early 2020. This will be presented for Planning Committee approval.

Engagement Strategy

The engagement strategy determines how the City Centre Masterplan team will engage with all people and organisations affected by or interested in the future strategy for the development of the city centre. This process will:

- Shape the content and details of CCMP content
- Provide a dialogue between the CCMP refresh team and city centre organisations representing tens of thousands of people and businesses
- Allow the CCMP refresh team to disseminate messaging and communications via groups’ memberships.
- Ensure that Aucklanders are informed about plans and developments and can participate in any trials concept testing and consultation activities.

In order to structure the level of engagement with interested parties the following classifications have been applied:

A) Elected Members
B) Partners
C) Council Internal Audiences
D) Council-Controlled Organisations (CCOs)
E) Advisory Panels
F) City Centre reference groups
G) Parties directly affected by upcoming changes
H) General public

Communications and engagement objectives and specific tactics for engaging with each of the groups identified above are outlined below:

Targeted Engagement

Groups A-G will be approached by Council. They can provide informal feedback and also submit formally via Have Your Say in Phase 2.

A) Elected members
Councillors

The Planning Committee oversees the CCMP. Councillors have been engaged via a programme of Planning Committee workshops and where appropriate, memos and briefings to the Chair and the Committee.

Local Board Members

A memo to all Local Boards was issued after the 1 November 2018 Planning Committee workshop on the CCMP refresh. All were offered the opportunity to be informed and to participate in the content development process for the CCMP.

The two Local Boards that responded, Waitemata and Orākei, have been briefed at workshops, proving the refresh team with informal feedback to inform the refreshed CCMP content. In July a memo will be provided to local boards. Face to face meetings will be available if desired. Local boards will be able to make submissions on the CCMP refresh via Have Your Say in August-September 2019.

Independent Māori Statutory Board

The Independent Māori Statutory Board (IMSB) has been approached for input and advice. CCMP content will be informed by the IMSB’s Schedule of Issues of Significance.

B) Partners

Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum

Council has engaged with the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum (MWKF) throughout the development of the Māori Outcomes strategic work. The CCMP refresh team has actively supported the MWKF Culture and Identity over the past year in developing this content and will continue to do so.

Mataawaka

A process for engaging with Mataawaka has been developed in conjunction with Tau Henare and the IMSB in response to questions from the Planning Committee meeting on 27 November 2019. A hui with Mataawaka will take place in July 2019 and this will be the basis for further engagement through 2019.

Ngāti Whātua Orakei

Since July 2018, CCMP refresh representatives have worked with Ngāti Whātua Orakei to develop a concept that is compatible with Ngāti Whātua Orakei long-term plans for the Quay Park area. This relationship will continue via targeted engagement, primarily regarding CCMP Transformational Move 2 (East and West Stitch).

C) Council internal audiences

Council internal audiences include:

- Staff responsible for delivering components of the refreshed CCMP
D) CCOs

Development of content to date has taken place with CCOs and other major stakeholders via project-specific working groups and workshops and presentations on the overall refresh. Targeted engagement will be offered to the following organisations during July 2019. This includes SMEs and senior management/ELTs.

- Panuku Development Auckland
- Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED)
- Auckland Transport (AT)
- New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA)
- Ports of Auckland Limited (POAL)
- Regional Facilities Auckland (RFA)

E) Advisory panels

Auckland’s 11 advisory panels provide specialist knowledge on issues pertaining to the subject areas and/or geographic areas. Following the 27 November 2018 Planning Committee meeting the CCMP refresh team gave a briefing and workshop discussion to all advisory panels that requested one. Briefings and workshops were also held with specialist panels within AT as directed.

The same will be offered in July 2019 to all panels. Advisory panels and specialist panels engaged with to date are listed below.

- Auckland City Centre Advisory Board
- Youth Advisory Panel
- Seniors Advisory Panel
- Disability Advisory Panel
- Heritage Advisory Panel
- AT Council Projects Advisory Group
- AT Public Transport Accessibility Group

F) City centre reference group

This group consists of membership organisations that represent people interested in or affected by the long-term development of the city centre. This has shaped the CCMP content. Engagement has occurred via reference group meetings and on a one-on-one basis as required.

Key parties include:

- Heart of the City
- City Centre Residents Group
- Greater Auckland
- Generation Zero
- Automobile Association
- Universities (UoA and AUT)
A reference group workshop is scheduled for early July.

G) Parties directly affected by upcoming changes

Outside the reference groups are people directly or indirectly affected by upcoming changes. These include Auckland’s diverse communities and people who operate in the city centre such as tradespeople, environmental services, couriers and those that work or make deliveries. It also includes economic and professional sectors, such as education, legal, financial, hospitality, and retail. These sectors will need to know about the CCMP refresh, how it will affect them and the benefits the proposed changes will provide. Groups that have been consulted on A4E to-date will be updated on the A4E trials process at the same time as CCMP.

All of the above groups will receive targeted engagement and will have the opportunity to provide informal feedback. They will also be invited to provide formal feedback via Have Your Say.

H) General Public

The city centre is for all Aucklanders. Phase 2 engagement will take place via Have Your Say from mid-August to late September 2019. Consultation material and questions will be developed during July, informed by targeted engagements. It is proposed that the consultation period runs for six weeks.

All relevant information and documentation will be available online at https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/have-your-say. In order to support Aucklanders to be able to provide feedback in a way that suits them best, all information will be provided online and in hard copy.

Members of the public will be able to read through this information and provide their feedback here. Hard copies of the relevant information will be made available in the relevant libraries, local board offices and service centres. Members of the public will also be able to request hard copies be sent to them by post.

Communication tools and methods

The team will communicate with interested parties in the following ways:

- Planning Committee workshops and meetings
- Local board memos, meetings and workshops
- Press releases, reporting and email or on-line messaging
- Auckland Council digital platforms
- One-on-one meetings with key stakeholders
- Mana whenua forums
- Letters, memos and emails
- Stakeholder meetings

### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elected Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Councillors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ensure councillors understand the objectives and outcomes of the CCMP and the associated work programme | • present concepts and programme of work at workshops.  
• provide updates using memos and verbal briefings as required  
• brief Chair |
| Ensure Councillors have opportunity to guide and shape the content | • use workshops to collect feedback  
• invite Councillors to participate and promote trial activity |
| Ensure Councillors have sufficient confidence to sign off the refresh CCMP | • provide material to evidence input from a wide range of sources |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Boards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ensure local boards who wish to be involved in content development have an opportunity to comment and shape the plan. | • send memo to local boards  
• engage with interested local boards as required, via workshops  
• obtain informal feedback at workshops  
• receive formal feedback and submissions via Have Your Say  
• follow up on any suggested activity  
• carry on the conversation as required  
• report to Local Boards for resolution prior to Planning Committee report deadlines |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Māori Statutory Board (IMSB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow recommendations of IMSB Schedule of Issues of Significance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Partners

**Mana whenua**
### Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ensure mana whenua have been engaged with and have had the opportunity to contribute to the shape of the plans | - establish relationships at appropriate level  
- ensure understanding of the nature of the issues  
- collect feedback via engagement with Kaitiaki Forum  
- follow up on any suggested activity  
- carry on the conversation as required |

### Mataawaka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ensure appropriate engagement with Mataawaka. | - carry out initial workshop in July 2019  
- carry on the conversation as required |

### Advisory Panels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ensure interested advisory panels have had a chance to comment and shape the plan | - send memo to panel chairs providing update of CCMP refresh progress to date.  
- Offer to attend a workshop or meeting  
- present the work programme and concepts at the meeting  
- collect feedback  
- follow up on any suggested activity  
- carry on the conversation as required |

### Internal Audiences and CCOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ensure Senior Managers internally within Council and at CCOs and other partner agencies are informed and have opportunity to comment | - meet with those senior managers that need to and want to know about the plans  
- engage and provide information as necessary so they are comfortable with the concepts, process and that they have had an opportunity to feed in |

### City Centre Reference Group

| Objective | Actions |
Ensure members and representative groups that operate in or are resident in the city centre are informed of the concepts and able to work through the implications for themselves

- engage with representative bodies by inviting them to join reference groups shaping the plan
- communicate with the wider city centre community notifying them of upcoming changes at points throughout the work programme
- provide quality messaging for direct and indirect dissemination

**Those directly affected by upcoming changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that those directly affected by the CCMP refresh are informed about it</td>
<td>Memo and marketing collateral distributed through print and electronic media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure they have an opportunity to experience trials and engage with the material</td>
<td>Obtain feedback via Have Your Say</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Public**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ensure all Aucklanders are aware of and have a chance to understand the CCMP Refresh | Publicise CCMP engagement via:  
  - Auckland Council and the 21 Local Board Facebook pages  
  - OurAuckland online  
  - Auckland Council LinkedIn  
  - Auckland Council Twitter  
  - Obtain feedback via Have Your Say. |

**Governance**

The governance of the project is

- **Committee Level**
  - Planning Committee

- **Executive Level**
  - City Centre and Waterfront Executive steering Group (ESG)
  - City Centre and Waterfront Portfolio Steering Group (PSG)

- **Project Level**
  - Ludo Campbell-Reid - Project Sponsor
  - Tim Fitzpatrick - Business Owner
Risks & mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible risks</th>
<th>Steps to be taken</th>
<th>Risk owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Election risk</td>
<td>• Maintain discussion at a high level to avoid being drawn into project level.</td>
<td>Auckland Design Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme or negative reaction to proposals</td>
<td>• Targeted engagement to refine material, informing and informed by engagement colleagues</td>
<td>Auckland Design Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Politicians or local board members talk negatively about the project in the media and/or provide incorrect information | • Ensure local boards are informed on progress and any concerns raised are understood and mitigated.  
  • Workshops held to explain concepts and collect feedback  
  • Workshops, memos and briefings sent to mayor and councillors to explain activities and progress and provide opportunities to participate | Auckland Design Office |

Appendix

Appendix 1: Planning Committee Resolutions

Resolution number PLA/2018/121

MOVED by Chairperson C Darby, seconded by Mayor P Goff:

That the Planning Committee:

a) agree the proposed process for updating the Auckland City Centre Masterplan 2040:
   i) digitisation in time to inform Auckland Council’s 2021 – 2031 Long Term Plan
   ii) the use of rolling updates rather than six yearly updates

b) agree on the development of the following new content for public consultation and committee approval by July 2019:
   i) Māori Outcomes
   ii) Grafton Gully Boulevard
   iii) Access for Everyone

c) endorse the use of trials and “tactical urbanism” initiatives in order to test and consult on the initiatives in clause b) ii) and iii) above

d) request staff to trial an “open streets” initiative in the City Centre and work with interested Local Boards to trial it in other centres

e) consider an indicative programme of a rolling review of the City Centre Masterplan by July 2019, ensuring the development of the programme and vision is undertaken collaboratively across the council family and with external stakeholders.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
### Planning Committee

02 July 2019

---

**City Centre Masterplan refresh**

#### Attachment B

**Item 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUNE</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUGUST</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER</th>
<th>OCTOBER</th>
<th>NOVEMBER</th>
<th>DECEMBER</th>
<th>JANUARY</th>
<th>FEBRUARY</th>
<th>MARCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12/06 FINAL WORKSHOP  
  - Transformational moves  
  - New Masterplan material | PHASE 1  
TARGETED ENGAGEMENT  
  - Elected members  
  - Partners  
  - Council & CCOs  
  - Advisory panels  
  - Reference groups  
  - Other interested parties | PHASE 2  
6 WEEKS PUBLIC CONSULTATION  
  "HAVE YOUR SAY" | INTERNAL REVIEW & ANALYSIS OF FEEDBACK  
Further targeted engagement as required | PHASE 3  
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Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To provide advice on council’s submission to the Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Bill and outline the process for finalising the submission.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Bill (the Bill) was introduced in to Parliament on 31 May 2019. The Bill establishes Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities as a new Crown entity bringing together Housing New Zealand Corporation (HNZC), HLC (Homes. Land. Community.) and the KiwiBuild Unit of the Ministry for Housing and Urban Development.

3. Submissions on the Bill close on 11 July 2019. The intention is that it will come into force on 1 October 2019.

4. The Bill is the first of two pieces of legislation applying to the new entity. A further Bill is expected in the third quarter of this year which will sets out the powers that Kāinga Ora- Homes and Communities can assume to enable it to undertake urban development in specified development areas.

5. In May 2017 the council’s submission to the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment’s (MBIE) “Urban Development Authorities: Discussion Document”, February 2017, supported, in principle, the establishment of urban development authorities but raised some issues relating to its powers and the process for selecting development locations.

6. Auckland Council will have a keen interest in the powers of the urban development authority and how they can be applied. These are matters that will be dealt with in the second Bill which will be the subject of a separate submission later this year.

7. The draft submission (attachment A) supports a number of aspects of the Bill but seeks much greater recognition of the significant overlaps between the functions of local government and those of the new entity.

8. Despite the nature and extent of the overlapping functions, local government is not explicitly recognised in the Bill. While there are provisions that reference partnering, engaging and consulting with ‘other persons and organisations’ (or similar), these provisions fall well short of what is required to ensure that local government’s responsibilities are recognised, and interests protected.

9. The draft submission also requests a number of changes, additions, or clarifications including a new provision that would have the effect of ensuring that the new entity is required to give effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and a provision that would clarify that the new entity is liable for development contributions.

10. The report recommends that the committee delegates authority to the Chair, Deputy Chair and an Independent Māori Statutory Board member to approve the final submission following receipt of all local board input by 9 July.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Planning Committee:

a) approve the draft submission (Attachment A) to the Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Bill subject to receiving input from local boards which will be appended to the submission and incorporating any changes requested by this committee.

b) delegate authority to the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Planning Committee, and an Independent Māori Statutory Board member to approve the final submission.

Horopaki
Context

11. The Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Bill (the Bill) was introduced in to Parliament on 31 May 2019. The Bill establishes Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities as a new Crown entity by:
   • disestablishing HNZC and HLC
   • putting HNZC and HLC’s assets into Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities
   • repealing the Housing Corporation Act 1974
   • putting some of the functions and assets related to KiwiBuild that currently sit in the Ministry for Housing and Urban Development into Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities
   • setting up a new board of 6-8 members.

12. Submissions on the Bill close on 11 July 2019. The intention is that it will come into force on 1 October 2019.

13. The Bill is the first of two pieces of legislation applying to the new entity. A further Bill is expected in the third quarter of this year which will sets out the powers that Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities can assume to enable it to undertake urban development in specified development areas.

14. In May 2017 council’s submission to MBIE’s “Urban Development Authorities: Discussion Document”, February 2017, supported, in principle, the establishment of urban development authorities but raised some issues relating to its powers and the process for selecting development locations.

15. Auckland Council will have a keen interest in the powers of the urban development authority and how they can be applied. These are matters that will be dealt with in the second Bill which will be the subject of a separate submission later this year.

Summary of Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities Bill

16. The objective of the new entity is to “contribute to sustainable, inclusive and thriving communities that:
   • provide people with good quality, affordable housing choices that meet diverse needs; and
   • support good access to jobs, amenities and services; and
   • otherwise sustain or enhance the overall economic, social, environmental and cultural wellbeing of current and future generations.”

17. The entity has two key functions;
   • being a public housing landlord
   • leading and co-ordinating urban development.
18. The Bill in section 13 elaborates on those functions, and in section 14 operating principles for the entity are set out under the following themes
   • Public housing solutions that contribute positively to well-being
   • Housing supply meets needs
   • Well-functioning urban environments
   • Stewardship and sustainability collaboration and effective partnership.

19. A key aspect of the Bill is the introduction of a Government Policy Statement (GPS) on housing and urban development. This GPS will set out:
   • the Government’s overall direction and priorities for housing and urban development
   • how the Government expects Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities to manage its functions and operations to meet the Government’s directions and priorities
   • how the Government expects other agencies to support that direction and those priorities
   • the Government’s expectations relating to Māori interests, partnering with Māori and protections for Māori interests.

20. The Ministers (the Minister of Finance and the Minister who has authority for the administration of the Act) must issue the GPS no later than 1 October 2020. It will cover a period of at least ten years from date of issue and must be reviewed at intervals of no more than three years.

21. In preparing the GPS the Ministers must:
   • be satisfied that the GPS promotes a housing and urban development system that contributes to the current or future well-being of New Zealanders; and
   • consult Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities and persons, and representative groups of persons, who have an interest in housing and urban development in New Zealand.

22. Another key focus is on Māori interests. Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities is charged with understanding, supporting and enabling the aspirations of Māori in relation to urban development. The GPS must include the government’s expectations in relation to Māori interests, partnering with Māori, and protecting Māori interests.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

23. The Government’s intention to create a new urban development agency and to combine the assets and functions of HNZC, HLC and the KiwiBuild Unit has been clearly signalled and government officials have kept council staff well informed of the process to establish the new entity.

24. The draft submission supports a number of aspects of the Bill but seeks much greater recognition of the significant overlaps between the functions of local government and those of the new entity.

25. Specific concerns arising from these overlaps are highlighted in the draft submission and include:
   • the potential for interruptions to Panuku Development Auckland’s delivery programme
   • the potential operational and financial implications for the council family of the new entity providing or enabling infrastructure that has impacts on wider infrastructure networks
   • the council family’s responsibility for managing and maintaining infrastructure after Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities exits a development project
• the implications of the new GPS on housing and urban development (GPS) for the Auckland Plan 2050 and the Auckland Development Strategy which have been through extensive community consultation processes.

26. Despite the nature and extent of the overlapping functions, local government is not explicitly recognised in the Bill. While there are provisions that reference partnering, engaging and consulting with ‘other persons and organisations’ (or similar), these provisions fall well short of what is required to ensure that local government’s responsibilities are recognised, and interests protected.

27. Another area of significant concern is the lack of clarity about whether Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities is liable for development contributions. While we believe the intent is for the entity to be liable, this needs to be explicit as the impact on local government would be substantial if the entity was found not to be liable.

28. Key points in the draft submission (Attachment A) include:

- The need for an explicit provision to specify that the Act will be administered and interpreted to give effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.
- Support for the requirement for expertise in local government to be part of the skill-set of the board and request inclusion of expertise in Treaty of Waitangi settlements to be part of the required skill-set.
- Support for the overarching objective of Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities ‘to contribute to sustainable, inclusive and thriving communities’.
- The need to limit the entity’s activities to locations where it can add value, for example for complex urban projects where there is a recognised market failure.
- Adding reference to ‘universal design’ in the functions and operating principles.
- Adding reference to ‘employment opportunities’ in the operating principles.
- Ensuring that the entity’s obligations to enable the aspirations of communities in relation to urban development require it to recognise aspirations reflected in local government plans and strategies that have been adopted following community consultation.
- Supporting the broad focus reflected in the operating principles on quality housing, tenant wellbeing and community connections.
- Ensuring that the entity is required to consider ‘value for money’ in its infrastructure investments as well as ‘whole of life costs’.
- Noting that requirements to partner and have early and meaningful engagement with Māori and offer Māori opportunities to participate in urban development will require the entity to partner and engage with both mana whenua and mataawaka in urban locations.
- Requesting a new operating principle “partnering and having early and meaningful engagement with local authorities within the areas in which Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities is operating.
- Supporting the restriction on disposal of Rights of First Refusal (RFR) land which prevents Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities from using HNZ’s exemptions in Treaty settlement legislation to override RFR but noting that this provision does not protect iwi where settlement processes have not been concluded.
- Supporting the role of the GPS on Housing and Urban Development to guide the focus of the new entity while raising a number of issues about the GPS including:
  - the need for alignment of the GPS with the GPS on Land Transport and with the new (proposed) National Policy Statement on Urban Development.
  - the need to clarify that the ‘other agencies’ required to support the direction and priorities of the GPS refers to central government agencies rather than local government or private sector agencies.
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- requesting specific reference to a requirement to consult with local government when preparing a GPS.

- Requesting an explicit provision that any development undertaken by, or on behalf of Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities, is liable for development contributions.

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rūpū Kaunihera**
Council group impacts and views

29. Staff have worked with Watercare, Auckland Transport, and Panuku staff in preparing the draft submission.

30. Watercare and Auckland Transport raised issues about the impact of the entity’s activities on wider infrastructure networks. Auckland Transport has also raised the need to ensure that the GPS on Land Transport and the GPS on Housing and Urban Development, are aligned.

31. Panuku noted their support for many of the Bill’s provisions but raised a number of matters including: the need to acknowledge the role of local government in urban development; the need to focus the entity’s activities where it can add value because the market and other players cannot deliver; the importance of the GPS in prioritising the entity’s focus; and the need for a partnership approach to ensure that Panuku’s extensive programme is not disrupted.

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

32. While the activities of Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities will have significant local benefits and impacts the main areas of interest for local communities will be the process by which the entity selects development projects and the specific powers it utilises in different locations. Provisions relating to these matters will be part of the second Bill.

33. As noted, the draft submission raises concerns about the lack of specific recognition of local government with respect to partnering and engagement. It also raises concerns about the potential for the GPS to override local government’s spatial and strategic plans which have been the subject of extensive public consultation.

34. Consistent with normal processes, local boards have been informed of the opportunity to provide feedback that will be appended to the submission. We expect that some local boards may provide feedback but due to the tight timeframes no feedback has been received to date.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**
Māori impact statement

35. The Bill has a number of provisions which seek to recognise and provide for Māori interests. These provisions appear as different clauses in the Bill but are also brought together in a single clause 4 ‘Māori interests’. These provisions cover:

- Ensuring the board maintains systems and processes and has the capability and capacity to uphold the Treaty of Waitangi, understand and apply Te Ture Whenua Māori Act (1993), and be able to engage with Māori and understand Māori perspectives.

- Giving the entity a function to understand, support, and enable the aspirations of Māori in relation to urban development.

- Identifying and protecting Māori interests in land and the relationship of Māori with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga.

- Partnering and having early and meaningful engagement with Māori and offering Māori opportunities to participate in urban development.

- Preventing Kāinga Ora- Homes and Communities from using Housing New Zealand’s exemptions in Treaty settlement legislation to override RFR.
Item 9

36. The Bill also requires Ministers to appoint members to the board with knowledge, experience and capability in perspectives of Māori and the Treaty of Waitangi and Te Ture Whenua Maori Act 1993.

37. The activities of the new entity have the potential to provide significant benefits to Māori through provision of public housing, affordable housing and opportunities for Māori to participate in urban development. There is also the risk of impacts, for example on wāhi tapu, sites of significance and wider environmental interests. The provisions of the second Bill will be important to ensure the protections offered by this Bill are effective.

38. While the draft submission supports many of the provisions in the Bill relating to Māori interests it also raises some concerns including:

- that the provisions fall short of requiring Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities to give effect to the Treaty of Waitangi and its principles and that a specific provision is required to ensure this
- that the restriction on disposal of RFR land does not protect iwi where settlement processes have not been concluded
- that the requirements to engage should clarify that, in urban environments, this will require engagement with mana whenua and mataawaka. The submission also notes that Auckland has 19 mana whenua groups
- that board expertise should also cover knowledge and expertise in Treaty settlements.

39. Staff have worked with Independent Māori Statutory Board (IMSB) staff in preparing the draft submission. IMSB staff have indicated that the Independent Māori Statutory Board may consider its own submission.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

40. The submission raises concerns about how the activities of Kāinga Ora could have financial implications for local government. Specific concerns include:

- the need for an explicit provision to clarify that the entity will be liable for development contributions
- the need for the entity to consider value for money and ‘whole of life costs’ as well as its impact on wider network infrastructure.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

41. The Bill does not have any specific risks for council beyond the matters raised in the draft submission and reflected in paragraphs 25-28.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

42. The report recommends that the committee delegates authority to the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Planning Committee and an Independent Māori Statutory Board member for approval of the final submission following receipt of all local board input by 9 July.
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Introduction

Auckland Council has previously submitted that it supports, in principle, the establishment of urban development authorities. We have further submitted that we support urban development that provides for local aspirations and aligns with current and future plans and takes a collaborative approach to urban regeneration (17 May 2017 Auckland Council response to MBIE “Urban Development Authorities: Discussion Document”, February 2017).

We recognise that the Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities Bill establishes a new entity and prescribes its objectives, functions and operating principles, but does not address its powers. While our previous submission raised some concerns about the potential powers of the new entity, we understand that these will be the subject of a second Bill. We would be very happy to assist with the preparation of that Bill including the provisions relating to Māori interests if that would be useful. We note the specialised nature of Māori land interests and activities and the need for a deep understanding of these matters in order to ensure that the protection the Bill seeks is achieved.

We agree with the intent of this Bill to consolidate the government’s housing and urban development initiatives, currently spread across multiple agencies, into a ‘one-stop-shop’. This will avoid duplication and create efficiencies in collaboration, coordination and expertise.

While we support many aspects of the Bill, our primary concern is to ensure that the establishment legislation recognises the significant overlap in functions between local government and the functions of the new entity as specified in clause 13. This means that the decisions of Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities, have significant implications for Auckland Council and other local authorities. For example:

- Auckland Council’s urban development agency, Panuku, has an advanced delivery programme for urban regeneration across agreed and prioritised locations in Auckland. We would like to ensure that Panuku can continue to deliver Auckland’s regeneration programme at scale and pace without unnecessary relitigation, duplication of effort and delay.

- Provision or enabling of infrastructure and amenities by the new entity will have implications for wider infrastructure networks outside the development project area - for example water treatment plants and public transport services. This could have significant operational and financial implications for local authorities and their CCOs.

- Councils and their CCOs will be responsible for managing and maintaining much of the infrastructure and amenities enabled by the new entity, after it exits a development project

- Local authorities undertake strategic planning through tools such as spatial plans, development strategies and infrastructure strategies adopted after consultation with local communities. For example, Auckland Council has the Auckland Plan 2050 which includes the Auckland Development Strategy. These plans provide certainty to developers and communities about the location and sequencing of urban development.

Our view is that these significant overlaps need to be recognised and better provided for in the establishment legislation by:

- including operating principles that recognise the overlapping functions

- including explicit requirements for Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities to engage with local government
• clarifying how the GPS on housing and urban development will apply to local government

• including explicit requirements for Ministers to engage with local government in the preparation of the GPS on housing and urban development.

Māori interests (clause 4)

As summarised in clause 4 of the Bill, there are a number of provisions in the Act that seek to recognise and respect the Crown’s responsibility to consider and provide for Māori interests. Our view is that this clause 4 should explicitly reference the Crown’s obligations with respect the Treaty of Waitangi in addition to Māori interests. As currently drafted the Bill requires the board to have systems and processes and the capability and capacity to uphold the Treaty of Waitangi and its principles but does not explicitly require it to do so. Our strong preference would be for the legislation to include a provision similar to that of section 4 of Conservation Act 1987, “This Act shall so be administered and interpreted to give effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.”

We make further comments on the provisions summarised in clause 4 under the relevant clause below.

Interpretation (clause 5)

Auckland council requests that “agencies” referred to in clause 24(1)(d) are defined as meaning Crown entities and that the definition clarifies that it does not include local government or other third parties, such as developers, with an interest in urban development.

Membership of Board of Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (clause 10)

It is important to ensure that the board reflects a wide variety of perspectives including those of Māori, local government, and developers/industry, and has experience of New Zealand’s housing and urban development systems. Auckland Council supports the skills that will be sought in appointing board members and agrees that they broadly reflect the experience and capabilities required for an effective board.

We acknowledge the recognition of the need for expertise in Māori perspectives, Te Tiriti o Waitangi and its principles and Te Ture Whenua Māori Act, however, we request the addition of expertise in Treaty settlements. We note that Māori capability will need to be well represented at the Board level to satisfy these requirements.

Objective of Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (clause 12)

Auckland Council supports the purpose of the legislation and the overarching objective of Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities “to contribute to sustainable, inclusive and thriving communities” as set out in section 12(1) and the subpoints (a) through (c).

This objective aligns well with the purpose of local government under section 10(1)(b) of the Local Government Act 2002 “to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities in the present and for the future” It also aligns with the council’s strategic outcomes and objectives for Auckland as set out in the Auckland Plan and other core council strategies and plans. Council particularly supports the broad focus of this objective on the factors that contribute to well-functioning communities. We would be concerned about targets to deliver specific numbers of houses without this wider focus.

We note that the Bill does not include a purpose and suggest that the addition of a purpose for the Act could assist with interpretation.
Functions of Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (clause 13)

Urban development function

As noted in the introduction, the council is concerned that there is no specific mention or consideration in the Bill of local government and how the new entity will work with them in achieving its objectives and functions, given that many of the proposed functions of Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities are similar to the role and function of local government, e.g. (f),(i), (ii) and (iii) and (g).

We are also concerned that 13(1)(f) provides a broad mandate for the entity to initiate or undertake any type of urban development in any location. In our view 13(1)(f) should be limited to situations where the market and current players cannot deliver and where Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities can add value. International experience indicates this will create a focus on complex urban development projects such as contaminated brownfields or where there is a recognised market failure, a desire to trial new methods/innovations; or a lack of commercial feasibility for regeneration, despite clear public/strategic benefit.

The council supports 13(1)(g) to provide a leadership or co-ordination role in relation supporting innovation within the sector and leading and promoting good urban design. We consider that 13(g)(i) should include “capacity” as well as “capability” as this would provide the entity with a clear mandate to invest in training and development to ensure that the sector has sufficient numbers of workers with the required skills.

The council suggests that 13(1)(g)(ii) could be strengthened by making a specific reference to ‘universal design’ – which will be essential to delivering a quality urban environment and inclusive communities.

We support operating principle 13(1)(h) and suggest the addition of “including the aspirations reflected in any adopted spatial plan or development strategy that the community has been consulted on” after the words “urban development.”

We support operating principle 13(1)(i) and highlight the importance of ensuring that there is sufficient capacity at the board and operational level to give meaningful effect to this clause.

Operating Principles (clause 14)

‘Public housing solutions that contribute positively to well-being’ and ‘Housing supply meets needs’

The council supports 14(1)(a)-(f) and the broad focus on quality housing, tenant wellbeing, and community connections. We believe this provides stronger direction than provisions of the Housing Corporation Act which requires HNZC to exhibit a sense of social responsibly by having to regard to the interests of the community (in which it operates) while acting in a business-like manner.

Well-functioning urban environments (14(1)(g) and (h))

The council suggests that (g) should include reference to ‘value for money’. While it is important to deliver quality infrastructure that meets community needs this should be balanced with making prudent investment decisions for current and future infrastructure needs.

We consider employment opportunities to be critical to well-functioning urban environments and suggest a new operating principle “ensuring that communities have access to employment opportunities.”
Consistent with our previous comments, we would support the inclusion of an additional operating principle in this section about universal design.

**Stewardship and sustainability (14(1)(i) and (j))**

We strongly support principle (i). We also support (j) however, we recommend that sustainability should include reference to financial and economic sustainability. It is essential that investment by the new entity in housing, community amenities and infrastructure (e.g. parks and open space and community facilities) factors in the “whole of life cost” of any new assets. These include the ongoing capital and operational costs to operate, programme and maintain the assets. This will be particularly important if there is any intention to hand these assets to local government to manage in the future.

**Collaborative and effective partnerships (14(1)(k)-(m))**

Clause (14)(1)(k) requires the entity to partner and have early and meaningful engagement with Māori and offering Māori opportunities to participate in urban development. While we support the intent, we note that in urban environments this needs to acknowledge both maatawaka and mana whenua, while recognising the significance of ancestral areas/rohe to mana whenua. We note that Auckland Council has 19 mana whenua groups.

We would also like similar operating principle in relation to local government and suggest a new principle, “partnering and having early and meaningful engagement with local authorities within the areas in which Kāinga Ora – Homes and Community is operating.”

We note that the Housing Corporation currently has a function under Section 19(1A) of the Housing Corporation Act 1974 to “take any action in the performance of its functions or achievement of its objectives jointly, or in conjunction, with – (a) a local authority.” Whilst we appreciate that the second Bill will contain more detail on the powers of the new entity we note that the entity will come into being well before that Bill is enacted. Auckland council is currently working with Housing New Zealand and HLC on a number of development projects and we would be concerned if this was interrupted.

**Restriction on disposal of RFR land (clause 20)**

We support clause 20 “Restriction on disposal of RFR land” which prevents Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities from using Housing New Zealand’s exemptions in Treaty settlement legislation to override Rights of First Refusal (RFR). However, we note that there are outstanding Treaty claims in Auckland and we await details of the second Bill that should ensure the new entity will not have the ability to assemble land in a manner that could frustrate treaty settlements.

**GPS on housing and urban development (clauses 22-29)**

We support the requirement for ministers to issue a GPS on housing and urban development to guide the focus of the new entity, however we have some questions about the wider application and purpose of the GPS.

We believe the GPS needs to set out a clear direction for Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities and help the agency to prioritise and focus its efforts where they will have the most impact. Without this guidance there is a risk that the agency will be spread too thinly across multiple locations which will hamper its ability to implement programmes efficiently and effectively. The GPS therefore has an important role to play in setting clear expectations and priorities for the new entity across the complex urban and housing system. This will also help provide certainty to developers, communities and local government. We suggest that interim guidance may be
required for Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities as the GPS may not be available for the first year of its operation.

We would like to see some clarity in the legislation on the wider implications of the GPS for local government. For example, we are unsure about the role of the GPS relative to the forthcoming NPS on Urban Development which we understand is likely to replace the NPS on Urban Development Capacity and provide stronger direction to local government on spatial planning.

We are also unclear about how the GPS would align to other planning instruments such as the GPS on Land Transport. It is critical for Auckland Council and Auckland Transport that the GPS on Land Transport and GPS on Housing and Urban Development are fully aligned. The GPS on Land Transport drives funding for Auckland Transport and to achieve our mode shift objectives we need to create urban form that supports this. As noted earlier in our submission in relation to clause 5, we seek clarity that clause 24(1)(d) does not apply to local government. We note that the GPS on housing and urban development is different in nature from the GPS on Land Transport as the latter guides funding decisions for local government. In our view it is not appropriate for the GPS on urban development to override requirements for local government to consult with communities on strategic direction, set urban development and housing policy, and determine funding priorities.

We are also like to see specific reference to a requirement to consult with local government when preparing a GPS in clause 23(b).

With respect to clause 29, while we acknowledge the need for flexibility with respect to providing direction to Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities, we are concerned about the potential for ad hoc changes in Government’s direction and priorities for urban growth and housing and the impact of the lack of certainty this provides. Utility/infrastructure providers, developers, community sector providers and our Treaty Partners require certainty in order to make long-term investments and we are concerned that the ability to amend the GPS at any time removes this. Again, this points to the need for the legislation to provide clarity about the role of the GPS and its wider application beyond providing direction to the new entity.

Other matters – Development Contributions

We request a provision establishing that any development undertaken by, or on behalf of Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities is liable for development contributions assessed under section 198 of the Local Government Act 2002. We note that Local Government Act 2002 exempts the Crown from paying development contributions but that this privilege does not extend to Housing New Zealand Limited (HNZL). Without an explicit provision we are concerned that there is ambiguity about the status of the new entity with respect to development contributions. Given that the new entity is expected to deliver a large proportion of the total new dwellings in Auckland in the future, this would represent a substantial loss of revenue for the council if the new entity was found to share the Crown’s exemption from paying development contributions.
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To update the committee on events related to the Auckland Plan 2050 since its adoption and to report the first Annual Monitoring Report.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The Auckland Plan 2050 was adopted in June 2018. It sets the long term strategic direction for Auckland. It is a digital plan which means it can be kept up to date when data and information changes.

3. Reporting on progress against the Auckland Plan 2050 is done in three ways:
   a) Six-monthly updates (of which this report is the second)
   b) Annual Monitoring Reports (the July 2019 Monitoring Report is included as Attachment A)
   c) Three Yearly Progress Reports (providing detailed analysis of measures and additional data – due in 2020)

4. This second six-monthly update on the Auckland Plan covers:
   • central government reforms and initiatives that indicate the plan is providing a strong strategic direction for advocacy for Auckland Plan outcomes. Central government’s Budget 2019 contained a wellbeing approach and several new initiatives which aligned closely to the Auckland Plan. Recent adoption of the Residential Tenancies (Healthy Homes Standards) Regulations 2019 is consistent with the Auckland Plan. The Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill and legislation to create the urban development agency Kāinga Ora shows that central government are active in addressing matters of interest in the Auckland Plan, and these reforms offer opportunities to ensure alignment of central government with the Auckland Plan
   • required changes to data and information contained in the plan following the release of the 2018 Serious and fatal injury data, RIMU’s climate change risk assessment series, and clarification of the sources utilised for certain data tables in the Development Strategy
   • anticipated data changes in the plan when the 2018 Census data is released (and potential impacts of its delay).

5. The Auckland Plan 2050 – Annual Monitoring Report 2019 is Attachment A. It uses 33 measures to measure general progress and trends across the six outcomes and the Development Strategy of the plan. The report uses seven categories for reporting trends. At the time of reporting:
   • eight measures had increasing positive trends
   • two measures had increasing negative trends
   • eleven measures with no significant change
   • one had a decreasing positive trend
   • one had a decreasing negative trend
   • seven had insufficient data to establish a clear trend
   • for the three modelled transport data measures no trend could be determined.
6. The Three Yearly Progress Report – due in 2020 – will provide detailed analysis of the trends identified in the annual monitoring report, drawing on additional data and context to explain the trends.

7. At the time of adopting the plan, the Planning Committee instructed staff to commence a process for developing a set of core targets in collaboration with central government to incorporate into the monitoring framework.

8. To achieve that objective, this report proposes working with central government and other key stakeholders through already established cross-sectoral working groups which could include the development of targets as an output.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the six-monthly update on the Auckland Plan 2050.

b) approve changes to the digital Auckland Plan 2050 as set out in the report.


Horopaki

Context


10. The legislation for the Auckland Plan sets out the requirements for implementing the plan. It must:

   • enable coherent and co-ordinated decision making by Auckland Council and other parties to determine the future location and timing of critical infrastructure, services, and investment within Auckland

   • provide a basis for aligning the implementation plans, regulatory plans, and funding programmes of the Auckland Council

   • identify policies, priorities, land allocations and programmes and investments to implement the strategic direction and specify how resources will be provided to implement the strategic direction.

11. The plan is a digital plan. This report sets out central government reforms and initiatives underway that are relevant to the plan, and ways that the data in the plan is being kept up to date.


13. The Three Yearly Progress Report – due in 2020 – will provide detailed analysis of the trends identified in the Annual Monitoring Report, drawing on additional data and context to explain the trends.
14. This report is the second six-monthly update and covers changes that impact on Auckland’s context or any new data or information that may have an impact on the plan and its implementation. The content from this update will be made available on the ‘what’s new’ section of the digital plan website. Any developments or events that could have a significant impact on the plan would be brought to committee as they arise.

15. There has been activity relevant to the Auckland Plan 2050 since its adoption. This includes:

- central government legislative reforms
- announcement and delivery of new programmes
- adoption of plans and strategies by Auckland Council.

16. This section of the report provides a summary of that activity and what it means for Auckland and the Auckland Plan. This activity will be reported in the “what’s new” section of the website with the updates to the digital plan.

17. Central government’s Budget 2019 seeks to measure government progress against GDP alongside five ‘wellbeing’ priorities. There is strong alignment between central government’s selected ‘wellbeing’ priorities and the Auckland Plan outcomes, making it likely central government investment will be delivered in ways which helps implement the Auckland Plan. A number of these initiatives will be covered in future updates as they are implemented, however some key initiatives to note include:

- An expansion of the Housing First programme. This will increase the number of people this programme delivers for in Auckland. The actual number of extra funded people and families for Auckland is being determined over the next few months by central government working with providers and stakeholders. This programme is key in the implementation of the Homes and Places outcome.

- $12 million to support innovative, community-led initiatives to reduce the incidence of rheumatic fever among Māori and Pasifika people and to support better management of the illness. This initiative is focused on Auckland as two thirds of rheumatic fever cases occur here. This announcement aligns with the direction set in Belonging and Participation Direction 2: Improve health and wellbeing for all Aucklanders by reducing harm and disparities in opportunities.

- In response to the He Ara Oranga report into mental health and wellbeing the Government will "significantly" increase access to publicly-funded mental health and addiction services for people with mild to moderate and moderate to severe mental health and addiction needs and will establish a mental health commission. This announcement also aligns with the direction set in Belonging and Participation Direction 2: Improve health and wellbeing for all Aucklanders by reducing harm and disparities in opportunities.

- The Government will spend $320 million over four years on a package of initiatives aimed preventing family and sexual violence and breaking the cycle of violence. The funding will deliver more support services to more New Zealanders, major campaigns aimed at stopping violence occurring and major changes to court process to reduce the trauma victims’ experience. This programme supports implementation of the Belonging and Participation outcome.
• Expansion of the Pacific Employment Support Service to reduce the rate of Pacific young people Not in Employment, Education or Training. This expansion aligns with the direction set in Opportunity and Prosperity Focus Area 5: Increase educational achievement, lifelong learning and training, with a focus on those most in need.

• Investigating a Green Transport Card to make public transport more affordable for low-income households. The implementation of such a scheme would support implementation of the Transport and Access Focus Area 4: Make walking, cycling and public transport preferred choices for many more Aucklanders.

18. Central government has commenced work in several areas of importance to Auckland that indicate the plan is providing a strong strategic direction for advocacy for the outcomes in the Auckland Plan on behalf of Aucklanders:

• Adoption of the Residential Tenancies (Healthy Homes Standards) Regulations 2019 introduces minimum standards for rental properties in terms of heating, insulation, ventilation, moisture ingress and drainage, and draught stopping. These regulations will apply from 1 July 2019, with compliance being required between 1 July 2021 and 1 July 2024, depending on the category and tenure of the rental accommodation.

• Passing of the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Act 2019. As well as reintroducing the four wellbeings in the purpose statement of local government, this legislation also broadens the classes of assets that development contributions can be gathered for. Expansion of what development contributions can be used for allows for a greater investment in the long-term plan to deliver on the Auckland Plan.

• The Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill was introduced to Parliament in early May. It is now being considered by the Environment Select Committee. The intended purpose of this bill is to provide a framework by which New Zealand can develop and implement clear and stable climate change policies that contribute to the global effort under the Paris agreement. The bill would set greenhouse gas reduction targets into law. The bill’s proposed reduction target of 1.5°C is the same as Auckland’s regional target (since November last year) and is the same target that is proposed for Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework.

• Central government has introduced legislation to create an urban development authority, Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities. The stated objective of Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities is to contribute to sustainable, inclusive, and thriving communities. It will have two key functions – being a public housing landlord, and leading and co-ordinating urban development projects. This first bill establishes the new entity by disestablishing Housing New Zealand, and its development subsidiary HLC (Homes, Land, Community), and putting the assets of those two disestablished entities into the new Crown entity. In addition, the bill proposes to transfer certain functions of the current KiwiBuild Unit to Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities. A second bill later this year will propose to give the entity enabling development powers which it can choose to utilise when undertaking urban development in specified development areas. Exactly what those powers are will not be known until the second bill is introduced but previous announcements have suggested those powers could include planning, consenting, land acquisition, rating, funding and infrastructure delivery.

19. Auckland Council has recently adopted several strategies and plans which support implementation of the Auckland Plan outcomes. Links with descriptions of their role will be added to the digital copy of the Auckland Plan as supporting strategies and plans:

• The Regional Pest Management Plan 2019 was adopted in March 2019. This statutory plan under the Biosecurity Act supports the implementation of the Environment and Cultural Heritage Outcome by seeking to protect Auckland’s priority ecosystems, threatened species and primary production by setting objectives and rules to manage over 400 pests in the region.
The Auckland Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy was released in March 2019. This strategy supports the implementation of the Environment and Cultural Heritage Outcome by establishing a clear framework to protect and grow Auckland’s urban ngahere.

Keeping the digital Auckland Plan up to date

20. One benefit of the digital Auckland Plan is that it can be kept up to date when data and information that has informed the plan changes. The plan takes a 30-year view and therefore changes in data are not expected to drive a change in strategic direction at this stage.

21. The plan needs to be updated to reflect new sets of information and data released since it was adopted and last updated:

- **2018 Serious and fatal injury data**
  The 2018 data was extracted from the Transport Agency Crash Analysis System (CAS). The CAS records all traffic crashes as reported to the Transport Agency by the NZ Police. The digital version will be changed to incorporate the updated graph which includes this new data.

- **RIMU’s climate change risk assessment series**
  This series of reports was commissioned in support of the Auckland Climate Action Framework (ACAF). The series of eight reports provides information about the risk and vulnerabilities Auckland may face from climate change. The reports consider various components of key risks – hazard, exposure and vulnerabilities. The following five technical reports will be added to the Auckland Plan evidence in the digital version, with a further three technical reports to be added in future updates:
  - Air quality and societal impacts from predicted climate change in Auckland. Auckland Council technical report, TR2019/012
  - Climate change risk assessment for terrestrial species and ecosystems in the Auckland region. Auckland Council technical report, TR2019/015
  - Climate change risk and vulnerability assessment for marine and freshwater ecosystems. Auckland Council technical report, TR2019/014
• Development strategy updates

In response to feedback from central government, footnotes will be added in the digital version of the plan to make clear the sources of information for several tables in the Development Strategy. The updates will apply to the following sections:

- Anticipated growth in population and dwellings (2018-2048)
- Anticipated timeframe of development in existing urban area
- Anticipated development and employment capacities and timing for future urban areas
- Anticipated development and employment capacities and timing for future urban areas – rural settlements
- Node – City Centre
- Node – Albany
- Node – Westgate
- Node – Manukau
- Node – Warkworth
- Node – Pukekohe
- Development Areas
- Remaining existing urban area.

22. Further changes to data and information in the Auckland Plan are anticipated as follows.

- Census 2018

Due to the low response rate necessitating supplementing the census data with additional data sets, Stats New Zealand has delayed the release of Census 2018 data from March 2019 until late September 2019. Census data will be released in stages and so regional and other demographic breakdowns will be released sometime after this, with population modelling currently being estimated to be available in mid-2020. Stats NZ has also confirmed that due to low response rates it will not be reporting Iwi affiliation as an official statistic. It is possible that there will be other metrics which will also not be reported at all or as official statistics, but this is subject to confirmation.

This could have impacts on release of long-term growth projections for Auckland which is one of the key assumptions of our 10-year budget. The projections determine the provision of services and infrastructure we need and inform the proposed funding approaches for these. As the new data is released, staff will review it against the Auckland Plan and make the necessary adjustments to data, infographics and related text. These changes will be reported in an upcoming six month update.

- Te Kupenga 2018

This is a national survey of Māori wellbeing conducted by Stats NZ. It is due to be released after the initial census results are released in late September. This may require adjustments to related data, infographics, and text.

Auckland Plan 2050 monitoring

Auckland Plan Annual Monitoring Report

23. This is the first Annual Monitoring Report since the adoption of the plan in June 2018. It follows on from the 2018 Auckland Plan baseline measures report presented to this Committee on 27 November 2018.

25. The monitoring framework is a work in progress, but good progress has been made since the baseline report was presented to Committee in November 2018 as demonstrated by the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures with established baselines</th>
<th>November 2018</th>
<th>July 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures with identified data sets, but data is not yet available</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures that require further development of data sets</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 (pending release of census data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New measure needed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. The measures table above will continue to change over time as the availability and quality of data improves. Anticipated areas of improvement are:

- **Belonging and Participation** – commitment by central government to measuring wellbeing may provide improved and more standardised measures in this area.

- **Māori Identity and Wellbeing** - Stats NZ through their work, “Indicators Aotearoa New Zealand – Ngā Tūtoku Aotearoa” are developing a measure for ‘intergenerational transfer of knowledge” which should help to measure components of whānau wellbeing.

- **Homes and Places** – development of a more robust monitoring framework for measuring homelessness is being proposed through the Auckland cross-sectoral leadership homelessness group.

- **Transport and Access** – Auckland Council (with Auckland Transport), Ministry of Transport and New Zealand Transport Agency are working on the development of an agreed set of transport measures that uses actual data to measure regional transport benefits resulting from the Auckland Transport Alignment Project.

- **Environment and Cultural Heritage** – development of the Auckland Unitary Plan monitoring framework currently underway should help provide more current and robust data.

27. At the time of reporting the following trends were evident across each of the outcomes:

- **Belonging and Participation** - people’s sense of community, safety, health and overall quality of life is the same or improving.

- **Māori Identity and Wellbeing** – little change across the measures.

- **Homes and Places** – housing supply is increasing, and the typology of dwellings being built is changing as the number of attached dwellings increases as a percentage of total new builds. Housing costs as a percentage of household income remains high along with homelessness and severe housing deprivation.
- **Transport and Access** – transport costs as a percentage of household costs remains stable. While there was a reduction in 2018, combined serious injuries and fatalities have shown a rising trend since 2012.

- **Environment and Cultural Heritage** – native land-based ecosystems are relatively stable, stream water quality is declining although lake and coastal environments are showing signs of improvement. Air quality based on pollutants is improving as is green-house gas emissions on a per-capita basis, although total green-house gas volume continues to increase.

- **Opportunity and Prosperity** – Auckland’s economy remains relatively strong but there are groups consistently lagging behind the regional average in terms of wages, education and employment.

28. The Annual Monitoring Report uses a fixed set of 33 measures to report on trends. The measures should not change, however the supporting data sets can if they add value and robustness to the measure. The 3-yearly progress report will use additional data sets as necessary to support the more detailed analysis of trends to provide a greater richness and context to reporting.

**Auckland Plan Targets**

29. As part of the 5 June 2018 Planning Committee resolution (PLA/2018/62) to adopt the Auckland Plan 2050, the committee agreed to commence the process of developing a set of core targets in collaboration with central government.

30. A political working group was established to provide staff with guidance and timely advice through what was anticipated to be fast paced discussions with central government across the four areas of housing, transport, natural environment and social inclusion. To date central government have not engaged formally in a process to develop targets as it is not part of their work programme. Staff therefore propose a different approach.

31. The revised approach recommends that existing and/or evolving processes with central government and other key stakeholders are used for developing shared targets. This includes development of strategies/plans and major projects which would provide the following advantages:

  - council’s formal commitment to secure and maintain the ongoing support of stakeholders is already established
  - targets are based on thorough analysis and co-design resulting in a greater understanding of key stakeholder needs
  - clearer ownership of targets that is likely to be closer to the source of implementation leading to clearer KPIs and actions
  - reinforces alignment between supporting strategies, plans and projects to the Auckland Plan.

32. The following table provides a summary of current relevant work and its status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Area</th>
<th>Relevant Work</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Through the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity we have an agreed minimum target of 408,300 dwellings over the next 30 years. (This number has been incorporated into the Unitary Plan Regional Policy Statement)</td>
<td>Agreed – central government and council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Area</td>
<td>Relevant Work</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central government’s Housing and Urban Development agenda - Council has been working with central government on improving the pace and scale of housing delivery across Auckland.</td>
<td>This work is ongoing and has the potential to determine further housing targets with council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Alignment Project</td>
<td>Working Group currently developing set of agreed measures. Targets are not part of the current discussions but could potentially be introduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turning the Tide – from Cars to Active Transport.</td>
<td>Staff have committed to working further with members of the Turning the Tide working group, which includes investigating targets required to meet national active transport objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management</td>
<td>Council is required to maintain or improve water quality. Implementation targets will need to be set in discussion with central government for achieving the desired levels required by 2040.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusion</td>
<td>Auckland cross-sectoral leadership homelessness group</td>
<td>Monitoring framework currently under development with potential to introduce targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34. As targets are proposed from each of the workstreams above, staff will engage with the political working group to seek their feedback on targets proposed and their appropriateness for measuring progress on the Auckland Plan. Any decision would then be brought to the Planning Committee for approval.

35. There are also legacy targets from the Auckland Plan 2012 that council remains committed to such as “smoke-free by 2025” and “zero waste 2040”. The plans to achieve those targets are both referenced in Auckland Plan 2050.

36. Setting targets will require a collaborative approach based on thorough analysis and a greater understanding of key stakeholder needs and responsibilities.

37. The achievability of core targets developed for the Auckland Plan 2050 would most likely require a commitment of funding from council. For example, transport targets delivered by Auckland Transport may require additional funding to be set through the LTP process.

38. Of the 33 Auckland Plan measures the Local Board Services Department have identified 19 measures that may help develop and track the progress of local board plans.

39. Staff will work with Local Board Services to improve the alignment between the regional and local reporting of the Auckland Plan.

40. The availability and range of specific and enduring data sets for the Māori Identity and Wellbeing outcome are relatively limited. There are new metrics being developed internal to council (Unitary Plan, Te Waka Anga Mua ki Uta) and external to council (Stats NZ – Indicators Aotearoa New Zealand, Te Pou Matakanai) that could potentially provide for more robust data sets. The Independent Māori Statutory Board, through the Māori Plan, continues to undertake work in this area that would further help to inform the Auckland Plan monitoring framework.

41. Input from the Independent Māori Statutory Board secretariat was fundamental to the development of the Māori Identity and Wellbeing – Whānau wellbeing measure. Their input and advice will also be sought once potential data-sets for that measure are identified.

42. The strategic direction set in the Auckland Plan 2050 is a key vehicle to support decision-making on council’s long-term plans. Staff are working to ensure that the programmes that have been funded through the current long-term plan are tracked to support better decision-making for the next long-term plan.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

44. The Planning Committee will receive the following regular reporting on the Auckland Plan 2050:

- impacts on the content or implementation of the plan – reported six monthly, next report due February 2020
- Auckland Plan measures report, containing a commentary on observed trends – reported annually
- a three year ‘deep dive’ analysis report that uses the measures as well as additional data-sets to explain the trends. This will provide a stronger evidence base for decision making in time to help inform decision making on the next long-term plan – first report due in 2020.
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Executive Summary

The Auckland Plan 2050 was adopted in June 2018 and is an overarching strategy prepared in response to the statutory requirement for Auckland Council to prepare a spatial plan to guide Auckland’s future development over the next 30 years. It provides broad direction for Auckland’s growth and development through the six outcomes and Development Strategy contained within the Plan.

The Auckland Plan Annual Monitoring Report uses 33 measures for tracking progress against the Auckland Plan 2050. Progress is reported as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Increasing positive trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Increasing negative trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➯</td>
<td>No significant change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Decreasing positive trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☯</td>
<td>Decreasing negative trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⋯</td>
<td>Insufficient data to determine a trend at the time of reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>A trend cannot be determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A brief analysis of the trends is provided but this report does not aim to explain why results may be moving in a particular direction. That explanation will be considered as part of the Three Yearly Progress Report.

The breadth of the Auckland Plan 2050 outcomes requires the monitoring report to use various metrics and data sources which vary in terms of their availability and frequency. Five of the 33 measures included in this report (housing, transport and business land) are drawn from the Development Strategy monitoring framework which is reported separately in August/September each year. The Development Strategy report provides a more comprehensive overview of growth, housing and land supply across the region.

As the availability of data-sets increases the ability to report trends will improve. The Three Yearly Progress Report will also provide additional data to help analyse trends.

Based on the data and subsequent trends initial findings suggest the following across the six outcomes:
| **Belonging and Participation** | In general belonging and participation based on people's sense of community, safety, health and overall quality of life is the same or improving. |
| **Māori identity and Wellbeing** | On balance, improvement for Māori has been minimal across the employment, education and training metrics as well as in the number of co-governance/co-management arrangements. The Whānau wellbeing measure when finalised will provide a more improved understanding of this outcome. |
| **Homes and Places** | The metrics against this outcome are either the same or improving except for Homelessness. Further analysis is required to determine whether the scale and rate of change is sufficient to meet Auckland's housing needs (to be provided through both the Development Strategy Report and Three Yearly Progress Report). |
| **Transport and Access** | Three of the five transport measures are drawn from the Auckland Regional Transport model which uses a combination of real data and various assumptions to predict the level and rate of change across different areas and components of the transport network. It is intended that the modelled data/measures be replaced with actual data to measure the performance of the network. To that end a working group consisting of Auckland Council/ Auckland Transport, Ministry of Transport, New Zealand Transport Agency has been established. Whilst transport costs as a percentage of household income have remained generally stable, serious injuries remain a negatively increasing trend. |
| **Environment and Cultural Heritage** | At the regional scale, landcover of native ecosystems has been relatively stable. However the loss of small habitat fragments is occurring in more intensively developed areas. Just like for plants, the most modified parts of the region retain a higher percentage of exotic birds. Stream water quality is declining across the region whilst lake water quality and beach swimability is showing signs of improvement. Air quality is improving across several monitored sites, however greenhouse gas emissions although decreasing on a per-capita basis are still increasing overall. Based on volunteer numbers Aucklanders still actively value their natural environment. |
| **Opportunity and Prosperity** | Auckland's labour productivity and average wages have continued to rise generally over the monitoring period in this report. Employment in advanced industries having dipped to negative three percent growth in 2010 has returned to between two and four percent growth since 2012. Total unemployment has fluctuated between 3.6 to 7.4% since 1998 settling at 4.3% in June 2018. All four groups (20 - 24 years old, Māori, Pacific People, and Female) specifically recognised in the measure with the exception of females consistently exceed the unemployment total average. Those aged 20 – 24 with a level 4 qualification based on the New Zealand Qualifications Framework (NZQF) has also decreased slightly since 2014. |
## Summary of measures

The following table provides a summary for each measure in terms of how they are tracking. Further detail on each measure is provided in the body of the report.

### Belonging and Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUCKLAND PLAN MEASURE</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>TREND</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE (DATE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Aucklanders’ sense of community in their neighbourhood</td>
<td>50% (2018)</td>
<td>Quality of Life survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who strongly agree or agree feeling a sense of community in their local neighbourhood (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Aucklanders’ sense of safety in their homes and neighbourhood</td>
<td>62% (2018)</td>
<td>Quality of Life survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rate their feelings of personal safety as safe or very safe (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Aucklanders’ quality of life</td>
<td>83% (2018)</td>
<td>Quality of Life survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rated their overall quality of life positively (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Relative deprivation across Auckland</td>
<td>Pending census data release</td>
<td>Census (2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population-Weighted Average Deprivation Index Score by local board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Aucklanders’ health</td>
<td>79% (2018)</td>
<td>Quality of Life survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rated their personal health positively (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Treaty of Waitangi awareness and understanding</td>
<td>49% (2018)</td>
<td>Auckland Council Resident Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents to council’s resident survey who rate their knowledge of Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty of Waitangi) either very well or a fair amount (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Māori Identity and Wellbeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUCKLAND PLAN MEASURE</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>TREND</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE (DATE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Whānau wellbeing</td>
<td>Under development</td>
<td>Under development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Māori youth in education, employment or training (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Māori decision making</td>
<td>9 co-governed/co-managed arrangements in place (2018)</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of co-governance/co-management arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Te reo Māori across Tāmaki Makaurau</td>
<td>Pending census data release</td>
<td>Te Kāpenga – Stats NZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to understand te reo Ability to speak te reo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current data understanding: 30.4% (2013) Speak 20.6% (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Homes and Places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUCKLAND PLAN MEASURE</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>TREND</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE (DATE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 New dwellings consented by location and type (Development Strategy) Number of dwellings consented by location and type</td>
<td>12,368 (2018)</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Stats NZ Building Consent data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Housing costs as a percentage of household income Ratio of housing costs to total household income (%)</td>
<td>18.1% (2018)</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Household Economic Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Homelessness Number of people living without shelter and in temporary accommodation</td>
<td>20,295 (2012)</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Stats NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Resident satisfaction with built environment at a neighbourhood level Respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who agree they feel a sense of pride in their local area (%)</td>
<td>61% (2018)</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Transport and Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUCKLAND PLAN MEASURE</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>TREND</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE (DATE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Access to jobs (Development Strategy) Proportion of jobs accessible to the average Aucklander in the morning peak within 30 minutes by car and 45 minutes by public transport (%)</td>
<td>35% of jobs in Auckland are accessible within 30 minutes by car 8% of jobs in Auckland are accessible within 45 minutes by public transport (2018)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Auckland Regional Transport Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Delay from congestion (Development Strategy) Per capita additional delay (minutes) per annum</td>
<td>841 minutes (2018)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Auckland Regional Transport Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Use of public transport, walking and cycling Proportion of trips made by public transport, walking and cycling during the morning peak (%)</td>
<td>7.4% Public transport 15.1% Walking and cycling (2018)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Auckland Regional Transport Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Household transport costs Average household transport costs ($/wk)</td>
<td>$234 per week (2016)</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Household Economic Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Deaths and Injuries from transport network Number of serious and fatal injuries</td>
<td>595 serious injuries 54 fatalities (2018)</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>NZTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environment and Cultural Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Plan Measure</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Data Source (Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State and quality of locally, regionally and nationally significant environments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Native vegetation cover and habitat loss Landcover Index Value (%)</td>
<td>Hauturu (LB) - 100</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Zealand Landcover Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aotea (GB) - 93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waitakere - 90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inner Gulf Islands - 69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hunua - 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rodney - 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaipara - 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awhitu - 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Otautahi - 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban north &amp; south - 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manukau - 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Average native plant diversity within plots for Auckland’s ecological neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Waitakere - 44.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Zealand Landcover Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haunui/LB - 44.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hunua - 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aotea/GB - 38.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awhitu - 37.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rodney - 36.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onetahi - 32.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban north - 29.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inner Gulf Islands - 22.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaipara - 21.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban south - 19.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manukau - 19.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Total number of bird species found in bird counts grouped by landscape type</td>
<td>All Sites - 60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Islands - 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural - 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban - 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manukau with Pest Control - 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marine and fresh water quality</strong></td>
<td>Native forest - Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exotic forest - Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural - Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban - Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lake water quality (Trophic level)</strong></td>
<td>Koestra – Eutrophic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kowakaihia – Supertrophic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Otokaia – Mesotrophic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purupuke – Microtrophic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spectacle – Supertrophic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomarata – Eutrophic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waharau – Eutrophic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Beach swimming safety (% time Safeswim marine beaches are suitable for contact recreation during the summer swimming season (Nov 1 to April 30)</td>
<td>77% (2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safeswim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air quality and greenhouse gas emissions</strong></td>
<td>AC Penrose NO2 (µg/m³) - 10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AC Queen Street NO2 (µg/m³) - 35.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AC Takapuna NO2 (µg/m³) - 10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Greenhouse gas emission (tonne of CO₂e accounting for CO₂e removed by forests)</td>
<td>6.3 tonne (2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environment and Cultural Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUCKLAND PLAN MEASURE</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>TREND</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE (DATE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**4a. Relative weediness of Auckland’s forest ecosystem index (100 = good)**

| 4b. Chewcards damaged by pest animals (% of cards chewed) | Refer to graph (2016) | ***                  | Auckland Council |

| Resilience to natural threats | Under development | ***                  | Under development |

**Treasuring of the environment**

| 6a. Statutory Provision | Under development | ***                  | Under development |

| 6b. Number of volunteer hours worked in regional park per year | 81,342 (2018) | −                   | Auckland Council |

### Opportunity and Prosperity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUCKLAND PLAN MEASURE</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>TREND</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE (DATE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


| Employment in advanced industries | 3.0% growth in Knowledge Intensive Industries, 3.6% growth in total employment (2018) | −                   | Auckland Economic Profile |


| Internet usage based on income | Proportion of respondents under 55 years of age by internet user status by household income bracket (%) | 98.9% uses, 11% non-users (2017) | ▼                   | World Internet Project New Zealand (WIPNZ) |

| Educational achievement of young people | Percentage of those aged 20-24 with a Level 4 qualification or above (%) | 39% (2018) | ▼                   | Household Labour Force Survey |
Future work and next steps

As at July 2019 the Belonging and Participation, Homes and Places, Opportunity and Prosperity outcomes had generally completed data sets available for reporting.

The ability to provide a regional view for the Transport and Access outcome is currently limited to modelled data making trend analysis difficult. This should be addressed in part through work underway between Auckland Council, AT, MoT and NZTA in the development of actual measures more suited to gauging network performance.

Data sets for the Māori Identity and Wellbeing outcome will remain a work in progress. At present there are limited data sets specific to Māori outside of generic measures broken down by ethnicity i.e. health, employment, education etc.

Stats NZ through their work, "Indicators Aotearoa New Zealand – Ngā Tūhohu Aotearoa" are currently looking to develop a measure for "intergenerational transfer of knowledge" which could help in part to measure a component of whanau wellbeing.

The data for the Environment and Cultural Heritage outcome is not as frequent or available relative to some of the other outcomes and also has limited coverage across the region. The future monitoring of the Unitary Plan should help provide more timely data across this outcome and others in the Auckland Plan.

Three Yearly Progress Report – Due in 2020 will include the annual monitoring report and provide detailed analysis of the trends. It will draw on additional data as necessary to explain trends.
Belonging and Participation

Measure 1
Aucklanders’ sense of community in their neighbourhood

Respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rated their sense of community in their local neighbourhood (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Strongly agree or agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly disagree or disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data
Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who report feeling a sense of community in their local neighbourhood.

Source

Frequency
Every 2 years.

Availability
The reports are available on Knowledge Auckland (www.knowledgeauckland.org.nz).

Note
From 2012, the Quality of Life survey method changed from a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) survey to an online self-complete survey. The 2018 survey used a sequential mixed-method methodology, enabling respondents to complete the survey either online or via a hard copy of the questionnaire.

Relevance
A sense of community is an important component of the liveability of a city, as it enables the establishment of social networks and builds social capital.

Baseline (2018)
In 2018, 50% of Auckland respondents agreed that they felt a sense of community with others in their neighbourhood.

Analysis
Between 2012 and 2018 there was a decrease from 53 percent to 50 percent of respondents feeling a sense of community with others in their neighbourhood.

Sense of community peaked at 56 percent in 2016.

Trend
From 2012 to 2018 there has been no significant change.
**Outcome**

**Belonging and Participation**

**Measure 2**

Aucklanders’ sense of safety in their homes and neighbourhood

Respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rated their sense of safety in their neighbourhood and city centre (%)

![Chart showing data]

**Data**

Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rate their feelings of personal safety as very safe or fairly safe.

**Source**


**Frequency**

Every 2 years.

**Availability**

The reports are available on Knowledge Auckland (www.knowledgeauckland.org.nz).

**Note**

The Quality of Life Survey asks respondents whether they feel very unsafe, a bit unsafe, fairly safe, or very safe in different situations, including walking alone in their neighborhood after dark.

From 2012, the Quality of Life survey method changed from a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) survey to an online self-complete survey. The 2018 survey used a sequential mixed-method methodology, enabling respondents to complete the survey either online or via a hard copy of the questionnaire.

**Relevance**

Perceptions of safety impact on the health and well-being of the individual, family and the wider community. If people feel unsafe, they are less likely to talk to their neighbours, use public transport, go out in the evening, use public amenities and generally participate in their communities.

**Baseline (2018)**

- 91% of Auckland respondents felt safe in their home after dark.
- 62% of Auckland respondents felt safe walking alone in their neighborhood after dark.
- 90% of Auckland respondents felt safe in their city centre during the day.
- 46% of Auckland respondents felt safe in their city centre after dark.

**Analysis**

Between 2012 and 2018 there was a general increase in respondents feelings of safety across three of the four categories measured.

While a high proportion of Auckland respondents reported feeling ‘very safe’ or ‘fairly safe’ (91%) in 2018, this proportion dropped to 46 per cent when considering their sense of safety in their city centre after dark, and 62 per cent when thinking about walking alone in their neighborhood. Both these numbers however had increased by 7% and 2% respectively on their 2016 comparative measures.

**Trend**

From 2012 to 2018 increasing positive trend.
Outcome

Belonging and Participation

Measure 3
Aucklanders’ rating of their quality of life

Respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rate their overall quality of life positively (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data
Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rated their overall quality of life positively.

Source

Frequency
Every 2 years.

Availability
The reports are available on Knowledge Auckland (www.knowledgeauckland.org.nz).

Note
Respondents were asked to rate their overall quality of life and to also indicate the extent to which they felt their quality of life had changed from 12 months prior.

The Quality of Life survey changed from a five scale rating to a seven scale rating reducing direct comparability.

The 2012 Quality of Life survey method changed from a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) survey to an online self-complete survey. The 2018 survey used a sequential mixed-method methodology, enabling respondents to complete the survey either online or via a hard copy of the questionnaire.

Relevance
Aucklanders’ perception of their quality of life is central to their health and well-being. Satisfaction with overall quality of life is a measure of subjective wellbeing. A number of factors contribute to satisfaction with quality of life, which are further explored in the Quality of Life survey.

Baseline (2018)
42% of Auckland respondents rated their quality of life as extremely or very good.
41% of Auckland respondents rated their quality of life as good.
13% of Auckland respondents rated their quality of life as neither good nor poor.
4% of Auckland respondents rated their quality of life as poor or very poor.
0% of Auckland respondents rated their quality of life as extremely poor.

Analysis
Due to the change to a 7-point scale for the 2018 survey, the 2018 Quality of Life survey is difficult to compare against previous surveys.
Generally, there is an improving trend in Aucklanders’ quality of life, as there is a reduction in Aucklanders who rate their quality of life as poor / very poor, as well as Aucklanders who rate their quality of life as neither good nor bad. There is also an increase in Aucklanders who rate their quality of life as good, very good or extremely good.

Trend
From 2012 to 2018 increasing positive trend.
**Belonging and Participation**

**Measure 4**

Relative deprivation across Auckland

Population-Weighted Average Deprivation Index Score (2013 Census)

---

**Data**
Socioeconomic Deprivation Index (NZDep).

**Source**
Department of Public Health, University of Otago, Wellington.

**Frequency**
The Deprivation Index is produced after each census, generally every 5 years.

**Availability**
Deprivation Index data can be downloaded from the “New Zealand Indices of Deprivation” section of the project website, where more technical details about the index can also be found.

**Note**
The Deprivation Index assigns a value to Census Area Units (CAUs) across New Zealand as a way to indicate relative socioeconomic deprivation. The index is not a measure of absolute deprivation (the lower the number the lower the relative deprivation).

The index is calculated via a number of census variables from the following themes: access to communications; income; employment, qualifications, home ownership, single-parent family status, living space and access to private transport.

**Relevance**
The deprivation index allows investigation of spatial patterns of relative socioeconomic deprivation, which can be used in planning both council and community projects.

**Baseline (2018)**
The 2018 baseline is pending subject to the release of census data (expected 2020).

**Analysis**
Analysis subject to release of census data.

**Trend**
Insufficient data to determine a trend at the time of reporting.
Outcome

Belonging and Participation

Measure 5
Aucklanders’ health

Respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rate their personal health (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data**
Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rated their health positively.

**Source**

**Frequency**
Every 2 years.

**Availability**
The reports are available on Knowledge Auckland (www.knowledgeauckland.org.nz).

**Note**
Respondents were asked to rate their general overall health.
From 2012, the Quality of Life Survey method changed from a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) survey to an online self-complete survey. The 2018 survey used a sequential mixed-method methodology, enabling respondents to complete the survey either online or via a hard copy of the questionnaire.

**Relevance**
Good health is critical to wellbeing as it enables people to participate in society and the economy. Without good health, people are less able to enjoy their lives to the fullest extent, and their options may be limited. Self-rated health is a widely used indicator of health status and has been shown to have a strong relationship with objective measures of health status.

**Baseline (2018)**
78% of Auckland respondents rated their health as good, very good or excellent.
18% of Auckland respondents rated their health as fair.
4% of Auckland respondents rated their health as poor.

**Analysis**
Between 2012 and 2018 there was no significant change in how Aucklanders rate their personal health.
In 2018 there was a small decrease in the number of Aucklanders who rate their personal health as good, very good and extremely good. There was also a small increase in the number of Aucklanders who rate their personal health as either fair or poor.

**Trend**
From 2012 to 2018 no significant change.
Belonging and Participation

Measure 6
Treaty of Waitangi awareness and understanding

Respondents to the Council’s Resident Survey who rate their knowledge of Te Tiriti o Waitangi - the Treaty of Waitangi

Data
Respondents in council's resident survey who rate their knowledge of Te Tiriti o Waitangi - the Treaty of Waitangi.

Source
Auckland Council – Citizen Engagement and Insights.

Frequency
Annual.

Availability
On request from Auckland Council.

Note
The survey primarily measures respondents’ use of, and satisfaction with, a range of council services. It is conducted using a mix of online, phone and face-to-face interviews among Auckland Residents aged 15 years and over. In 2018, 4,475 respondents took part in the survey.

Relevance
Te Tiriti o Waitangi - the Treaty of Waitangi is important as a ‘living document’, central to New Zealand’s present and future, as well as its past. It provides the basis for all people to belong, while recognising Māori as tangata whenua. Valuing and better understanding the Treaty contributes to our shared identity and sense of belonging.

Baseline (2018)
In 2018 respondents in Council’s resident survey rate their knowledge of Te Tiriti o Waitangi - the Treaty of Waitangi with:
- 13% considered they knew it very well,
- 36% considered they had a fair amount of knowledge,
- 35% considered they knew just a little,
- 8% considered they knew almost nothing,
- 4% considered they knew nothing about the Treaty of Waitangi.

Analysis
New survey data will be available post June 2019 that will provide a basis for comparison.

Trend
Insufficient data to determine a trend at the time of reporting.
Outcome

Māori Identity and Wellbeing

Measure 1
Whānau wellbeing – based on principles of whanaungatanga

Explanation of measure:
The general principles of whanaungatanga have been used as the basis for determining whānau wellbeing. For the purpose of defining whanaungatanga various sources including the Māori dictionary, Te Puaawaitanga o ngā whānau – six markers of flourishing whānau, Māori Plan 2017 Glossary (IMS8).

Common across the different definitions for whanaungatanga were the important themes of whānau relationships and connectedness as described in the notes below.

Identification of data sets that measure whānau relationships and connectedness is on hold pending the outcome of work currently underway by Stats NZ. The “Ngā Titikaka Aoteaara indicators” work is looking specifically to develop measures for 1) intergenerational transfer of knowledge and 2) whānau connectedness.

Graph under development

Data
Ngā Titikaka Aoteaara indicators – Proposed – Intergenerational transfer of knowledge, whānau connectedness

Source
Statistics New Zealand

Frequency
To be determined.

Availability
To be determined.

Note
Statistics New Zealand.

Relevance
Whanau Relationships - “Whānau will flourish when they are cohesive, practice whanaungatanga, and are able to foster positive intergenerational transfers.” Whānau cohesion includes the quality of relationships within households and within the wider whānau; the use of online communication systems; opportunities for whānau living elsewhere to participate in whānau life; whānau leadership; whānau events and participation in those events; involvement in whānau ‘traditions’; whānau whānau.” – Te Puaawaitanga o ngā whānau.

Whanau connectedness - “Whānau will flourish when their connections beyond the whānau lead to empowerment.” Whānau Connectedness includes: whānau utilisation of societal institutions (e.g. schools, health care) and facilities (e.g. sport grounds, gymnasium), whānau participation in sport and/or recreation, whānau engagement in community affairs; whānau exercise of citizenship rights; whānau utilisation of banking and other financial institutions; whānau contributions to community committees, boards, voluntary efforts – Te Puaawaitanga o ngā whānau.

Baseline
To be determined.

Analysis
To be determined.

Trend
To be determined.
Māori Identity and Wellbeing

Measure 2
Māori in employment, education and training

Measure 2a.
Proportion of Māori youth in education, employment or training (%)

Data
Derived from youth (aged 15-24) NEET rates (not in employment, education or training) by ethnicity and age (15-19, 20-24).

Source
Statistics New Zealand, Household Labour Force Survey (HLFS); Auckland Council, RIMU calculations.

Frequency
Quarterly and moving annual average (to avoid seasonality).

Availability

Note
Education and training data is available only for youth (ages 15-24). Employment here is number of individuals in paid employment (including self-employed and working proprietors and part-timers). People not working or studying include those who are not available (eg full-time parents and other caregivers), as well as unemployed and other jobless people (not just the workforce). All data is subject to sampling errors, which increases for smaller sub-samples. Quarterly data is seasonal, so annual averages are recommended.

Relevance
Employment generates wealth for society, and income and job experience for the individual. Education and training enables youth in particular to improve their prospects. In the labour market, young people are often the first to lose their jobs and the last to gain employment. Youths who are in employment, education or training are less at risk of long-term unemployment, have better health outcomes and are less likely to be socially or economically disadvantaged in the future.

Baseline (2018)
In 2018, 81% of Māori youth aged 15 – 24 were in employment, education or training.

Analysis
Between 2007 and 2018 the proportion of Māori youth aged 15 – 24 in employment, education or training increased slightly from 78% to 81%.

Trend
From 2007 to 2018 increasing positive trend.
Measure 2b.
Type of employment for Māori (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2010 (Māori)</th>
<th>2018 (Māori)</th>
<th>2018 (Total – Auckland)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery operators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and administrative workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community personal service workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians and trade workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data
Employment (filled jobs) of Māori and all-ethnicities by occupation (ANZSCO1 digit), modelled by Infometrics from Statistics NZ data (census and quarterly HILFS).

Source
Infometrics, Auckland regional economic profile – Māori – skills – occupation.

Frequency
Annual

Availability

Note
Employment here is number of filled jobs (including self-employed and working proprietors and part-timers). Infometrics model Māori occupation data using their Regional Industry-Occupational matrix.

Relevance
Modern economies tend to shift employment out of lower skilled occupations such as labourers and machinery operators, and into higher skilled ones such as managers and professionals. Higher skilled occupations generally tend to be more productive and rewarding, and to offer better opportunities. Skills require education and training.

Baseline (2018)
Employment by occupation for Māori in 2018 relative to the total population:
- Labourers - 15% (Total population – 8.7%)
- Machinery operators and drivers - 11% (Total population – 5.2%)
- Sales workers - 8.4% (Total population – 10%)
- Clerical and administrative workers - 11.2% (Total population 11.9%)
- Community, personal service workers – 11.9% (Total population - 8.9%)
- Technicians and Trade workers – 12.7% (Total population – 12.5%)
- Professionals - 17.8% (Total population – 25.3%)
- Managers - 12.1% (Total population – 17.5%)

Analysis
As at 2018, Māori employed as labourers, machinery operators and drivers, community and personal service workers were above the regional average. Māori employed as clerical and administrative workers, technicians and trade workers were approximately the same as the Auckland population. Māori employed in sales dropped below the general population whilst professionals and managers also remained below the general population.

Trend
From 2010 to 2018 no significant change.
Outcome

Māori Identity and Wellbeing

Measure 3

Māori decision making

Number of co-governance/co-management arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Co-governance/co-management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data
Number of co-governance/co-management arrangements

Source
Auckland Council, Te Waka Angamua.

Frequency
Annual.

Availability
Auckland Council, Te Waka Angamua.

• All years excludes Rangihoa and Taiwhapera Committee, which is not currently in operation.
• All years excludes new governance structure over the Ōnehunga Portage, which is not yet fully operational.
• All years includes 2 co-management agreements – Pūkaki and Wai-o-maru.
• 2018 list reclassifies Pukekiwiriki Pa Joint Management Committee as co-governance rather than co-management.

Relevance
Reciprocal decision-making is a significant issue concerning Māori and is a primary pillar for Māori well-being and capacity.

Baseline (2018)
There are nine co-governance arrangements, some of which were initiated by Treaty of Waitangi Settlement Legislation.

Analysis
As at May 2019:
• Tūpuna Maunga Authority.
• Wai-o-maru.
• Te Motu a Hiaroa (Puketutu Island) Governance Trust.
• Mutukaroa (Hamilins Hill) Management Trust.
• Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei Reserves Board.
• Pukekiwiriki Pa Joint Management Committee.
• Te Poari o Kairākia ki Kalpara.
• Rangihoa and Taiwhapera Committee.
• Te Pūkaki Tapu o Poutukaka Historic Reserve and associated Māori lands co-management Committee (Pukaki).

Trend
From 2014 to 2019 no significant change.
**Māori Identity and Wellbeing**

**Measure 4**

**Te reo Māori across Tāmaki Makaurau**

**Te reo Māori proficiency (self-rated) (%)**

- **Very well**: 5.5% (2013), 8.6% (2013)
- **Well**: 3.2% (2013), 7.1% (2013)
- **Fairly well**: 9.9% (2013), 14.7% (2013)
- **Not very well**: 29.4% (2013), 28.9% (2013)
- **No more than a few words or phrases**: 49.9% (2013), 40.8% (2013)

**Data**

Self-rated te reo Māori proficiency.

**Source**

Te Kupenga, Stats NZ (Te Kupenga is Stats NZ’s survey of Māori well-being. It was first run in 2013).

**Frequency**

5 yearly.

**Availability**

Available from the Stats NZ website.

**Relevance**

Language is intrinsic to expressing and sustaining culture as a means of communicating values, beliefs, and customs. As the indigenous culture of New Zealand, Māori culture is unique to New Zealand and forms a fundamental part of the national identity. Māori language is central to Māori culture and an important aspect of cultural participation and identity.

**Baseline (2018)**

Data collected August 2018 but yet to be released.

**Analysis**

Analysis subject to release of Te Kupenga data.

**Trend**

Insufficient data to determine a trend.
Outcome

Homes and Places

Measure 1
New dwellings consented by location and type
(Development Strategy)

Number of new dwellings consented by type

Data
Numbers of new residential dwellings consented (per annum) by location and type.

Source
Statistics New Zealand, building consent data.

Frequency
Annual (also available monthly)

Availability
Building consent data for Auckland is freely available on Statistics New Zealand’s Infoshare website. Detailed data at sub-regional level is available on request from the Research and Evaluation Unit (REMU) at Auckland Council.

Note
Statistics NZ building consent data is produced both for the number of consents issued and the number of dwellings consented – this analysis is for dwellings consented. Data is for calendar years, and is presented for the previous 9 years. A single building consent may allow for the building of more than one dwelling.

In 2015 Stats NZ revised the classification of data resulting in four categories: 1) Houses, 2) Apartments, 3) Townhouses, flats, units and other dwellings, 4) Retirement village units.

Relevance
The housing preferences of Aucklanders are diverse. A broad range of housing types are required, in a variety of locations. These characteristics are also important measures of a quality compact urban form.

This measure will also be used to track progress towards the aims of the Auckland plan 2050 Development Strategy.

Baseline (2018)
As at 1 July 2018:

- Houses: 5,917 new dwelling consents.
- Apartments: 2,811.
- Houses, townhouses, flats, units and other dwellings: 2,823.
- Retirement village units: 817.

Total: 12,368.

Analysis
Since 2010 there has been a continued increase in the number of new dwellings consented. Between 2013 and 2018 the number of new dwellings consented increased significantly from 6,310 to 12,862. The typology of housing also changed significantly in this period. In 2013, apartments, townhouses, flats, units, and other dwellings made up approximately 24% of new dwellings consented. In 2018 this had risen to 46%.
This change in typology has enabled most growth to occur within the existing urban area, particularly in and around centres (refer to Map - Number of dwellings consented by location).

**Trend**
From 2010 to 2018 increasing positive trend.
Outcome

Homes and Places

Measure 2
New dwellings consented and completed (Development Strategy)

Number of new dwellings issued with code of compliance certificate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>7416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>9433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data
Numbers of new residential dwellings that have a Code of Compliance Certificate (CCC) issued per annum.

Source
Auckland Council, CCC data.

Frequency
Annual (also available monthly).

Availability
Numbers of CCCs and the number of dwellings with CCCs are recorded as part of Auckland Council’s building consenting processes. Detailed data at sub-regional level is available on request from the Research and Evaluation Unit (REMU) at Auckland Council.

Note
‘Dwellings with CCCs issued’ is a metric that was developed by council’s Building Control department in response to monitoring requirements for the Auckland Housing Accord. ‘Dwellings with CCCs issued’ data is only available from October 2013 onwards, and spatial matching of this data is only 95 per cent.

Relevance
CCCs provide a measure for when a dwelling is able to be occupied rather than a building consent that indicates an intention to build. There is no strict requirements to obtain a CCC, however they are a useful indicator of actual completions.

Baseline (2018)
At 1 July 2018: 9,433.

Analysis
Between 2014 and 2018 the number of dwellings with a CCC issued has steadily increased. The largest year-on-year increase during the monitored time frame was for 2018 at 9,433 (an increase of 2,521 CCCs on the 2017 figure).

Trend
From 2014 to 2018 increasing positive trend.
Outcome

Homes and Places

Measure 3
Housing costs as a percentage of household income

Housing costs to total household income (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data
Auckland average household annual expenditure on housing costs and average household total (gross) annual income.

Source
Statistics New Zealand, HES Household Economic Survey and HES (Income).

Frequency
Annual.

Availability
Published on Statistics New Zealand website.

Note
All dollars are nominal (not adjusted for inflation), and include survey error margins of up to 10%. Values are averages (not medians) of households in the Auckland region. Household income includes wages and salary, self-employment, investments and government benefits, and superannuation. Housing costs include rent and mortgages, property rates and building-related insurance.

Relevance
Although this ratio is a common indicator of housing cost stress, the household income component depends on many things, including household size and number of income earners, which can sometimes change in response to financial pressures and compensate for them, but does not alleviate them. Also, housing affordability can be affected by the interplay of a wide range of factors including, taxation and fiscal policy, planning and regulatory requirements and costs; industry practice and productivity, migration and demographic changes. These factors affect housing costs for a very broad cross-section of society. It should also be remembered that people who already owned (or inherited) property prior to the price rises, were largely unaffected or even benefited from the price rises.

Baseline (2018)
In 2018 housing costs as a percentage of total household income was 181%.

Analysis
Between 2010 and 2018 expenditure on housing costs as a percentage of total household income remained stable at between 17 to 20%.

Trend
From 2010 to 2018 no significant change.
### Outcome

**Homes and Places**

**Measure 4**

**Homelessness**

Numbers of people living without shelter and in temporary accommodation

![Bar chart showing numbers of people living without shelter and in temporary accommodation from 2001 to 2013: 13009 in 2001, 14848 in 2006, and 20296 in 2013.]

**Data**
Statistics New Zealand.

**Source**

**Frequency**
Every five years.

**Availability**

**Note**
Severe housing deprivation refers to people living in severely inadequate housing due to a lack of access to minimally adequate housing. This means not being able to access an acceptable dwelling to rent, let alone buy. It includes four main categories:

- Uninhabitable housing – garages, sheds.
- Sharing temporarily – Couch surfing in private residence.
- Temporary accommodation – Emergency housing, refuges, camp grounds, boarding houses, hotels, motels, marae.
- Without shelter – Rough sleeping, vehicles, improvised or makeshift shelter.

**Relevance**
Severe housing deprivation is an important social issue which requires an integrated approach at both the local and national level to reduce poverty and increase opportunity as well as to develop effective interventions to meet the needs of homeless people.

**Baseline (2013)**
As at 2013: 20,296 Aucklanders were homeless.

**Analysis**
Between 2001 and 2013 the number of Aucklanders who were homeless increased significantly from 13,009 to 20,296.

**Trend**
From 2001 to 2013 increasing negative trend.
Outcome

Homes and Places

Measure 5
Resident satisfaction with their built environment at a neighbourhood level

Respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who agreed they feel a sense of pride in their local area (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data
Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who feel a sense of pride in the way that their local area or neighborhood looks and feels.

Source

Frequency
Every 2 years.

Availability
The reports are available on Knowledge Auckland (www.knowledgeauckland.org.nz).

Note
From 2012, the Quality of Life survey method changed from a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) survey to an online self-complete survey. The 2018 survey used a sequential mixed-method methodology, enabling respondents to complete the survey either online or via a hard copy of the questionnaire.

Relevance
How residents feel about their local area or neighbourhood can also be considered a reflection in part of how satisfied they are with the built environment. This measure will help to determine whether Auckland is creating a strong sense of place that resonates with its residents.

Baseline (2018)
In 2018, 61% of Auckland respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they felt a sense of pride in the way their city or local area feels.

Analysis
Between 2012 and 2018, respondents that felt a sense of pride in the built environment was relatively steady between 60% to 64%.

Trend
From 2010 to 2018 no significant change.
**Outcome**

**Transport and Access**

**Measure 1**

**Access to jobs (Development Strategy)**

Proportion of jobs reached by car or public transport (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reach by car within 30 mins (%)</th>
<th>Reach by public transport within 45 mins (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2046</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data**
Number of jobs accessible to the average Aucklander in the morning peak within 30 minutes by car and 45 minutes by public transport.

**Source**
ART model outputs, Auckland Forecasting Centre.

**Frequency**
Variable – An updated version of the model is dependent on 2018 census data not yet available.

**Availability**
Data can be sourced from the Auckland Forecasting centre.

**Note**
ART model uses a combination of real data and various assumptions to predict the level and rate of change across different areas and components of the transport network. The use of modelling enables targeted interventions to be made and understood within the context of the broader network now and into the future. The model output was prepared for the 2016 Auckland Transport Alignment project (ATAP). Further refinement to the model outputs was carried out through the revised ATAP in 2018.

As at May 2019 a real time measure was under development through the ATAP measures working group for monitoring access to jobs which could replace this measure.

**Relevance**
For Auckland to benefit from the region’s growth, it is essential for people from all parts of Auckland to have good access to the employment, education and other opportunities that growth creates. Our continued prosperity is dependent on the convenient, affordable, safe and sustainable movement of people, goods and services within Auckland, and with the rest of New Zealand and the world. Improving access to employment and education is particularly critical to boosting Auckland’s economic productivity and overall prosperity (Ministry of Transport, 2014). To be productive, businesses need a wide choice of potential employees. Similarly, workers need a wide choice of potential jobs within a reasonable commute time to best match their skills and to reduce their vulnerability to long-term unemployment in the event of job loss.

**Baseline (2016)**
34.6% of jobs are accessible to the average Aucklander in the morning peak within 30 minutes by car.
8.3% of jobs are accessible to the average Aucklanders in the morning peak within 30 minutes by public transport.

**Analysis**
Job accessibility varies significantly by mode and distance. The number of jobs accessible by public transport is expected to significantly increase over the next 30 years. In 2016, 8 per cent of jobs were considered accessible to Aucklanders within a 45-minute trip on public transport. This figure is expected to increase to 25 per cent by 2036. Access by car is also expected to increase significantly especially between 2016 and 2036. In 2016 35 per cent of jobs were considered accessible to Aucklanders within a 30-minute trip by car. This figure should increase to 61 per cent by 2036.

**Trend**
A trend cannot be determined.
Outcome

Transport and Access

Measure 2
Delay from congestion (Development Strategy)

Per capita additional delay (minutes)

Data
Per capita annual delay from congestion (minutes).

Source
Auckland Regional Transport model outputs, Auckland Forecasting Centre.

Frequency
Variable – An updated version of the model is dependent on 2018 census data not yet available.

Availability
Data can be sourced from the Auckland Forecasting Centre.

Note
ART model uses a combination of real data and various assumptions to predict the level and rate of change across different areas and components of the transport network. The use of modelling enables targeted interventions to be made and understood within the context of the broader network now and into the future. The model output was prepared for the 2016 Auckland Transport Alignment project (ATAP). Further refinement to the model outputs was carried out through the revised ATAP in 2018.

As at May 2019 a real time measure that would monitor congestion levels on motorways and key arterials was under consideration by the ATAP measures working group which could replace this measure.

Relevance
Traffic delays constrain economic productivity so moving people and goods efficiently through Auckland is a key transport objective. This measure shows the total and per capita delay across the network based on the projected volume of traffic divided by its theoretical capacity (VC ratio).

Congestion is defined by combining the two worst levels of service measures for measuring network performance:
- Significant delay and low average speed (Level of service E).
- High delay and extremely low speeds (Level of service F).

Baseline (2016)
841 minutes per capita annual from congestion.

Analysis
Delay from congestion, measured as per capita additional delay, is expected to peak in 2026 before reducing heavily from 2026 and rising gain from 2036.

Trend
A trend cannot be determined.
**Outcome**

**Transport and Access**

**Measure 3**

**Use of public transport, walking and cycling**

Proportion of trips made by public transport, walking and cycling during the AM peak (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Public Transport (%)</th>
<th>Active (Walking and cycling) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>11.88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>15.58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2046</td>
<td>19.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data**

Proportion of trips made by public transport, walking and cycling during the AM peak.

**Source**

Auckland Regional Transport model, Auckland Forecasting Centre.

**Frequency**

Variable – An updated version of the model is dependent on 2018 census data not yet available.

**Availability**

Data can be sourced from the Auckland Forecasting Centre.

**Note**

ART model uses a combination of real data and various assumptions to predict the level and rate of change across different areas and components of the transport network. The use of modelling enables targeted interventions to be made and understood within the context of the broader network now and into the future. The model output was prepared for the 2016 Auckland Transport Alignment project (ATAP). Further refinement to the model outputs was carried out through the revised ATAP in 2018.

**Relevance**

For Auckland to benefit from the region’s growth, it is essential for people from all parts of Auckland to have good access to the employment, education and other opportunities that growth creates. People need access to a range of modes to ensure they can move easily throughout the region.

**Baseline (2016)**

7.4% of trips made by public transport during AM peak.

15.1% of trips made by active transport (walking and cycling during AM peak).

**Analysis**

The proportion of trips taken in Auckland by public transport and active modes is expected to increase between 2016 to 2046. In 2016 it was calculated that just over 20 per cent of trips taken in Auckland were by public transport or active modes. In 2046 it is expected that over 30 per cent of trips taken in Auckland will be by public transport or active modes.

**Trend**

A trend cannot be determined.
Outcome

Transport and Access

Measure 4
Household transport costs

Average weekly household transport costs ($)

Data
Average weekly transport costs.

Source
Statistics New Zealand, HES Household Economic Survey and HES (Income).

Frequency
3 yearly.

Availability
Stats NZ.

Note
All dollars are nominal (not adjusted for inflation) and include survey error margins of up to 10%. Values are averages (not medians) of households in the Auckland region.

Relevance
Reducing household transport costs can help to improve equity across the region. It can also drive change in mode choice. Transport costs contain expenditure on vehicle purchases, private transport supplies and services, and passenger transport services. It includes spending on petrol, vehicle parts and servicing, and travel by rail, road, air and sea.

Baseline (2016)
As at 2016 the average cost per week as a percentage of average household costs were:
- Purchase of vehicles - $72.50 per week
- Private transport supplies and services - $70.50 per week
- Passenger transport services - $71.00 per week
- Percentage of transport costs to average household costs (%) - 14.0%

Analysis
Between 2007 and 2016 the ratio of transport costs as a percentage of household costs has remained constant at between 13.9 to 14.0%.

Between 2007 and 2016 passenger transport costs as a proportion of average household costs increased the most from $26 to $71. Purchase of vehicle costs showed the second highest increase from $44 to $72 whilst passenger transport supplies and services decreased slightly from $78 to $71.

Trend
From 2007 to 2016 no significant change.
Outcome

Transport and Access

Measure 5
Deaths and injuries from transport network

Number of serious and fatal injuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data
Serious and fatal traffic deaths and injuries.

Source
New Zealand Transport Agency.

Frequency
Weekly.

Availability
New Zealand Transport Agency website.

Note
Road crash ‘fatal and serious injuries’ (FSI) is an annual measure of the number of individual deaths and serious injuries recorded by NZ Police Traffic Crash Reports (TCRs) on all local roads, state highways and motorways within the Auckland Council boundary during a calendar year. Reporting delays may cause numbers to change slightly between reporting cycles.

Relevance
This is a key indicator for understanding annual changes in the severity of road trauma across Auckland. The measure reflects the recent international and national shift to a Safe Road System increasingly free of death and serious injury. This approach acknowledges that while minor injury or non-injury crashes may still occur, road system designers have a responsibility to creating and operating a transport system where people are protected from death or serious injury.

Baseline (2018)
As at December 2018 there were:
- 595 serious injuries.
- 54 fatalities.

Analysis
Between 2010 to 2014 fatalities were declining whilst serious injuries remained consistent between 400 to 450 per year.
While there was a reduction in 2018 combined serious injuries and fatalities have shown a rising trend from 2012.

Trend
From 2010 to 2018 increasing negative trend.
Outcome

Environment and Cultural Heritage

Measure 1
State and quality of locally, regionally and nationally significant environments

Composite measure explanation - New Zealand is internationally regarded as a ‘biodiversity hotspot’. Our indigenous plants and animals, and the ecosystems they live in, are world treasures. When humans first discovered New Zealand, it was a different world: apart and isolated for 80 million years, and populated with many plant & animal species that seemed to belong to the age of dinosaurs. The Auckland Region, has an amazing diversity of species and ecosystems disproportionate to its size, including several species that are found nowhere else in the world. This composite measure covers:

- Native vegetation cover and habitat loss
- Native plant diversity
- Native bird species

Measure 1a. Native vegetation cover and habitat loss
Landcover Index Value (%)

Data
Data landcover index value.

Source
New Zealand Landcover Database (NZLCD), regionally acquired spatial data.

Frequency
NZLCDB – 5 to 10 years.

Availability
NZLCDB, managed and updated by Land Information New Zealand (LINZ). An update is expected in 2019.

Notes
Full regional cover is provided by LCDB, and council data, such as the Regional Ecosystem Layer, LiDAR runs or aerial photo analysis, provides higher spatial resolution for some areas and time stamps.

Relevance
This measure tracks key components of the ecological health and resilience of our native ecosystems and species including the total cover, extent and condition of native ecosystems, the loss or clearance of native ecosystems, and the quantity and variety of native species within these habitats. The combination of these programmes provides a comprehensive indication of the stability and resilience of ecological communities. This information feeds into policy changes, environmental management strategies and long-term plans.

Baseline (2012)
Due to the current unavailability of data the current baseline is drawn from 2012.

Haururu (LB) - 100
Aotea (GB) - 93
Waitakere - 90
Inner Gulf Islands - 69
Hunua - 60
Rodney - 48
Kaihapa - 42
Awhitu - 39
Otamata - 38
Urban north & south - 32
Manukau - 27

Auckland Plan 2050 Six-monthly update
Analysis
Measured at the regional scale, the percent landcover of native ecosystems has been relatively stable over the last few decades (refer to graph), however, case-study data shows loss of small habitat fragments is occurring in the more intensively developed parts of the region.

Trend
From 2001 to 2012 no significant change.

Measure 1b.
Average native plant diversity within plots for Auckland’s ecological neighbourhoods

Data
Data landcover data base.

Source
New Zealand Landcover Database (NZLCDB), regionally acquired spatial data.

Availability
NZLCDB, managed and updated by Land Information New Zealand (LINZ). An update is expected in 2019.

Notes
Full regional coverage is provided by LCDB, and council data, such as the Regional Ecosystem Layer, LiDAR runs or aerial photography, provides higher spatial resolution for some areas and time stamps.

Relevance
This measure tracks a key component of the ecological health and resilience of our native ecosystems and through quantifying plant diversity across the region. The combination of these programmes provides a comprehensive indication of the stability and resilience of ecological communities. This information feeds into policy changes, environmental management strategies and long-term plans.

Baseline (2012)
Due to the current unavailability of data the current baseline is drawn from 2012:
- Waitakere - 44.39
- Hauraki - 44.18
- Henderson - 42
- Auckland CBD - 38.25
- Auckland City - 37.08
- Rodney - 36.33
- Auckland Urban North - 32.88
- Auckland Urban South - 29.95
- Auckland Island - 22.5
- Makara - 21.5
- Manukau - 19.77
- Manukau - 19.3

Analysis
Forest ecosystems in landscapes that have been modified by high-intensity farming activity and urban growth have lower plant diversity and naturalness, as well as higher tree and sapling mortality.

Trend
Insufficient data to determine a trend at the time of reporting.
Measure 1c.
Total number of bird species found in bird counts grouped by landscape type

Data
RI MU Terrestrial Monitoring programme.

Source
Field surveys as part of regular monitoring.

Availability
3 yearly.

Relevance
The feeding relationships among all the animals in an ecosystem help prevent any one species from becoming too numerous. Birds play a vital role in keeping this balance of nature. In addition to being important parts of food webs, birds play other roles within ecosystems as pollinators and are also a valued taonga.

Baseline (2016)
Due to the current unavailability of data the current baseline is drawn from 2016.
All Sites - 60
Islands - 23
Rural - 42
Urban - 34
Mainland with Pest Control - 30

Analysis
The highest numbers of endemic birds (that’s birds only found in New Zealand), such as tui, grey warbler, New Zealand fantail, and New Zealand pigeon, were found on island sites, where native species outnumbered introduced species. There were similar numbers of introduced species across the rural, urban and other mainland sites with pest management in place (e.g. parkland), yet rural sites tended to have more endemic species. Just like for plants, the most modified parts of the region had a higher presence of exotic birds.

Trend
Insufficient data to determine a trend at the time of reporting.
Outcome

Environment and Cultural Heritage

Measure 2
Marine and freshwater quality

Composite measure explanation - The Auckland Region is surrounded by water and has a complex coastline with many harbours, estuaries and islands. The region is also home to many streams, natural and artificial lakes, and aquifers.

Water quality and quantity are both significant issues that will escalate as the population grows and the impacts of climate change become increasingly apparent.

In both urban and rural areas, water quality has declined, and freshwater environments have been compromised.

This composite measure covers:

- Fresh water quality:
  - Rivers
  - Lakes
- Marine water quality

Measure 2a.
Stream water quality

Data
Water quality index.

Source
Stream water quality monitoring programme.

Availability
Annually.

Frequency
monitored annually reported trend 5 yearly.

Notes
The average water quality index from 0 (worst) to 100 (best) for broad land use categories in the Auckland Region (2013-2016) and the 2016 water quality class. The data was gathered from across 36 sites.

Relevance
Stream water quality is largely influenced by catchment landuse. In general streams with an urban catchment are heavily impacted by contaminants and have poor water quality. Streams within rural catchments generally have good water quality but specific sites are impacted by nutrients and sediment. Streams with a native forest catchment generally have little to no human impact and thereby excellent water quality.

Baseline (2016)
The current baseline is set against 2016 data as per the analysis below:

Native forest - Good    Exotic forest - Fair
Rural - Fair            Urban - Poor
**Analysis**

Over the time period monitored all catchments have demonstrated a decline in water quality. The water quality index gave the four catchments the following ratings: Native forest – Good, Exotic forest – Fair, Rural – Fair, Urban – Poor.

**Trend**

From 2013 to 2016 decreasing trend.

**Measure 2b.**  
Lake water quality - trophic level

**Data**

Trophic level index (TU).

**Source**

Lake water quality monitoring programme.

**Availability**

Monitored monthly and reported periodically.

**Frequency**

Monitored annually and reported trend 5 yearly.

**Notes**

The TLI is used to place lakes into nutrient-enrichment categories known as trophic states:

- Microtrophic (TLI < 2; very good) lakes are very clean and often have snow or glacial sources.
- Oligotrophic (TLI 2-3; good) lakes are clear and blue, with low concentrations of nutrients and algae.
- Mesotrophic (TLI 3-4; average) lakes have moderate concentrations of nutrients and algae.
- Eutrophic (TLI 4-5; poor) lakes are murky, with high concentrations of nutrients and algae.
- Supertrophic or hypertrophic (TLI > 5; very poor) lakes have extremely high concentrations of phosphorus and nitrogen, and are overly fertile; they are rarely suitable for recreation and lack habitats for desirable aquatic species.

**Relevance**

When nitrogen and phosphorus accumulate in lakes (referred to as ‘nutrient enrichment’) above certain concentrations, they can stimulate the growth of algae and cyanobacteria. Chlorophyll-a is a measure of the phytoplankton (algae) biomass. Lakes with very high concentrations of nutrients and algae are rarely suitable for recreation and provide poor habitats for aquatic species, particularly through reduction in dissolved oxygen concentrations. Ammoniacal nitrogen and nitrate-nitrogen can be toxic to aquatic life if concentrations are high enough. Water clarity is a measure of underwater visibility in lakes.

**Baseline (2012)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kereta (Eutrophic)</th>
<th>Kuwakatai (Super-trophic)</th>
<th>Ototoa (Mesotrophic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupuke (Mesotrophic)</td>
<td>Spectacle (Super-trophic)</td>
<td>Tomataua (Eutrophic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

The lakes monitored range from super-trophic/very poor (Kuwakatai) to mesotrophic/average (Ototoa). Some of Auckland’s monitored lakes have poor water quality, but showed improving trends over the period 1993 to 2012.

**Trend**

From 2002 to 2012 decreasing positive trend.
Measure 2c.
Beach swimming safety

![Chart showing number of long term water quality alerts for beaches and streams, and proportion of time Safeswim marine beaches are suitable for contact recreation during the summer swimming season (Nov 1 to April 30).]

Data
Number of long term water quality alerts for beaches and streams. Proportion of time Safeswim marine beaches are suitable for contact recreation during the summer swimming season (Nov 1 to April 30).

Source
https://www.safeswim.org.nz

Frequency
Annually.

Availability
https://www.safeswim.org.nz

Notes
The Water Quality categories relate to the amount of bacteria in the water. Safeswim uses thresholds that are set by the Ministry for the Environment and Ministry of Health, and published in national Microbiological Water Quality Guidelines.

Relevance
Health risks are also evident at popular beaches, to varying degrees, where the majority of swimming takes place. In urban areas, this is typically the result of wastewater overflows and contaminated stormwater during rainstorms. Rural streams generally have better water quality, although they also face problems with elevated levels of nutrients, sediment and E. coli in some areas of more intensive agriculture and towns with aging or improperly maintained septic systems.

Baseline (2018)
The 2018 baseline for long-term water quality alerts was 12. The proportion of time Safeswim marine beaches were suitable for contact recreation during the summer swimming season 2018/2019 was 77%.

Analysis
There has been a decrease in water quality beach alerts between summer swimming seasons from 16 to 12. The percentage of time that Safeswim marine beaches are suitable for contact recreation has also increased over this time.

Trend
From 2017/2018 to 2018/2019 increasing positive trend.
Outcome

Environment and Cultural Heritage

Measure 3
Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Measure 3a.
Concentration of air pollutants

Data
Concentrations of following pollutants:
- Particulate matter (PM2.5 and PM10).
- Gaseous pollutants (ozone of nitrogen, carbon monoxide, sulphur dioxide, ozone).

Source
Auckland Council ambient air quality monitoring programme.

Frequency
Continuous data are collected every minute and averaged over 10 minutes, 1-hour and 24-hour periods. Most national and regional standards and targets are based on 1-hour and 24-hour periods. Diffusion tube and volatile organic compounds measurements can be obtained over weekly or monthly time periods.

Availability
Real-time and historical data are available from Auckland Council on request. Various technical and summary reports describing Auckland’s air quality are available at Knowledge Auckland.

Notes
The following data are collected and used for air quality monitoring.
- PM$_{10}$ particulate data are currently collected at eight sites across the network. This size of particulate is emitted from natural sources such as oceanic sea salt and pollen. Anthropogenic sources include dust, transport emission and home heating.
- PM$_{2.5}$ is currently monitored at four sites. PM$_{2.5}$ measures the smallest size fraction of particulates that are most commonly anthropogenic in origin, including combustion sources, home heating, and secondary particulates emanating from gas emissions.
- Emissions from vehicles (especially diesel) also contribute nitrogen oxides (NOx), mainly nitric oxide (NO). Nitric oxide reacts with oxygen in the atmosphere to form NO$_2$, which can cause the brown haze that affects our health.
- Shipping traffic also has an impact, contributing mainly PM, NOx and Sulphur dioxide (SO$_2$) to the air.
- Ozone (O$_3$) is produced because of vehicle exhaust emissions interacting with sunlight in the presence of volatile organic compounds.

Relevance
There is a statistically significant increase in the number of admissions to hospital for respiratory disorders following brown haze events over Auckland. This is because the brown haze is a stagnant pool of polluted air sitting over a large area of Auckland’s airshed. These events tend to occur on clear calm mornings in winter when people tend to go out and exercise, unaware of the risks of exacerbating existing bronchial and respiratory disorders. This model will act as a warning for the public, advisory for the ADHBs, and as a mitigation tool for key polluters such as Auckland Transport.
Baseline (2016)
The current baseline is set against 2016 data:
AC Penrose NO2 [µg/m³] - 10.5
AC Queen Street NO2 [µg/m³] - 35.5
AC Takapuna NO2 [µg/m³] - 10.7

Analysis
The graphed NO2 data is collected from 3 air quality monitoring stations across Auckland, Penrose, Takapuna and Queen Street. The dashed lines show the long-term trend in the data for each of the sites.

Key air quality information can be determined from this simple graph.
A long-term downward trend in measured NO2 is evident. NO2 is largely emitted from on-road vehicles. As vehicle numbers are known to be increasing, the data may seem surprising. However, improvements in engine efficiency and cleaner fuel have proved more influential on pollution emissions than the increasing traffic volume. This is more evident before 2012. Since then, traffic volume has started to mitigate gains in vehicle efficiency with trends leveling off, and in some locations, now increasing.
Penrose and Takapuna display almost identical concentrations, despite being almost 10km apart. This is due to similarities in their relative proximity to the SH motorway. The similarity in data demonstrates that they are measuring the same emission source with similar emission rates.
Queen Street shows a marked drop in 2011. This was due to the reconfiguration of Queen Street, effectively reducing traffic. Interestingly, since 2012, the trend in NO2 has slowly increasing at this location due to an increasing number of vehicles, and buses. This demonstrates the importance and influence of policy and planning on Auckland's air quality.

Trend
From 2011 to 2016, decreasing positive trend.

Measure 3b.
Greenhouse gas emissions (tonne of CO2e accounting for CO2e removed by forests)

Data
Multiple indicators and data sources used.

Source

Frequency
Annual greenhouse gas emissions are reported from 1990 and from 2009 to 2015, so a pre-Auckland Plan 2050 baseline is available. Projected greenhouse gas emissions are reported every 3 to 5 years.

Availability
Emissions data from all the sectors and sources are available.

Notes
There are multiple indicators and data sets that can be used to report on greenhouse gas emissions and projections across various environmental domains.

Relevance
Climate change mitigation contributes to all Focus Areas and Directions of the Environment and Cultural Heritage Outcome, as well as Auckland’s Climate Action Plan. The measure of greenhouse gas emissions enables us:
• To be in line with national and international best practice
• To better measure progress
Baseline (2015)
The current baseline is set against 2015 data - 6.5 net tCO₂e per person.

Analysis
In 2015, Auckland's gross greenhouse gas emissions were 11,309 kilo-tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (kt CO₂e) (10,267 kt with forestry sequestration included). Transport emissions made up 39.7% of total emissions (Figure 1), with 35.7% of this made up of road transport emissions. 2015 saw an increase of 1.5% on net 2014 emissions, and 2.1% on 2009 emissions.

Auckland's greenhouse gas emissions are increasing. However, as Auckland's population and Gross Domestic Product (GDP) have increased, there has not been a proportional increase in greenhouse gas emissions, and thus emissions per capita and per unit GDP have declined.

(Trend)
From 2009 to 2015 increasing negative trend.
Outcome

Environment and Cultural Heritage

Measure 4
Protection of the environment

Composite measure explanation – Pest animals and plants are exotic animals and plants that cause damage and disruption to native ecosystems or agriculture. New Zealand’s isolation from the rest of the world and unique biodiversity means that Auckland’s indigenous ecosystems and species are especially vulnerable to the impact of introduced animals and pest plants.
This composite measure covers two main categories:
• Exotic plants
• Pests

Measure 4a.
Relative weediness of Auckland’s forest ecosystems index (100 = good)

Data
Weed index score.

Source
Auckland Council State of the Environment monitoring and research. Site-based monitoring carried out by Auckland Council, Department of Conservation and a wide range of different community groups.

Frequency
Collected annually and reported 3 yearly.

Availability
New data expected to be released in 2019.

Notes
Pest plant (weed) plot and survey data from a representative sample of wetland, dune, forest, riparian freshwater, urban forest and lake ecosystems.

Relevance
More than 1,000 exotic plants have naturalised in the Auckland Region and new introductions continue. Many of these introduced species have the potential to become pest plants. For example, pest plants such as pine, wattle, pampas and privet outcompete and displace adult native trees, seedlings and shrubs. Other pest plants, such as climbing asparagus, tradescantia and ginger, can suppress the regeneration of indigenous seedlings and saplings.

Baseline (2016)
The current baseline is for 2016:

Hauturu - 100
Rodney - 89
Otama - 71
Urban north - 56

Waitakere - 95
Great Barrier (Aotea) - 80.5
Inner Gulf Islands - 69
Manukau - 55

Hunua - 94
Kaipora - 75
Awhitu - 68.5
Urban south - 40

Analysis
Hauturu (Little Barrier Island) is the least weed affected part of the region, and the values recorded in its plots are the standard against which all other locations are judged. In contrast, the forest and scrub vegetation of the Auckland urban area is heavily compromised by weeds. Up to 15% of all tree stems, 34% of all saplings and 20% of all seedlings we recorded in urban forests were comprised of exotic or weedy plant species.

Trend
Insufficient data to determine a trend at the time of reporting.
Data
Mean percent of chewcards damaged by pest animals in different parts of the Auckland Region. (Bars are standard errors)

Source
Auckland Council. State of the Environment monitoring and research. Site-based monitoring carried out by Auckland Council, Department of Conservation and a wide range of different community groups.

Frequency
Collected annually and reported 3 yearly.

Availability
New data expected to be released 2019.

Notes
Presence/absence of possums, rats, and mice, and ungulate pellet counts on 8km x 8km grid plots. Possum RTC (residual trap catch) data for Hunua and Waitakere Ranges. Presence/absence of possums, rats and mice in land covered by various ‘Pest Free’ and other community initiatives.

Relevance
Pest animals are a major threat to New Zealand’s native species. New Zealand has been geographically separated from other land masses for over 80 million years, over which our plants and animals have evolved in isolation of land mammals and thus without adaptations to succeed in their presence. For example, pests such as possums, rats and stoats compete with our native birdlife for food and habitat. They also eat bird’s eggs and young and attack the adults. Animal browsers such as domestic stock, possums, deer, goats and rabbits consume native vegetation, and can significantly alter ecosystem composition and nutrient cycling.

Baseline (2016)
The current baseline is for data collected prior to 2016.

Analysis
Pest density is relatively good (i.e. low) in our highly managed areas (e.g. Ark in the Park, kokako management area (Hunua), Glen Fern, Windy Hill). However, in some locations where pests are not controlled there is a lot more work to do to secure our native biodiversity against the negative impact of pest animals. Note the data in Figure 2 only includes data collected prior to 2016, before the Hunua Ranges 1080 poison drop dramatically reduced rat density in the Hunua ranges.

Trend
Insufficient data to determine a trend at the time of reporting.

Additional data to be added to composite measure in the future:
Auckland Council resource consents and compliance records - The issuing of resource consents is one of the main ways in which our policies and plans are implemented – through the regulatory control of activities. The numbers and types of resource consents issued or active provide one measure of environmental pressure and compliance monitoring provides one measure of how effective consent conditions are. This information can be combined with environmental state and change information to provide a measure of how effective our policies and plans are implemented through resource consents and achieve good environmental outcomes.
This information will be available through the Unitary Plan monitoring programme currently under development.
Outcome

Environment and Cultural Heritage

Measure 5
Resilience to natural threats

Under development

This measure will draw on the same measures as for Measure 1, 2 and 4 to gauge current Ecosystem Health and Resilience. There are multiple indicators and data sets that will be used to report on ecosystem health and resilience across various environmental domains.

In addition to the existing data sets this measure will look to incorporate through the AUP Schedule 1, clause 1.4 "Matters to identify, investigate and address" for the purpose of "considering anticipated climate change impacts (and identifying an appropriate planning response). This should result in a more pro-active approach towards avoiding and/or mitigating impacts on the environment."
Outcome

**Environment and Cultural Heritage**

**Measure 6**
**Treasuring of the environment**

**Composite measure explanation** – Retention of treasured environments such as Maunga, volcanic features and sites of cultural and natural heritage significance – The natural and built environment is inextricably connected to Aucklanders’ sense of identity and place. This composite measure covers:

- Statutory provisions as a measure for how much and how well our treasured areas are protected (under development)
- Volunteering – An expression of personal commitment by Aucklanders of how they treasure their environment.

**Under development**

**Measure 6a.**
**Statutory Provisions (Under Development)**

This composite measure requires further development to determine the most informative indicators to use and to ensure systems are in place to provide data in a consistent and timely manner.

The spatial layers exist in the Auckland Unitary but in many cases the mapped areas are those we know about and are not necessarily a complete stocktake. Some are being updated through currently funded work programmes, e.g. Natural Environment Targeted Rate.

To measure change in extent (e.g. loss) of treasured environments would require survey or some other systematic form of collecting data on change in status.

Records of consents issued in overlay areas would provide a measure of impact.
Measure 6b.
Number of volunteer hours worked in regional parks each year

Data
Level of service from Auckland Council Long Term Plan.

Source
Auckland Council.

Frequency
Annual.

Availability

Notes
There are other environmental volunteer programmes and groups outside of regional parks e.g. Stream restoration, Conservation Volunteers New Zealand. Inclusion of these groups will be considered for future reporting.

Relevance
Individuals and communities invest considerable time volunteering which makes a considerable contribution to the protection and enhancement of their environment. An individual’s willingness and ability to commit personal time can be considered a general expression and demonstration of how they value their environment.

Baseline (2018)
In 2018, 81,342 volunteer hours were given across the regional parks network.

Analysis
LTP measures have predetermined targets which are used to monitor success. Based on those targets expected volunteer hours were significantly exceeded between 2011 and 2012, but were not met between 2013 and 2014. Targets were met between 2015 and 2018.

Trend
From 2015 to 2018 no significant change.
**Outcome**

**Opportunity and Prosperity**

**Measure 1**

**Labour productivity**

Real GDP per filled job ($)

---

**Data**

Output per worker: real Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in constant 2010 dollars, per filled job.

**Source**

Infometrics, Auckland regional economic profile

**Frequency**

Annual

**Availability**

Public access funded by Council subscription to Infometrics website portal. https://ecoprofile.infometrics.co.nz/Auckland/

**Productivity**, which also includes a variety of related data such as productivity breakdowns by industry and location and changes over time.

**Note**

Labour productivity uses GDP per employed person (in constant 2010 prices). GDP measures the value economic units add to their inputs - broadly equivalent to its sales revenue less the cost of materials and services purchased from other firms. Infometrics breaks national production-based GDP (published by Statistics New Zealand for years ended March) down to territorial authority (TA) level by applying estimated TA shares to the national total.

**Relevance**

Productivity relates to how efficiently a firm or any other organisation can turn its inputs, such as labour and capital, into outputs in the form of goods and services. Labour productivity is a measure of the amount produced for a certain amount of labour effort. It is closely related to individual incomes (i.e. wages and salaries) and living standards. Growth in labour productivity over time can imply an increase in the efficiency and competitiveness of the economy. (However, comparisons of labour productivity over time or between regions should be done with caution, as each worker may have different levels of access to other production inputs (such as machinery, technology, and land) over time or between regions whose economies have vastly different industrial structures.)

**Baseline (2018)**

In 2018 GDP per job filled in Auckland was $103,438 (NZD).

**Analysis**

Between 2000 and 2018 there was a general increase in real GDP per job filled in Auckland. Real GDP per job filled in Auckland remains consistently higher than New Zealand average.

**Trend**

From 2000 to 2018 increasing positive trend.
**Outcome**

**Opportunity and Prosperity**

**Measure 2**

**Aucklanders’ average wages**

Median weekly earnings of employed people by ethnicity ($)

![Graph showing median weekly earnings of employed people by ethnicity](attachment:image.png)

**Data**

Earnings of people in paid employment by region, age, sex and ethnic group - median and average, hourly and weekly; inflation-adjusted.

**Source**


**Frequency**

Annual, (Ethnicity, only from 2009).

**Availability**


**Note**

All data is subject to survey error margins. Coverage is people over 15 years old who work for wages or salaries or are self-employed. Earnings now comprise income from wages and salaries, self-employment, and government transfers, but no longer including private transfers or investment income. Variations in weekly earnings arise from variation in both hourly earnings and hours worked. Weekly earnings comprise full- and part-timers, but median hourly rates typically equate to 37 - 40 hours/week. Ethnic group sums may exceed totals due to respondents selecting multiple ethnic groups.

**Relevance**

Employment earnings are the main source of income for most people and their households, and the main way that improved prosperity benefits the general population. They also generate taxes that help fund government services and transfers to other households.

**Baseline (2018)**

In 2018 the mean weekly earnings for Aucklanders who identify as European were $1,150 (NZD), $959 (NZD) for Māori, $878 (NZD) for Pacific, and $928 (NZD) for Asian (Auckland average wages $1,036).

**Analysis**

Between 2009 and 2018 there was a general increase in median weekly earnings for all ethnic groups in Auckland. This increase was largest for the European ethnic group.

**(✓) Trend**

From 2009 to 2018 increasing positive trend.
**Outcome**

Opportunity and Prosperity

Measure 3

Employment in advanced industries

Knowledge Intensive industries and total employment growth (%)

![Graph showing knowledge intensive and total employment growth over years](attachment://graph.png)

**Data**

Employment in advanced industries (Australian & New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification, NZSIC 7 digit) defined as knowledge intensive: 25 per cent of workforce have degrees and 30 per cent are professional, managerial or scientific and technical.

**Source**

Infometrics, Auckland regional economic profile – skills – knowledge intensive.

**Frequency**

Annual

**Availability**


**Note**

Employment here is average number of filled jobs (including self-employed and working proprietors and part-timers) for the year ended March, estimated by Infometrics from Statistics New Zealand’s quarterly Linked Employer Employee Data (LEED). Advanced industries are largely a subset of knowledge intensive industries (11% versus 36% of Auckland’s workforce), defined by high spending on research and development, and workers having degrees in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM).

**Relevance**

Knowledge intensive (KI) industries are those in which the generation and exploitation of knowledge play the predominant part in the creation of economic activity. They represent an increasing share of the New Zealand economy’s output and employment, and may be a source of future productivity growth.

**Baseline (2018)**

In 2019 growth in knowledge intensive industries and the total employment market averaged around 3 per cent and 3.6 per cent, respectively.

**Analysis**

Between 2000 and 2018 there was a general increase in the growth of Auckland’s knowledge intensive industries as well as in the total employment market. Some negative growth occurred in both knowledge intensive industries and the total employment market around 2009 and 2010. Growth figures recovered following this period. However, these figures have not matched the 2004 peak of over 5 per cent and over 4 per cent in the knowledge intensive industries and the total employment market, respectively.

**Trend**

From 2001 to 2018 no significant change.
**Outcome**

**Opportunity and Prosperity**

**Measure 4**

**Zoned industrial land (Development Strategy)**

Zoned industrial land by local board (hectare)

---

**Data**

Hectares of zoned industrial land.

**Source**

Auckland Council.

**Frequency**

Annual.

**Availability**

The area of zoned industrial land is calculated in geospatial software, using zoning data from the Auckland Unitary Plan, as at 2017, by Research and Evaluation Unit (REMU) at Auckland Council. Detailed data at sub-regional level is available on request from the Research and Evaluation Unit (REMU) at Auckland Council.

**Note**

Business zoned land under the Auckland Unitary Plan are zones that are classified as being in either the Light Industry or Heavy Industry zones.

**Relevance**

This is a high-level strategic measure directly related to the Development Strategy (DS) required to track zoned land for light and heavy industry. The DS identifies the need for up to 1,400 hectares of business land (mainly industrial) in the future urban areas, and the retention of existing business land. This will require monitoring as locations of industrial land may shift as they compete with other uses for well-located land.

**Baseline (2018)**

6,396 hectares.

**Analysis**

Measure 4 demonstrates the amount of zoned industrial land in Auckland.

**Trend**

From 2017 to 2018 no significant change.
Opportunity and Prosperity

Measure 5
Level of unemployment

Unemployment rate for selected age, ethnicity and gender (%)

Data
Unemployment levels and rates by location, ethnicity, age group – also gender.

Source

Frequency
Quarterly.

Availability

Note
Employment here is the number of individuals in paid employment (including self-employed and working proprietors and part-timers). Unemployed excludes people whose only job search method was to look at job advertisements in newspapers or online. All data is subject to sampling errors, which can be prohibitive for small sub-samples. Quarterly data is seasonal, so annual averages are recommended.

Relevance
Employment generates wealth for society and income for the individual, so unemployment diminishes these benefits. Unemployed people (especially youth) who are also not in education or training are particularly at risk of becoming socially excluded – individuals with income below the poverty-line and lacking the skills to improve their economic situation.

Baseline (2018)
In June 2018:
9 per cent of 20-24 year olds were unemployed.
8.4 per cent of Maori were unemployed.
8.3 per cent of Pacific people were unemployed.
4.9 per cent of females were unemployed.
(4.3% total level of unemployment)

Analysis
Between 1998 and 2018 unemployment rates for 20-24 year olds, Maori, Pacific Peoples and females fluctuated. For all groups, unemployment rates peaked around 1998 and again between 2010 and 2013. Since the last peak in 2013, unemployment rates have decreased for all groups.

Trend
From 2010 to 2018 decreasing positive trend.
Outcome

Opportunity and Prosperity

Measure 6
Internet usage based on income

Proportion of respondents under 65 years of age by internet user status by household income bracket (%)

Data
Proportion of respondents under 65 years old to the World Internet Project New Zealand survey of internet usage who gave their household income information, by categories of internet user status and household income brackets.

Source
Auckland University of Technology (AUT), World Internet Project New Zealand (WIPNZ) survey of internet users 2017.

Frequency
The WIPNZ survey is undertaken every 2 years.

Availability
Report of the 2017 survey results for New Zealand is published by AUT in late May 2018. Data and analysis of the results for Auckland are available on request from RIMU.

Note
The WIPNZ survey begins with asking respondents (at the age of 16 or above) whether they are currently using the internet or have used internet in the last three months. Based on answers to a series of questions in regards to internet usage (e.g. frequency of using different devices, type of internet connection at home, abilities in using the internet and frequencies of engaging in a range of online activities), respondents have been grouped into five sub-groups of internet user status:
- never-users (those who have never used the internet);
- ex-users (those who have used the internet in the past but are not current users);
- low-level users (those who use the internet but at a relatively low level);
- first generation users (internet users who tend to connect through traditional devices);
- next generation users (internet users who are highly connected, using multiple, and more mobile devices to go online).

Relevance
Indication of how lower incomes may affect the level of internet usage among Aucklanders. A higher proportion of never-users or low level users among those at the lower income brackets could suggest that those who are socio-economically disadvantaged may also be more likely to be digitally-disadvantaged, which constrains their access to information, education and employment opportunities available online. Data on those aged 65 or above have been excluded as 65 is the retirement age, so the incomes of people in this age group tend to be significantly below those who are under 65.

Baseline (2017)
The 2017 data is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>$35,000 or less</th>
<th>$35,001 to $50,000</th>
<th>$50,001 to $70,000</th>
<th>$70,001 to $100,000</th>
<th>$100,000 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Users</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-users</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
For respondents under 65 years of age who gave their income information, 4.9 per cent of the up to $35,000 household income bracket indicated that they are non-users. This is higher compared to those across all other income brackets.

Trend
Insufficient data to determine trend at the time of reporting.
Opportunity and Prosperity

Measure 7

Educational achievement of young people

Percentage of those aged 20-24 with a Level 4 qualification or above (%)

Data
Proportion of young people aged 20-24 with a qualification registered on the New Zealand Qualifications Framework (NZQF) at Level 4 or above.

Source
Stats NZ Household and Labour Force Survey (HILFS).

Frequency
Annual.

Availability
Available by custom order from Stats NZ.

Note
Annual data is obtained by averaging quarterly data across four quarters.

Relevance
Higher-level qualifications, including vocational education and training at NZQF levels 4, and bachelor’s level and above, have the greatest benefits for students. People with higher qualifications tend to have better economic and social outcomes and higher life satisfaction than those with low qualifications. In particular, individuals with higher level qualifications are more likely to be employed and generally have higher incomes.

National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) is the national qualification system for New Zealand’s senior secondary school students and NCEA sits within the larger New Zealand Qualifications Framework (NZQF). A secondary student with qualifications at NCEA Level 1, 2 or 3 has achieved Levels 1, 2 and 3 of the NZQF respectively.

Levels 4 and above are usually studied after finishing secondary school. Measuring the NZQF Level 4 and above achievement of young people aged 20 to 24 gauges levels of achievement in both vocational, training and tertiary education. This provides insight into how well young people are prepared with the skills required to access employment. As well, this is an indication of how well the education system is assisting young Aucklanders to develop the skills and qualifications to support Auckland’s workforce and economic growth.

Baseline (2018)
In 2018, 39 percent of Aucklanders aged between 20 and 24 had a NZQF qualification at Level 4 or above.

Analysis
The percentage of those aged 20-24 with a Level 4 qualification or above decreased slightly between 2014 and 2018.

Trend
From 2014 to 2018 decreasing negative trend.
Converting Road Reserve, Unformed Legal Roads and Pedestrian Accessways to Open Space (Covering report)

File No.: CP2019/11976

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To identify options for using road reserve and unformed legal roads (paper roads) as open space and to highlight some of the potential issues that could be involved.
2. To recommend the most appropriate mechanism(s) for investigating potential conversions of road reserve and unformed legal road to open space.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This is a late covering report for the above item. The comprehensive agenda report was not available when the agenda went to print and will be provided prior to the 02 July 2019 Planning Committee meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
The recommendations will be provided in the comprehensive agenda report.
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To consider a private plan change request to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) from Homes Land Community (HLC) 2017 Limited to change the zone on 1367 square metres of land in Cadness Street, Northcote, from Open Space – Informal Recreation zone and public road to Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. HLC 2017 Limited has made a private plan change request (plan change) to change the zone on 1367 square metres of land in Cadness Street, Northcote from Open Space – Informal Recreation zone and public road to Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone. Refer to Attachment A (private plan change request).

3. The plan change will reflect land exchanges and acquisitions that have been agreed, to enable the development of a block of new housing as part of HLC’s ongoing Northcote redevelopment, and the reconfiguration and enlargement of Cadness Loop Reserve.

4. The plan change is signalled in the HLC development masterplan for the area and also the reference design plan for the Awataha Greenway, to which a reconfigured Cadness Loop Reserve will directly connect. HLC have already obtained superlot resource consents for new housing blocks to the north and east of the existing Cadness Loop Reserve. This proposed plan change will enable superlot consents to be sought for new housing to front the enlarged reserve on the south side.

5. The plan change requested does not however include the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zoned land immediately to the north adjacent to the land sought for a change of zone, where the enlarged reserve will occupy. It is proposed therefore to modify the plan change request to include the change of zone across this land from Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone and public road to Open Space – Informal Recreation zone.

6. The council is required to make a decision under clause 25 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act) to either adopt the request as a council plan change, accept the plan change for processing, reject it, or require it to be subject to resource consent processes.

7. The council decision at this stage is largely a process one and does not involve a full evaluation of the merits of the plan change. However, part of the decision involves being satisfied that the request does not fail on grounds the Act sets out enabling its rejection: the most pertinent in this case is being ‘not contrary to sound resource management practice’.

8. An analysis has concluded that the plan change should not be rejected nor made subject to resource consent processes. It could be accepted by council as it stands. However, the recommendation is to adopt and modify the proposed plan change to include the change of zone on adjacent land to Open Space – Informal Recreation zone across a reconfigured and enlarged local reserve. This could not be achieved by accepting the plan change.

9. If the plan change is adopted, it will be prepared for notification, and then proceed to a hearing, at which point the detailed merits of the plan change will be fully evaluated.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) agree to adopt the private plan change request by Homes Land Community (HLC) 2017 Limited for changes to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) to change the zoning of an area of Open Space – Informal Recreation zone and public road to Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone pursuant to clause 25(2)(a) of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 for the following reasons:
   i) having regard to relevant case law the request does not meet the limited grounds for rejection under clause 25(4);
   ii) it is more appropriate to adopt the request rather than ‘accept’ it or treat it as a resource consent application.

b) agree to modify the private plan change request to include a change of zone of an adjacent area of Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone and public road to Open Space – Informal Recreation zone pursuant to clause 24 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 in order to include the reconfiguration of an enlarged Cadness Loop Reserve in the proposed plan change.

c) authorise the Manager Planning North, West and Islands to undertake the required notification and other statutory processes associated with processing the Cadness Loop Reserve plan change request by HLC 2017 Ltd pursuant to the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Horopaki
Context
General context

10. Cadness Loop Reserve is a local community park surrounded by roads and Housing New Zealand Corporation (HNZC) housing in Cadness Street, Northcote. The reserve area is 1756 square metres and contains a basketball half-court and a children’s playground, with the balance grassed with a small number of trees. The reserve was first formed in the 1950s as part of the new state housing area in Northcote. It is 300 metres from Northcote town centre along Cadness Street and through Cadness Reserve. The reserve is shown circled in red in the aerial map in Figure 1 below.
11. Northcote is undergoing housing and town centre redevelopment, through ongoing efforts of HLC and Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku). An area framework plan was approved in 2017 by HLC and Panuku for the general redevelopment layout of Northcote, followed by a housing development area masterplan by HLC.

12. HLC is presently undertaking the clearance of all existing buildings to the north and west of the site, as authorised under approved superlot subdivision consents. Existing HNZC housing stock remains to the south of the site as tenants are gradually relocated to facilitate future stages of the Northcote redevelopment.

13. Current development plans build on earlier concept and framework plans for the area, and a town centre plan, prepared by HNZC and the former North Shore City Council. These plans identified the importance of a new green link through the area, which became the Awataha Greenway project. The plans also indicate the opening up and connection of Cadness Loop Reserve to the greenway, in the general location of the plan change request. This reconfiguration is shown outlined in red on the greenway reference design plan at Figure 2, sourced from the Awataha Greenway Design Guide (Isthmus 2018) commissioned jointly by Panuku and HLC.
14. Panuku and HLC have sponsored the design of the Awataha Greenway, extending from the south-west end of the Northcote redevelopment area, through Greenslade Reserve and the town centre to Tonar Street. A new road will extend from the southern end of Cadness Street along the existing boundary with the two local schools to Tonar Street.

15. Cadness Loop Reserve is zoned Open Space – Informal Recreation zone in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part). The surrounding housing area is Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone. Unzoned public road immediately surrounds the reserve on all sides. The zoning pattern for the area is shown below in Figure 3, with green Open Space – Informal Recreation zone at Cadness Loop Reserve circled in red, surrounded by public road (white) and orange THAB zone.
16. The Environment and Community Committee on 11 September 2018 resolved to publicly notify, under section 15(2) of the Reserves Act 1977, the intention of the council to undertake a land exchange involving 525 square metres of Cadness Loop Reserve for 525 square metres of land at 68-82 Cadness Street, Northcote, owned by HNZC. The map below at Figure 4 shows the relevant parcels of land to be exchanged i.e. sections 5 and 7.

17. The land subject to the plan change request relates to sections 2 and 5 in Figure 4 below, shown in orange (Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone). The proposed land exchange will combine with acquisition of section 2 by HLC and section 4 by the council, along with required road stopping, to enable reconfiguration and enlargement of Cadness Loop Reserve from 1756 square metres to 3217 square metres.
18. Rezoning of sections of land to create the enlarged reserve (sections 1, 4 and 7 in Figure 4) would normally be undertaken through council-initiated rolling plan changes to take account for vested roads and reserves following subdivision. The next of these plan changes is not expected until the second half of 2020.

19. It is noted by HLC that a concurrent/future subdivision application by them will seek to realign existing roads that define the existing Cadness Loop Reserve, as shown in the current zone map from the Auckland Unitary Plan at Figure 3.

**Statutory and planning context**

20. The council is required to make a process decision under clause 25 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act) to either adopt the private plan change as a council plan change, accept it for processing, reject it, or require it to be subject to resource consent processes. Council is required to have particular regard to the evaluation report lodged with the application, setting out the purpose of, and reasons for the plan change.

21. This process decision does not involve a full evaluation of the planning merits of the provisions of the plan change (and its intended environmental outcomes). Primarily, the council must be satisfied that the plan does not fail on various grounds the Act sets out.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

22. The Act provides that council may adopt the plan change as its own. This would generally only be appropriate where wider public interest factors are at stake, or significant public benefits might accrue, and the processing costs can justifiably be borne by the council. If adopted, the request has legal effect once publicly notified.

23. This plan change request is for the rezoning of land to enable more intensive housing development, now anticipated by the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone, which is an outcome that has been supported by the council in this area over a number of years. The proposed change also recognises the land exchange agreements between the council and HNZC that will enable the housing development on the southern portion to the existing Cadness Loop Reserve, and the land acquisition that is required by HLC of public road that borders it to the south and west (sections 2 and 5 in Figure 4).

24. The plan change request does not include changes to the zoning on Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone land immediately to the north to Open Space – Informal Recreation zone, to recognise and enable the enlarged public open space of a reconfigured Cadness Loop Reserve (sections 1, 4 and 7 in Figure 4). This component has broader public interest value as part of the Northcote housing development and the Awataha Greenway project, and represents a significant addition to the amount of open space available to a growth area where there will be a substantial number of additional dwellings and residents.

25. Having regard to the significant public benefit that will result from the open space reconfiguration it is recommended that the council adopt the plan change and modify it to include sections 1, 4 and 7 in Figure 4, by changing the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone across section 4 and 7 to Open Space – Informal Recreation zone and zoning public road at section 1 to Open Space – Informal Recreation zone. Together with the land exchange and acquisition agreements that are progressing, this modification will enable the comprehensive land-use outcome sought for this part of the Northcote development masterplan, and the Awataha Greenway design plan.

26. At the other end of the spectrum is a ‘reject’ decision. The Act provides that the council may reject the plan change, in whole or in part, in reliance on one of the grounds set out in clause 25(4) of the First Schedule to the Act. An applicant is able to appeal against a ‘reject’ decision to the Environment Court.

27. The limited and specific grounds for rejection of a requested plan change under clause 25(4) are:
   a) the request or part of the request is frivolous or vexatious; or
   b) within the last two years, the substance of the request or part of the request:
      i) has been considered and given effect to, or rejected by, the local authority or the Environment Court; or
      ii) has been given effect to by regulations made under section 360A; or
   c) the request or part of the request is not in accordance with sound resource management practice; or
   d) the request or part of the request would make the policy statement or plan inconsistent with Part 5 (sustainable management); or
   e) in the case of a proposed change to a policy statement or plan, the policy statement or plan has been operative for less than two years.

Is the request frivolous or vexatious?

28. The request is not considered frivolous or vexatious. It is part of a long-term comprehensive redevelopment planning programme and area-wide plan that has involved extensive stakeholder and community engagement over many years. It has been well researched and
is supported by various technical reports prepared by experts in environmental planning. The purpose of, and reasons for, the plan change are considered by council staff to be aligned in principle with the strategic directions of the relevant planning documents.

Has the substance of the request been considered and given effect to or rejected by the council within the last two years or given effect to by regulations?

29. The Auckland Unitary Plan became substantially operative on 15 November 2016 and the request has not been considered (or given effect to or rejected) in the last two years, by the Auckland Unitary Plan Independent Hearings Panel or the council, nor given effect to by 'regulations'.

Is the request in accordance with sound resource management practice or would it make the policy statement or plan (i.e. the Auckland Unitary Plan) inconsistent with Part 5 of the RMA?

30. The key test in this case is whether the plan change is in accordance with sound resource management practice, or whether it would render the Auckland Unitary Plan inconsistent with part 5 of the Act (sustainable management).

31. The statements in the plan change application that the proposal would give effect to the regional policy statement of the Auckland Unitary Plan are accepted by staff and council’s experts and are not disputed. The change of zone will support quality, compact development in the existing urban area close to a town centre and will facilitate through land exchange the increase in size and connectedness of Cadness Loop Reserve. This would particularly be the case should the change be adopted and modified to include a reconfigured and enlarged reserve.

32. The statements in the plan change application that the proposal would give effect to the THAB zone objectives and policies in the Auckland Unitary Plan are also accepted. It will enable additional residential development to locate close to a town centre in a comprehensive and integrated manner, coordinated with the provision of public infrastructure, connections and open space. The Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone is the prevalent zone around Northcote town centre and also surrounds the plan change site, therefore it is the most appropriate zone to be applied.

33. The plan change would also promote some key ‘directions’ and ‘focus areas’ of the newly adopted Auckland Plan 2050. The Auckland Plan identifies Northcote as a development area, expected to be developed for additional housing and employment growth in the short term between the years 2018-2021.

34. Accordingly, on a coarse merits assessment, the plan change request is considered to be in accordance with sound resource management practice and consistent with part 5 of the Act.

35. The final consideration under clause 25(4) of the First Schedule to the Act is whether the request should be subject to resource consent processes. The proposal is for the rezoning of open space and also public road to an intensive residential zone that can enable comprehensive medium density development. It is part of an area-wide masterplan that establishes superlots that have been and will continue to be consented as they are brought forward in the development sequence.

36. Large, medium to long-term development schemes such as being undertaken by HLC in Northcote will occur in stages, such as this future housing block where the zone change is sought. This will be enabled and assessed by Auckland Unitary Plan provisions where each stage is subject to a resource consent application and detailed evaluation in terms of structuring elements, urban design criteria, and residential and open space amenity factors. A plan change is the appropriate process to set up this framework.
37. The conclusion therefore is that the plan change should be adopted so as to proceed to notification and a detailed assessment of its planning merits. It should also be modified to include land immediately adjacent to the north associated with an enlarged Cadness Loop Reserve (sections 1, 4 and 7 in Figure 4), in order to achieve a comprehensive zoning outcome for this location.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

38. The relevant council departments and agencies, including Auckland Transport, have reviewed the requested plan change for adequacy of information and have not identified any issues at this stage. Furthermore, staff from Panuku Development Auckland, the Auckland Design Office, Development Programme Office and the Community & Social Policy Department have been involved in the design and development of the framework plans and masterplans that have identified the location of reconfigured blocks and reserves in Northcote, including Cadness Loop Reserve. These groups are supportive of the proposed plan change.

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

39. Bearing in mind that the committee’s decision is a process one and not a detailed merits or outcomes one, it is nevertheless appropriate to note that the applicant and council’s experts have identified that the plan change could have a range of generally positive potential environmental effects. All matters would be fully evaluated in the course of processing the plan change (if it is adopted).

40. The Kaipātiki Local Board has considered the plan change request. The Chair and Deputy Chair of the Local Board have expressed their support for it. The Local Board has been informed and involved in the development of plans for the Northcote housing development at every stage since HLC initiated the development project in 2016.

41. The Kaipātiki Local Board will have the opportunity to comment on the merits of the plan change once it is notified (if it is adopted by the committee).

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

42. The applicant has been engaging with a mana whenua forum in relation to the Northcote development and the Awataha Greenway since 2017 and as part of the wider Northcote framework plan development with Panuku. The mana whenua forum involves representatives from Ngāti Whātua, Te Kawerau ā Maki, Marutūahu and Ngāti Paoa.

43. The applicant has established partnership arrangements with mana whenua across their Auckland housing programme. These have been advanced through individual relationship agreements as well as collective and individual forums that meet regularly.

44. In terms of the Awataha Greenway project, which the Cadness Loop Reserve open space proposal connects with, the applicant has engaged in co-design with mana whenua as well as local stakeholders in conjunction with Panuku. The Te Aranga Māori design principles have formed a basis to the greenway reference design. Design input of mana whenua into the HLC housing masterplan has occurred at various points in the past two years and is continuing to progress.

45. The Act’s relatively new clause 4A to the First Schedule anticipates that a draft plan change will be pre-circulated to all mana whenua groups (iwi authorities) for comment, giving adequate time to consider the plan change before it is formally notified and submissions called for. This process will be followed in consultation with the applicant.

46. It is also anticipated that if the plan change is ‘adopted’ there will be discussions with the applicant about the extent to which Te Aranga Design Principles can be incorporated into the provisions of the plan change.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
47. If the plan change is ‘adopted’ all costs of processing the plan change are normally borne by the council. In this case, given the benefits that will accrue to the applicant from a change in zoning, the council will seek to share some of the costs with the applicant.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
48. There are not considered to be any significant risks other than Environment Court costs to council in the event of a ‘reject’ decision, as identified above.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
49. If the recommendations to ‘adopt’ and to modify the plan change request are supported, council staff will work to prepare for notification. The Act provides four months for this. Following notification and submissions the matter proceeds to a hearing and a decision by independent commissioners appointed by the council’s Regulatory Committee. After resolving any appeals to the Environment Court, it will be reported back to the council for final confirmation and the setting of a ‘plan change operative’ date. The plan change if adopted will have immediate legal effect from the day it is notified.
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1.0 Private Plan Change Applicant and Property Details

Applicant: HLC (2017) Limited  
C/- Tamsyn McDonald

Address for Service: C/- Campbell Brown Planning Limited  
P O Box 147001  
Ponsonby  
AUCKLAND 1144

Attention: Mark Thode

Email: mark@campbellbrown.co.nz  
(all written correspondence via email please)

Site Location: Cadness Loop Reserve, Northcote (96 Cadness Street, Northcote)

Legal Description: Lot 393, DP 48335

Current Unitary Plan Zoning: Public Open Space – Informal Recreation  
Terraced Housing and Apartment Buildings (‘THAB’)

Unitary Plan Overlays: None

Controls: Flood Sensitive Area  
Flood Plain  
Overland Flow Paths  
Macroinvertebrate Community Index – Urban

Designations: Designations – ID 4311, Defence purposes – protection of approach and departure paths (Whenuapai Air Base), Airspace Restriction Designations, Minister of Defence

Unitary Plan Modifications: None of relevance to this request
2.0 Summary of Plan Change Request

It is proposed that the GIS mapping layer of the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part (‘AUP’) be amended to rezone existing land within the future Cadness Reserve Area to reflect the land exchange that has taken place. This results in reciprocal zoning change from the Terrace Housing and Apartments zone to Open Space – Informal Recreation zone.

It is noted that a concurrent/future subdivision application by Homes Land Community (‘HLC’) will seek/s to realign existing roads that define the existing Cadness Loop Reserve shown in figure 1 below.

3.0 Site Location

![Image of map showing site location]

Figure 1: Existing land and surrounding AUP(OP) context

4.0 Description of the Site and Surrounding Environment

4.1 The Site

The land affected by the proposed zoning change has a combined area of 525m² and is located about the existing Cadness Loop Reserve as shown in Figures 1 and 2. The
surrounding area is currently being redeveloped by HLC and Housing New Zealand Corporation as the principal land owner in the area and as part of the redevelopment of existing HNZC housing stock in the Northcote area.

The existing Cadness Loop Reserve is bounded on all sides by existing road reserve. This roading provides frontage to residential lots (owned by HNZC) that surround the reserve. The reserve presently contains a large grassed area, children’s playground and basketball court. The site is bounded by Onepoto Primary School to the west, with a large playing field, administrative building and walkway along the common boundary. As shown in figure 5 below, this area is subject to an overland flow path as a result of a depression in the land between the subject site and school. All existing vegetation along the western boundary is located within the subject site.

![Figure 2: Sites and surrounding area](image)

HLC are presently undertaking the clearance of all existing buildings to the north and west of the site, as-authorised under the approved superlot subdivision consents (discussed in section 4.2 below). As such the existing environment in these locations consists of stabilised earthworks areas generally devoid of buildings and vegetation. Existing HNZC housing stock remains to the south of the site as tenants are gradually relocated to facilitate future stages of the Northcote Redevelopment.
Certificates of Title for the site (as it currently exists) and the drainage reserve are attached at Appendix A.

## 4.2 Surrounding Environment

The affected land is located in the south-eastern extent of the Northcote Redevelopment Area, within the southern portion of a block contained by Lake Road, Tonar Avenue and Fraser Avenue. The site is within 500m of the Northcote Town Centre to the southwest, which contains a supermarket, healthcare, service amenities, entertainment, and access to public transport. The site is also 1.2km from the Northcote on/offramp to State Highway One (SH1), making it well-connected to local public transport and in close proximity to the wider highway network. It is anticipated that Lake Road will accommodate the planned Northcote Safe Cycle Network\(^1\) (Auckland Transport) and potentially a dedicated bus lane, as part of the wider development planning for the Northcote area being undertaken by Panuku Development. There are several non-residential activities taking place on the opposite side of Lake Road, contained within adapted residential dwellings.

![Figure 3: HLC development Master Plan](image)

While not shown on existing GIS mapping, a number of resource consents have recently been approved to subdivide surrounding land to the north and east of the site. These subdivisions create new road layouts and facilitate superlot subdivision, the installation of upgraded public infrastructure, and the clearance of existing buildings and vegetation through bulk earthworks. These are shown in figure 3 above for their location relative to the reserve.

• Stage 2B superlot subdivision (BUN60323398) approved 2 November 2018. To carry out land preparatory works including earthworks and installation of infrastructure (new roads and servicing upgrades), and a two-stage subdivision to create the NC-32 and NC-33 superlots. Refer Appendix M for a copy of the approved subdivision scheme and streetscape plans.

• Stage 3B superlot subdivision (BUN60330591) approved on 22 February 2019. To carry out land preparatory works including earthworks and installation of infrastructure (new roads and servicing upgrades), and a two-stage subdivision to create the NC-29A, NC-29B, and NC-28 superlots. Refer Appendix N for a copy of the approved subdivision scheme and streetscape plans.

The Stage 3B development as-described above, effectively creates the road network bordering the northern extent of the proposed reserve, extending north past the NC-29B superlot as shown in Figure 3. Future roads to the west and south of NC-30 will be established through future subdivision.

4.3 Zoning and Overlays

The land is currently zoned Terrace Housing and Apartments, Open Space – Informal Recreation, with an element of un-zoned road as shown in figure 1.

![Figure 4: Existing AUP zoning of the site and surrounding area](image)

The land is located within a flood sensitive area, as a result of overland flow paths and a flood plain located in the depression running north to south along the wester extent of the site. Extensive stormwater modelling undertaken through the Northcote...
Stormwater Management Plan prepared by HLC, will reduce the extent of flooding otherwise shown in the [existing] GIS image above.

The land is also subject to a High-Use Aquifer Management Areas Overlay and a designation imposing airspace height restrictions in respect of Whenuapai Airbase. Neither of these impose any material restrictions on the use or zoning of the land.

5.0 Background

5.1 Northcote Greenway and Master Plan

HLC are taking a comprehensive approach to the overall redevelopment of the Northcote area. This has been guided by an overarching masterplan to ensure that the delivery of housing through the various stages of redevelopment, are aligned with other necessary upgrades (i.e. main trunk sewer upgrades, stormwater upgrades). There is no statutory requirement to masterplan the redevelopment area, and HLC has not sought to undertake a plan change due the Unitary Plan process resulting in an up-zoning of the area to THAB, as well as extensive and overlapping redevelopment being undertaken by Panuku Development Auckland for the Northcote Town Centre, Healthy Waters and Watercare. Area-wide master planning in coordination with Council and its CCO’s has therefore achieved a coordinated and strategic approach to Northcote’s redevelopment. This has also resulted in the identification of the need for new roads to service the redevelopment, and the significant opportunities available as a result of existing flooding/overland flow areas within the wider catchment.

Of particular relevance to this Plan Change request is the connection the land exchange reserve plays in the overall future-planned Awataha Greenway (the northern extent of which was consented under stage 2C). The Greenway will also partly function as a bio-retention device for the significant stormwater flows present within the catchment (shown in figure 4 above).

The Greenway would extend from the southwestern corner of the redevelopment area at Jesse Tonar Scout Reserve through to Greenslade Reserve and the Northcote Town centre. As part of the wider masterplan, a new road would extend from the southern end of Cadness Street, north along the boundary of Northcote Intermediate and Onepoto Primary Schools, before meeting Fraser Avenue and connecting to Tonar Street and the existing access to sports fields at Hato Petera College. The Greenway will then extend north west into the approved stage 2C development area (BUN60313122), before connecting to Lak Road.

The overall Greenway layout is demonstrated in the ‘Awataha Greenway Reference Plan’ (figure 10) below, with the proposed reserve identified in blue.
5.2 Cadness Reserve Land Exchange

On 11 September 2018, the Environment and Community Committee resolved that Auckland Council publicly notify, under section 15(2) of the Reserves Act 1977, the intention to undertake a land exchange between 525m² of Cadness Loop Reserve and 525m² of land at 68-74 and 76-82 Cadness Street, Northcote.

Housing New Zealand Corporation (of which HLC are a subsidiary) are redeveloping this area and the proposed land exchange along with a land acquisition and road stopping will reconfigure and enlarge Cadness Loop Reserve.

The intended land exchange will go towards:

- increasing the size of the reserve from approximately 1,756m² to 3,215m²;
- providing increased recreational opportunities for the community;

As shown in figure 5 below, Cadness Loop Reserve currently comprises sections 5 and 6 with an area of 1,756m² (orange shading). The land exchange scheme plans and consultation document are attached in Appendix L.
The intended land exchange will swap section 5 for section 7, which is represented in figure 6. The proposed reconfigured and expanded reserve is shaded in green – there would be an increase in reserve area from 1,756m² to 3,215m².

The land exchange would therefore necessitate the following zoning changes to enable use of that land for the intended purpose (reserve and residential land) as follows:

- Section 4 and 7 changes from THAB to Open Space - Informal Recreation;
- Section 2 changes from legal road to THAB;
- Section 1 changes from legal road to Open Space – informal recreation.
Sections 1 and 2 are part of existing road that are going through an approved road stopping process (refer item 8.5(iv)(a) under Appendix H). Section 2 will be acquired by HLC through that process.

Council has previously advised (refer Appendix O) that the rezoning of Sections 1, 4 and 7 will be undertaken through rolling Unitary Plan updates to account for vested road and reserve following subdivision processes about the Auckland Region. As such, while the implications of the land exchange are relevant to the wider consideration of proposed zoning change, they are outside the scope of this Plan Change Request as it relates to the land under the ownership of HLC following the land exchange.

It is intended to rezone existing ‘stopped’ road (section 2) through this process as-advised by Council, so that further plan change processes are not required after the future subdivision of the subject land. As noted above, that section of road will be acquired by HLC. Section 3 (the large balance area that will contain the HNZC N30 development and a new road to the south as shown in figure 3 above), retains its existing THAB zoning until a superlot subdivision is applied for and approved to facilitate the N30 development.

Survey plans for the affected land are attached in Appendix D.

6.0 Private Plan Change Request

6.1 Introduction

Homes Land Community (the ‘applicant’) makes this request, seeking a private plan change to the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part.

The private plan change is referred to as ‘Proposed Plan Change 24 (Private): Cadness Loop Reserve (PC24)’.

6.2 Requirements of the Act

Part 2 of Schedule 1 to the RMA sets out the procedure to be followed when making a request to change a Plan. Key elements of the process, in the context of this proposal, are noted below:

- Any person may request a change to the AUP\(^2\);
- The request shall be in writing to the Council\(^3\);

\(^2\) Clause 21(1), Schedule 1, RMA
\(^3\) Clause 22(1), Schedule 1, RMA
- The request shall explain the purpose of the proposed plan change and the reasons for the change⁴;
- The request shall include an evaluation report prepared in accordance with s32 RMA⁵;
- The request shall include a description of the environmental effects anticipated from implementation of the plan change⁶;
- The Council can require the applicant to provide further information⁷;
- The Council shall either adopt the request, accept the request, deal with the request as if it were an application for resource consent, or reject the request⁸;
- Notification of the Plan Change will occur if the Council decides to adopt or accept the request, and any submissions will be considered by the Council at a hearing;
- The Council may decline the plan change, approve it, or approve it with modifications⁹.

An important part of the plan change process is the s32 RMA requirement to undertake an evaluation of the costs and benefits of alternatives. The most relevant parts of s32 in terms of process are set out in clauses (1) - (3), which state as follows:

**32 Requirements for preparing and publishing evaluation reports**

(1) An evaluation report required under this Act must—

(a) examine the extent to which the objectives of the proposal being evaluated are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of this Act; and

(b) examine whether the provisions in the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives by—

(i) identifying other reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives; and

(ii) assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the objectives; and

(iii) summarising the reasons for deciding on the provisions; and

---

⁴ Clause 22(1), Schedule 1, RMA
⁵ Clause 22(1), Schedule 1, RMA
⁶ Clause 22(2), Schedule 1, RMA
⁷ Clause 23, Schedule 1, RMA
⁸ Clause 25, Schedule 1, RMA
⁹ Clause 29(4), Schedule 1, RMA
(c) contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.

(2) An assessment under subsection (1)(b)(ii) must—

(a) identify and assess the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions, including the opportunities for—

(i) economic growth that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and

(ii) employment that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and

(b) if practicable, quantify the benefits and costs referred to in paragraph (a); and

(c) assess the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions.

(3) If the proposal (an amending proposal) will amend a standard, statement, national planning standard, regulation, plan, or change that is already proposed or that already exists (an existing proposal), the examination under subsection (1)(b) must relate to—

(a) the provisions and objectives of the amending proposal; and

(b) the objectives of the existing proposal to the extent that those objectives—

(i) are relevant to the objectives of the amending proposal; and

(ii) would remain if the amending proposal were to take effect.

PC24 is simple in its form, as it seeks only to change the zones of the land from one established AUP zone to another. The change relates only to the GIS map layer of the AUP and no changes are proposed to the objectives, policies, rules or other written provisions of the AUP.

In this context the ‘proposal’ means the nature of the change, being to re-identify the land in question. The ‘objectives’ of the proposal refers to its purpose, which is to enable and facilitate the use of the land exchanged to HLC for future Terrace Housing and Apartment zone development. The ‘provisions’ are the re-identification of the land to the respective proposed zonings.
Based on this explanation of the PC24 proposal and its objectives, s32 requires the following assessment:

- Whether the use of the land for Open Space and THAB is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA;
- Whether PC24 is the most appropriate means to provide for a Open Space and THAB zones in this location, considering other possible options and questions of efficiency and effectiveness;
- Evaluation of the costs and benefits of the effects anticipated from the implementation of PC24, including the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions;
- Quantification of benefits and costs (if practicable); and
- Assessment of the risks associated with proceeding or not proceeding with PC24.

The s32 evaluation relating to PC24 is contained in section 7.0 of this report.

6.3 Nature and Purpose of PC24

PC24 relates only to the planning maps contained in the Auckland Council’s GIS viewer. There are no changes proposed to the text of the AUP.

As discussed in section 5.2 above, the proposed changes to the planning maps are as follows:

- Section 2 changes from legal road to THAB;
- Section 5 changes from Open Space – Informal Recreation to Terrace Housing and Apartment zone.
- Any consequential amendments to the planning maps to appropriately reconcile the zoning with the boundaries of the applicant’s land.
6.4 PC24 Conclusion

Based on the evaluation contained in section 7.0 of this report, it is considered that PC24 is the most appropriate means to achieve the purpose of the RMA, and to realise the intended outcomes of both the land exchange agreement between Council and HLC, as well as the future subdivision of the land in question. It would be the best available option to enable and facilitate the use of the land for residential purposes, with a zoning consistent with the dominant surrounding Terrace Housing and Apartment zone.

Campbell Brown
7.0 Section 32 Evaluation

7.1 Scope and Purpose

This s32 evaluation report is prepared to fulfill the statutory requirements of s32 RMA in respect of PC24.

PC24 seeks to amend the AUP planning maps contained within the Council’s GIS mapping layer, so that the land under the ownership of HLC/HNZC following the land exchange with Auckland Council, is re-identified from Road and open space – Informal recreation Zone, to Terrace housing and Apartment zone. PC24 seeks to enable and facilitate the use of the land for residential housing delivery as part of the wider redevelopment of the Northcote area being led by HLC at a master planning level, and HNZC as the governments social housing provider.

Section 32 RMA requires that before adopting any objective, policy, rule or other method, regard shall be had to the extent to which each objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, and whether the policies and rules or other methods are the most appropriate way of achieving the objectives. A report must be prepared summarising the evaluation and giving reasons for the evaluation.

In accordance with s32(6) RMA and for the purposes of this report:

- the ‘proposal’ means PC24;
- the ‘objectives’ means the purpose of the proposal/PC24; and
- the ‘provisions’ means the change to the zone of the land that implements, or gives effect to the objectives of the proposal.

The AUP uses the technique of zoning for achieving the purpose of the RMA, and contains a number of established zones to apply to land. PC24 seeks to use one of these existing zones (Terrace Housing and Apartment Zone). This evaluation report on PC24 relates solely to the change of zone proposed for the land, and sits within the existing policy framework of the AUP which will remain unchanged.

This s32 evaluation will continue to be refined in relation to any consultation that occurs, and in relation to any new information or changes that may arise, including through submissions and during any hearing that may be required. This approach of further evaluation is anticipated under the requirements of s32AA RMA.

7.2 Development of Options

In addition to consideration of the extent to which the objectives of PC24 are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, s32 requires an examination of
whether the provisions in PC24 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the proposed plan change by identifying other reasonably practical options for achieving the objective. In the preparation of PC24, the following options have been identified:

- **Option 1** – Do nothing/retain the status quo
- **Option 2** – Only rezone Reserve land (i.e. exclude Section 2 road)
- **Option 3** – Rezone acquired land to Terrace Housing and Apartments

A further option was briefly considered, to apply an alternative Residential zoning under the AUP. However, this was considered to be a *fanciful* alternative where the predominant zoning surrounding the land in question is Terrace Housing and Apartments. Any alternative residential zoning would restrict and limit a comprehensive approach to achieving the THAB zone outcomes, and create a pocket of lesser-intensity residential zoning incompatible with the amenity values and higher-density outcomes enabled by the THAB zone.

### 7.3 Evaluation of Options

In accordance with s32(1)(b) and 32(2) of the RMA, the options have been assessed on their appropriateness, efficiency, effectiveness, costs, benefits and risks. The results of this evaluation are discussed in this section and summarised in table form in Appendix C. There are no realistic non-regulatory methods that could deliver the outcome sought by PC24.

**Option 1 – Adopt a ‘do nothing’ approach/retain the status quo**

This option would retain the existing situation, consisting of legal road reserve and Open Space – Informal Recreation zoning in respect of the land exchanged to HLC.

This option implies delaying any proposed changes to the existing Unitary Plan (“AUP”) zonings, until a subdivision application has been approved (or at least lodged) to formalise the intended road and reserve layout of the land exchange and Northcote Master Plan.

**Option 2 – Only rezone Reserve land (i.e. exclude Section 2 road)**

This option would delay the rezoning of the road (section 2), until future subdivision in accordance with the Northcote Master Plan and land exchange, establishes new roads and the Cadness Reserve layout.
Following subdivision and road closure, the zoning of Section 2 would revert to the adjacent zonings (which are sought to be THAB) as a result of the AUP(OP) infrastructure standard E26.2.3.2(4).

**Option 3 – Rezone acquired land to Terrace Housing and Apartments (preferred option)**

This option would rezone the land exchanged to HLC, from the existing legal road and Open Space zone, to the proposed Terrace Housing and Apartment zone (Sections 2 and 5 of the land exchange).

This will enable future subdivision and associated land use development to take place without the need for a further Plan Change to eliminate zoning disparities on the N30 superlot to be established in accordance with the Northcote Master plan.

### 7.4 Risk of Acting or Not Acting

Section 32(2)(c) RMA requires this evaluation to assess the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions. It is considered that there is sufficient information about the proposed replacement zone to proceed with PC24. The change from Open Space – Informal Recreation to Terrace Housing and Apartment zone is neither unclear or uncertain in the context of the underlying land exchange. This s32 evaluation will continue to be refined in relation to any new information that may arise following notification, including during any required hearings.

### 7.5 Reasons for the Preferred Option

The objective of the proposal which is to enable and facilitate the use of the land exchanged to HLC and HNZC for future Terrace Housing and Apartment zone development.

Retention of the existing stopped road and the Open Space - Informal Recreation zone would not achieve this outcome, and there is no benefit is delaying the plan change request until subdivision in accordance with the land exchange agreement. These options do not address the identified issue associated with the Land Exchange, being the incompatible zoning for future residential development of the land acquired by HLC and HNZC. A further plan change process would be required to alter the (stopped) road reserve were it not included at this time. While the Unitary Plan makes provisions for this situation under Unitary Plan standard E26.2.3.1(4), it is efficient to address this zoning disparity now as the use of the land (Section 2) is certain, and formally ‘stopped’ as legal road.
As a result of the land exchange between the Council and HLC/HNZC, the future development layout of the remaining Open Space zone land (as it currently exists) has legally been agreed to so as to facilitate an increase in the overall size and usability of the Cadness Reserve. The proposed zoning will therefore not result in a loss, but rather an increase, in the land available for informal recreation purposes as well as a large reserve area which will enable a greater range of recreation activities to take place. This is integral to the overall master planned-approach to the Northcote redevelopment, and will ensure a vital aspect of the Awataha Greenway is provided for to support the ongoing redevelopment and intensification that is planned within wider Northcote area.

The scale of residential development that would be enabled is commensurate with the surrounding residential area. The dominant zoning within Northcote is Terrace Housing and Apartments (‘THAB’), which is the zoning that surrounds the land in question (with the exception of the existing Reserve). This zone is within walking distance of the existing Northcote town centre and existing public transport options to support the higher intensity of residential development anticipated. In this respect, THAB is the appropriate zoning for the land.

Rezoning of the exchanged land and stopped road, will enable HLC/HNZC to progress redevelopment to the south of the future Cadness Reserve in a comprehensive manner and with a zoning that is appropriate and consistent with the surrounding residential environment. Inclusion of the stopped road in this process at this time, will avoid any potential future split zoning complications that might arise where differing zones are applied to the centreline of the road under AUP standard E26.2.3.1(4). It is noted that the THAB zone description notes that the zone is intended to make efficient use of land, and to ensure that residents have convenient access to public open space (amongst other matters). The proposed zoning will give effect to this intention and provide greater-opportunity for passive surveillance and activation of the reserve interface with the THAB zone as noted within the Urban Design report (Appendix B).

Built development that could occur on the exchanged land would be consistent with the adjacent and immediately-surrounding Terrace Housing and Apartment zone. Alternative residential AUPzonings would not be consistent with the overall Northcote zoning context, and would result in lower development densities that might otherwise constrain the efficient use of land by HNZC for future social housing development. It is noted that all new development within the Terrace Housing and Apartment zone requires resource consent to ensure, amongst other matters that the design response is appropriate.

The evaluation of options undertaken in this report demonstrates that the preferred option for meeting the objectives of PC24 is a plan change to the AUP to rezone the site to Terrace Housing and Apartment zone. In accordance with section 32(1)(a), the
objectives of the proposal are considered to be the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

Application of the Terrace Housing and Apartment zone to the land, is therefore the most efficient and effective means of achieving the objectives of the proposal.

8.0 Resource Management Framework

8.1 Part 2 of the RMA

The purpose of the RMA is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, as defined in section 5(2) of the Act. Part 2 matters relevant to PC24 include:

- enabling people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being (s5(2));
- avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment (s5(2)(c));
- the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources (s7(b)); and
- the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values (s7(c)).

Section 6 requires authorities to recognise and provide for a number of matters of national importance in exercising powers and functions under the RMA. The majority of the stated matters of national importance are not relevant to the application. The site is not located on the coast and the proposed residential development would have no impact on an outstanding natural feature, indigenous vegetation, Maori values, or historic heritage. Any known natural hazards can be suitable addressed through the existing AUP Policy framework.

The plan change would sit comfortably with the ‘other matters’ contained in section 7. The proposal would maintain existing amenity values of neighbouring properties and enhance amenity values of future occupants, while enabling the efficient use of the physical resources of the site. Likewise, the proposal would not offend any section 8 requirements, this being that those exercising powers or functions under the RMA to take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.

PC24 is considered to be aligned with Part 2 of the RMA as it seeks to provide for the social and economic well-being of the community in a way that mitigates adverse effects, maintains amenity values; and uses land efficiently to enable comprehensive development.
8.2 Other Relevant Sections of the RMA

Section 31(1)(a) of the RMA states that a function of the Council is “the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district”. It is considered that PC24 assists the Council to carry out its functions as set out in section 31.

Section 31(1)(aa) is of particular relevance to PC24 in that it states that a function of territorial authorities is also “the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to ensure that there is sufficient development capacity in respect of housing and business land to meet the expected demands of the district”. PC24 assists in fulfilling this function as it provides for additional residential land to meet the demands of the surrounding community, and in particular New Zealand’s public social housing provider.

Section 75(3) of the RMA sets out the matters to be given effect to by a district plan:

- any national policy statement;
- any New Zealand coastal policy statement;
- a national planning standard; and
- any regional policy statement

It is also noted that a territorial authority must not have regard to trade competition or the effects of trade competition in preparing or changing its district plan (s74(3)).

It is proposed that PC24 would have legal effect only once a decision on submissions is made, as is the default position under section 86B(1).

8.3 National Policy Statements

National policy statements (‘NPS’) are instruments issued under section 52(2) of the RMA and state objectives and policies for matters of national significance. There are currently five national policy statements in place:

- National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity
- National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management
- National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation
- National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission
- New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement
The only NPS of relevance to PC24 is the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (‘NPS-UDC’). The NPS-UDC sets out the objectives and policies for providing development capacity under the RMA, and recognises the national significance of well-functioning urban environments. Particular focus is on ensuring that local authorities, through their planning, enable urban environments to grow and change in response to the changing needs of existing communities and future generations, and provide sufficient development capacity for residential and business growth.

PC24 accords with many of the objectives and policies of the NPS-UDC, as it seeks to provide further capacity for urban growth, by rezoning exchanged land to Terrace Housing and Apartments zone. As previously noted, this will enable an efficient use of land along the southern boundary of the future Cadness Reserve. Additional land will enable HNZC to be efficient in their site planning and development of the land, which is intended to deliver much needed housing supply to greater Auckland. Due to the land being located adjacent to the reserve, greater opportunity will be available to provide residential dwellings with a favourable northerly aspect that benefit from solar access and overlooking of the Cadness Reserve.

An emphasis of the NPS-UDC is on the need for councils to be responsive to changes that occur in urban environments as a result of growth. Particular objectives and policies that support, or are relevant to, PC24 are noted below:

**OA2:** *Urban environments that have sufficient opportunities for the development of housing and business land to meet demand, and which provide choices that will meet the needs of people and communities and future generations for a range of dwelling types and locations, working environments and places to locate businesses.*

**OA3:** *Urban environments that, over time, develop and change in response to the changing needs of people and communities and future generations.*

**OC2:** *Local authorities adapt and respond to evidence about urban development, market activity and the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of people and communities and future generations, in a timely way.*
OD1: Urban environments where land use, development, development infrastructure and other infrastructure are integrated with each other.

PA3: When making planning decisions that affect the way and the rate at which development capacity is provided, decision-makers shall provide for the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of people and communities and future generations, whilst having particular regard to:
   a) Providing for choices that will meet the needs of people and communities and future generations for a range of dwelling types and locations, working environments and places to locate businesses;
   b) Promoting the efficient use of urban land and development infrastructure and other infrastructure; and
   c) Limiting as much as possible adverse impacts on the competitive operation of land and development markets.

PA4: When considering the effects of urban development, decision-makers shall take into account:
   a) The benefits that urban development will provide with respect to the ability for people and communities and future generations to provide for their social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing; and
   b) The benefits and costs of urban development at a national, inter-regional, regional and district scale, as well as the local effects.

8.4 National Environmental Standards

National environmental standards (NES) are regulations that prescribe standards for environmental matters. There are currently six NES in force as regulations, but none of these are relevant to the proposal to change the zoning of the site, and would be taken into consideration (where relevant) when resource consents are applied for to physically develop the land.

8.5 National Planning Standards

The purpose of the National Planning Standards is to improve consistency in plan and policy statement structure, format and content so they are easier to prepare, understand, compare and comply with. The Standards also support implementation of national policy statements and help people observe the procedural principles of the
RMA. National Planning Standards must be given effect to by district plans, in accordance with s75(3) RMA.

The first set of draft Standards were publicly notified for submissions in June 2018, and were reviewed and refined in response to the submissions received. They were approved and gazetted in April 2019, and came into force on 3 May 2019.

The Ministry for the Environment has specified timeframes in which local and unitary authorities are to give effect to the planning standards, based upon various considerations that include the age the current plans. In the case of the Auckland Unitary Plan, there is a 7+ year timeframe in which the AUP(OP) will need to be amended to reflect the planning standards and ‘plan templates. It is understood that this timeframe is the result of the relatively ‘fresh’ nature of the Unitary Plan. Due to this time period, it is not anticipated that the planning standards will have any substantive effect on, or undermine, the zoning sought under this private plan change request. ‘High Intensity Residential’ is a standardised zoning that has been identified within the standards, and this zone directly aligns with the Terrace Housing and Apartment zone.

For these reasons, it is considered that the Standards will have no effect on the development of PC24 at the current time.

8.6 Other Legislation

There is no other legislation that is of direct relevance to PC24. It is noted that the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 does not apply to the site as it falls outside the catchment for the Hauraki Gulf (as identified in Schedule 3 of that Act).

8.7 The Auckland Plan

The Auckland Plan 2050 is a long-term spatial plan for Auckland for the next 30 years.

The development strategy contained in the Auckland Plan addresses the supply of business land and supporting infrastructure. Growth is to be managed to build strong urban centres and neighbourhoods. The Auckland Plan notes that centres are at the heart of neighbourhoods and are focal points for the surrounding community. Centres are supported by a surrounding (typically residential) area that is within easy walking distance, usually thought of as 10 minutes. The dominant THAB zoning within Northcote, supports the established Northcote Town Centre that contains the full-spectrum of residential support services and activities necessary to maintain a vibrant local centre. The proposal seeks to establish this zoning, and is therefore wholly-consistent with the anticipated outcomes of the Auckland Plan.
This is supported by the ‘Homes and Places’ Direction 1, which seeks to develop a quality compact urban form to accommodate Auckland’s growth, and the ‘Transport and Access’ Direction 1 to better connect people, places, goods and services. This strategy recognises the importance of intensification near centres, and therefore, the higher-intensity zoning sought is consistent with this direction.

8.8 The Auckland Unitary Plan – Regional Policy Statement

When preparing or changing a district plan, Council must give effect to any Regional Policy Statement (‘RPS’). The RPS seeks to achieve the purpose of the RMA by providing an overview of the resource management issues for the region, and establishing policies and methods to achieve integrated management of the region’s natural and physical resources.

The RPS contains a number of higher order objectives and policies that are relevant to the assignment of zoning to land. Those of most relevance in this respect are set out below:

B2.2. Urban growth and form

B2.2.1. Objectives

(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;
(d) improved and more effective public transport;
(e) greater social and cultural vitality;
(f) better maintenance of rural character and rural productivity; and
(g) reduced adverse environmental effects.

(2) Urban growth is primarily accommodated within the urban area 2016 (as identified in Appendix 1A).

(3) Sufficient development capacity and land supply is provided to accommodate residential, commercial, industrial growth and social facilities to support growth.

10 s75(3)(c) RMA
B2.2.2. Policies

Quality compact urban form

(4) Promote urban growth and intensification within the urban area 2016 (as identified in Appendix 1A), enable urban growth and intensification within the Rural Urban Boundary, towns, and rural and coastal towns and villages, and avoid urbanisation outside these areas.

(5) Enable higher residential intensification:
(a) in and around centres;
(b) along identified corridors; and
(c) close to public transport, social facilities (including open space) and employment opportunities.

(6) Identify a hierarchy of centres that supports a quality compact urban form:
(a) at a regional level through the city centre, metropolitan centres and town centres which function as commercial, cultural and social focal points for the region or sub-regions; and
(b) at a local level through local and neighbourhood centres that provide for a range of activities to support and serve as focal points for their local communities.

(7) Enable rezoning of land within the Rural Urban Boundary or other land zoned future urban to accommodate urban growth in ways that do all of the following:
(a) support a quality compact urban form;
(b) provide for a range of housing types and employment choices for the area;
(c) integrate with the provision of infrastructure; and
(d) follow the structure plan guidelines as set out in Appendix 1.

B2.4. Residential growth

B2.4.1. Objectives

(1) Residential intensification supports a quality compact urban form.

(2) Residential areas are attractive, healthy and safe with quality development that is in keeping with the planned built character of the area.

(3) Land within and adjacent to centres and corridors or in close proximity to public transport and social facilities (including open space) or
employment opportunities is the primary focus for residential intensification.

(4) An increase in housing capacity and the range of housing choice which meets the varied needs and lifestyles of Auckland’s diverse and growing population.

(5) Non-residential activities are provided in residential areas to support the needs of people and communities.

B2.4.2. Policies
Residential intensification

(1) Provide a range of residential zones that enable different housing types and intensity that are appropriate to the residential character of the area.

(2) Enable higher residential intensities in areas closest to centres, the public transport network, large social facilities, education facilities, tertiary education facilities, healthcare facilities and existing or proposed open space.

It is considered that PC24 would give effect to the RPS in that it:

- Provides for rezoning of land within the Rural Urban Boundary that supports a quality compact urban form, and delivers additional high-intensity residential land to support a range of employment choices within the existing Northcote Centre (B2.2.2(7));
- Enables higher residential intensification in an around centres and close to public transport and social facilities (including open space) and employment opportunities – all within the existing Northcote local centre and suburb (B2.2.2(5));
- Provides for non-residential activities to support the needs of the surrounding residential community, by being facilitated through the land exchange that will increase the size and usability of the Cadness Loop Reserve (B2.4.1(5));
- Will contribute to minimum wellbeing targets by providing additional residential land within an existing urban environment (B2.4.1(6));
- Enables higher residential intensities in an area closest to the Northcote Centre that is supported by the public transport network, education facilities, tertiary education facilities, healthcare facilities and existing and proposed open space (B2.4.2(2));
- Comprehensive and master planned development within Northcote will ensure development is adequately serviced by existing infrastructure or is provided with infrastructure prior to or at the same time as residential intensification (B2.4.2(6));
Will enable a sufficient supply and diverse range of dwelling types and sizes that meet the housing needs of people and communities – in particular housing provided by HNZC (B2.4.2(11)).

8.9 The Auckland Unitary Plan – Objectives and Policies

Terrace Housing and Apartments zone

PC24 seeks to identify the land as Terrace Housing and Apartments zone. Relevant AUP objectives and policies for this zone are:

H6.2 Objectives

1. Land adjacent to centres and near the public transport network is efficiently used to provide high-density urban living that increases housing capacity and choice and access to centres and public transport.

2. Development is in keeping with the areas planned urban built character of predominantly five, six or seven storey buildings in identified areas, in a variety of forms.

3. Development provides quality on-site residential amenity for residents and the street.

H6.3 Policies

1. Enable a variety of housing types at high densities including terrace housing and apartments and integrated residential development such as retirement villages.

2. Require the height, bulk, form and appearance of development and the provision of setbacks and landscaped areas to achieve a high-density urban built character of predominantly five, six or seven storey buildings in identified areas, in a variety of forms.

3. Encourage development to achieve attractive and safe streets and public open spaces including by:
   a) providing for passive surveillance
   b) optimising front yard landscaping
   c) minimising visual dominance of garage doors.

4. In identified locations adjacent to centres, enable greater building height through the application of the Height Variation Control where the additional development potential enabled:

Campbell Brown
a) provides an appropriate transition in building scale from the adjoining higher density business zone to neighbouring lower intensity residential zones, and;

b) supports public transport, social infrastructure and the vitality of the adjoining centre.

(5) Manage the height and bulk of development to maintain daylight access and a reasonable standard of privacy, and to minimise visual dominance effects to adjoining sites and developments.

(6) Require accommodation to be designed to meet the day to day needs of residents by:

a) providing privacy and outlook; and

b) providing access to daylight and sunlight, and providing the amenities necessary for those residents.

(7) Recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.

(8) Encourage accommodation to have useable and accessible outdoor living space.

(9) Restrict the maximum impervious area on a site in order to manage the amount of stormwater runoff generated by a development and ensure that adverse effects on water quality, quantity and amenity values are avoided or mitigated.

a) Provide for non-residential activities that:

b) support the social and economic well-being of the community;

c) are in keeping with the with the scale and intensity of development anticipated within the zone;

d) avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on residential amenity; and

e) will not detract from the vitality of the Business – City Centre Zone, Business – Metropolitan Centre Zone and Business – Town Centre Zone.

The primary focus of the adjacent residential THAB zone is the Local Centre zone in the case of Northcote. The Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone is predominantly located around metropolitan, town and local centres and the public transport network to support the highest levels of intensification. The purpose of the zone is to make efficient use of land and infrastructure, increase the capacity of housing and ensure that residents have convenient access to services, employment, education facilities, retail
and entertainment opportunities, public open space and public transport. This will promote walkable neighbourhoods and increase the vitality of centres.\textsuperscript{11}

The objectives and policies follow the direction of the RPS and reinforce the use of a hierarchy approach to intensification that is located near town and local centres. PC24 will give effect to the relevant AUP objectives and policies as:

- It will enable additional residential development to take place on land that within walking distance to a local centre (Northcote) and support services such as public transport, social services, retail and employment.

- The zoning is consistent with the dominant surrounding residential zoning (THAB) and is therefore compatible with that zoning and the residential amenity values sought through that zoning.

- It will not give rise to any adverse effects on the quality of on-site residential amenity for residents and the street, as result of future development being subject to the development standards of the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone.

- The location of the land adjacent to public Open Space, along with the northerly aspect of this interface with the reoriented reserve land, provides for passive surveillance opportunities, optimisation of front yard landscaping and access to sunlight and daylight, and direct access to open space for recreation.

- Infrastructure upgrades being delivered sequentially through the resource consent process, will ensure that future development is adequately serviced by infrastructure. The proposed additional residential land will not compromise existing or planner infrastructure within Northcote as-conform by the infrastructure memo prepared by Woods Ltd (refer Appendix G).

- The range of residential and non-residential activities anticipated and provided for within the THAB zone, will be able to be realised on the site subject to assessment through future resource consent applications. As previously noted, the addition THAB land sought will provide the opportunity for additional frontage to a public open space, which has a number of urban design and amenity benefits.

\textsuperscript{11} AUP H61. Zone description
9.0 **Environmental Effects**

A number of specialist reports have been obtained to understand the likely effects of the proposed zone change and, where relevant, to satisfy the requirements of AUP Appendix 1 – Structure Plan Guidelines. Those reports are as follows:

- A contextual Urban Design Analysis, prepared by Isthmus Ltd (Appendix B);
- A Transportation memo, prepared by FLOW Transportation (Appendix F);
- An Integrated Transport Assessment, prepared by FLOW Transportation (Appendix E);
- An Infrastructure memo and assessment, prepared by Woods Ltd (Appendix G);

The first document outlines PC24’s place within the wider Northcote master plan and urban context, and is considered to be the ‘structure plan’ in respect of PC24.

The AUP structure plan guidelines note that the level of analysis required needs to be appropriate to the type and scale of development, and these reports and structure plan are considered to appropriately relate to the simple zone change proposed for the two land parcels in question. In light of the limited size and scale of the affected land, the AUP structure plan guidelines are of little direct relevance to the proposal.

The reports and the preceding assessment have comprehensively considered the potential environmental effects of PC24, and demonstrate that the zone change will not give rise to any significant adverse environmental effects. In particular, the integrated transport assessment that has been prepared to support the various resource consent applications and master plan prepared by HLC, account for the proposed zoning change and consequential creation of the larger Cadness Loop Reserve. Sequential infrastructure upgrades are being delivered through Northcote to support staged redevelopment, and the proposed zonings are consistent with the planned direction of the Northcote masterplan.

On the basis of the technical information that has been provided, it is concluded that PC24 will not generate any significant adverse environmental effects.

10.0 **Consultation**

In preparing PC24, the applicant has commenced consultation and engagement with a number of parties, including iwi, Auckland Transport, local boards, and adjacent property owners. All surrounding land is under the ownership of HNZC, for which HLC are a wholly-owned subsidiary (refer Appendix J).
Due to the comprehensive nature of the Northcote Redevelopment, consultation on the Private Plan Change Request has taken place in conjunction with wider discussions and consultation with community groups, Council and Iwi; relating to the Awataha Greenway Design Guidelines and Master Plan development. A summary of consultation will be provided within Appendix K as any formal correspondence is received.

At this stage, no concerns have been raised although consultation is ongoing and some parties have not yet had an opportunity to respond, or have verbally indicated that they will formally comment through the submission process. Council will be advised of all responses received as the PC24 process moves forward.

11.0 Conclusion

It is considered that the proposed rezoning of the site to Local Centre zone is the most appropriate means to achieve the purpose of the RMA. It would be the best available option to enable and facilitate the use of the land for a local centre to serve the surrounding residential area.

PC24 assessment undertaken by:

Mark Thode
Principal Planner / MplanPrac (Hons) / MNZPI
Campbell Brown Planning Limited

Reviewed by:

Michael Campbell
Director / BREP(Hons) / MNZPI
Campbell Brown Planning Limited

(For and on behalf of ‘HLC’ (2017) Limited)
Planning Committee
02 July 2019
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SCHEDULE

MARLBOROUGH LAND DISTRICT—MARLBOROUGH COUNTY—PARI KAWAU SCENIC RESERVE
69,032 hectares, more or less, Sections 22A and 40, Block XII, Gore Survey District. Reserve for scenic purposes by all New Zealand Gazette 1982, page 552, S.O. Plan 360 and 787.
Dated at Blenheim this 8th day of March 1982.
D. I. MURPHY,
Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands.
(L. and S. H.O. Res. 8/3/25; D.O. 13/146)

Classification of Reserve
PURSUANT to the Reserves Act 1977, and to a delegation from the Minister of Lands, the Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands hereby declares the reserve, described in the Schedule hereto, to be classified as a reserve for scenic purposes, pursuant to section 19 (1) (a) of the said Act and subject to the provisions of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

MARLBOROUGH LAND DISTRICT—MARLBOROUGH COUNTY—CARDULKI SCENIC RESERVE
4,856 hectares, more or less, Section 52A, formerly Section 52B, Block I, Wakatipu Survey District. Reserve for scenic purposes by New Zealand Gazette 1912, page 2427. Part certificate of title 1920/224; S.O. Plan 566.
Dated at Blenheim this 8th day of March 1982.
D. I. MURPHY,
Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands.
(L. and S. H.O. Res. 8/3/1; D.O. 13/8)

Classification of Reserve and Declaration That the Reserve be Part of the Lakeside Scenic Reserve
PURSUANT to the Reserves Act 1977, and to a delegation from the Minister of Lands, the Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands hereby classifies the reserve, described in the Schedule hereto, as a reserve for scenic purposes, and further, declares the said reserve to form part of the Lakeside Scenic Reserve.

SCHEDULE

SOUTH AUCKLAND LAND DISTRICT—TAUPORUPE COUNTY—PART LAKESIDE SCENIC RESERVE
849 square metres, more or less, being Lot 1, D.P. S. 27809, situated in Block XIV, Takanini Survey District. Part certificated of title No. 242/1393.
Dated at Hamilton this 1st day of March 1982.
L. C. PRICE,
Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands.
(L. and S. H.O. Res. 3/3/41; D.O. 13/188)

Classification of Reserve
PURSUANT to the Reserves Act 1977, and to a delegation from the Minister of Lands, the Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands hereby declares the reserve described in the Schedule hereto, to be classified as a reserve for local purpose (soil conservation and river control), subject to the provisions of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

SOUTH AUCKLAND LAND DISTRICT—WHAKATANE DISTRICT
6,717 hectares, more or less, being Allotment 686, Whakatane Parish, and Allotments 299 to 301, Haupiti Parish, situated in Block I, Whakatane Survey District. All New Zealand Gazette, 1981, page 3728. S.O. Plan 50216 to 50219.
Dated at Hamilton this 1st day of March 1982.
L. C. PRICE,
Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands.
(L. and S. H.O. Res. 3/12/2; D.O. 8/6/2/3)

Classification of Reserve
PURSUANT to the Reserves Act 1977, and to a delegation from the Minister of Lands, the Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands hereby declares the reserve, described in the Schedule hereto, to be classified as a reserve for scientific purposes, subject to the provisions of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

SOUTH AUCKLAND LAND DISTRICT—TAUPORUPE COUNTY—OPUNA HUIK ROYAL SCIENTIFIC RESERVE
26,376 hectares, more or less, being Section 3, Block X, Waitakaruru Survey District. All New Zealand Gazette, 1982, page 34. S.O. Plan 51383.
Dated at Hamilton this 1st day of March 1982.
L. C. PRICE,
Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands.
(L. and S. H.O. Res. 3/7/7; D.O. 13/150)

Transfer of Unformed Legal Road in Block VI, Cohden Survey District
PURSUANT to section 233 of the Local Government Act 1974, and to a delegation from the Minister of Lands, the Commissioner of Crown Lands hereby declares that the land, described in the Schedule hereto, has been transferred to the Crown by the Waikato County Council pursuant to the said section 233 and on the publication of this notice the said land shall be deemed to be Crown land, subject to the Land Act 1948.

SCHEDULE

WESTLAND LAND DISTRICT—GRAY COUNTY
1,034 hectares, more or less, being unformed legal road adjoining part Reserve 1416, and Section 222, Square 119, situated in Block IV, Cohden Survey District. Macked A, S.O. Plan 10386.
Dated at Hokitika this 2nd day of March 1982.
J. N. RODDA,
Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands.
(L. and S. H.O. Res. 10/3/21; D.O. 13/75)

Classification of Reserves
PURSUANT to the Reserves Act 1977, and to a delegation from the Minister of Lands, the Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands hereby declares the reserves, described in the Schedule hereto, to be classified as reserves for recreation purposes, subject to the provisions of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

NORTH AUCKLAND LAND DISTRICT—NORTHCOTE BOROUGH
1,755 square metres, more or less, being Lot 393, D.P. 48335, situated in Block XII, Waitakera Survey District. All Gazette notice 18970.
4,096 square metres, more or less, being Lot 21, D.P. 37758, situated in Block XII, Waitakera Survey District. All certificated of title 10/614.
5,273 square metres, more or less, being Lot 25, D.P. 38915, situated in Block XII, Waitakera Survey District. All certificated of title 93/189.
2,787 square metres, more or less, being Lot 51, D.P. 38481, situated in Block XII, Waitakera Survey District. All certificate of title 10/1409. Subject to a building line restriction contained in K.B.715.
792 square metres, more or less, being Lot 88, D.P. 49307, situated in Block XII, Waitakera Survey District. All certificate of title 93/189. Subject to a building line restriction contained in K.B.715.
480 square metres, more or less, being Lot 2, D.P. 25884, situated in Block XII, Waitakera Survey District. All certificate of title 673/17.
1,120 square metres, more or less, being Lot 21, Deeds Plan T367, situated in Block XII, Waitakera Survey District. All certificate of title 556/121.
2,067 hectares, more or less, being Lots 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82 and 82A and part Lots 72A, 73 and 74, D.P. 712, situated in Block XII, Waitakera Survey District. Balance certificate of title 62/272.

Dated at Auckland this 21st day of March 1981.
R. C. SMITH,
Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands.
(L. and C.H.O. Res. 2/2/146; D.O. 1/30/2/28)

Definition of the Purpose of Reserves and Classification of Reserves
PURSUANT to the Reserves Act 1977, and to a delegation from the Minister of Lands, the Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands hereby defines the purpose for which the reserves, described in the Schedule hereto, shall be classified, as that of reserves for scenic purposes, and further, declares that the said reserves be classified as reserves for scenic purposes, subject to the provisions of section 19 (1) (a) of the said Act.
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Northcote is located 5 km from Auckland CBD and 2 km from Takapuna. It is a central city suburb yet it maintains a low-density suburb.

This masterplan aims to maximise the suburb’s excellent location, leverage its key amenities and add significantly to its residential density. Northcote has all the key elements required for a residential densification project. A town centre, a local primary school and an intermediate school sit within the middle of the suburb. There are already strong connections to public transport and walkable destinations such as AUT shops, council walkways, and tidal tuff ring recreation reserve.

The town centre is also undergoing a master planning exercise. Panuku are actively master planning jointly with HLC and Homze for more residential housing and retail shops within the town centre. They intend to enhance the community hub consisting of a library, art gallery and community buildings.
Policy Context.

Past Engagement & Greenway Development Summary

2006 - 2010 Extensive consultation was conducted on Northcote and the potential for re-orientating Cadness Loop Reserve.

1. Northcote Central Project (NCP)
   - Auckland City Council, Northcote Community Trust, Northcote Central Business District (Community Trust)
   - Major features: historic buildings, streetscape improvement, improvements to safety, accessibility, green spaces, and community engagement.

2. Northcote Children and Youth Development Project
   - Auckland City Council, Auckland Council, Northcote Community Trust
   - Major features: youth centre, youth development activities, community engagement.

   - Auckland City Council, Auckland Council
   - Major features: youth development activities, community engagement.

   - Auckland City Council
   - Major features: planning framework for the eastern area, including the development of the Eastern Area Plan.

5. Northcote Town Centre Plan (NTP), 2010
   - Auckland City Council
   - Major features: planning framework for the Northcote Town Centre.

6. Greenway Community Perspectives' Workshops, Nov 2016 - March 2017
   - Auckland City Council
   - Major features: community perspectives' workshops with key stakeholders and community representatives for the Greenway.

   - Auckland City Council
   - Major features: planning framework for the Northcote development.

8. Information Centre, April 2017, Stage 2
   - Auckland City Council
   - Major features: information centre for the Northcote development.

Groups consulted and key aspirations for Greenway:

- As an open recreational space that is well-connected to other districts.
- As a place for community events and celebrations.
- To enhance the aesthetic and social value of the Greenway.
- To provide opportunities for the public to engage with the Greenway.

Groups consulted and key aspirations for Northcote:

- As an open recreational space that is well-connected to other districts.
- As a place for community events and celebrations.
- To enhance the aesthetic and social value of the Northcote.
- To provide opportunities for the public to engage with the Northcote.
Past Engagement & Greenway Development Plan (2009).

Through this original consultation it was agreed in principle that Cadness Loop Reserve boundaries would be amended to integrate into the Greenway.

The Awstaha Greenway Reference Plan and Design Guide has been informed by a process of framing, imagining and testing aspirations and priorities with Mana Whenua KaTiki, Kai pākōkō Local Board members, the Council family, the Greenway Community Reference Group, and Northcote Intermediate School. These partners and key stakeholders were selected to help shape design parameters that will underpin the design outcomes for the Greenway projects in future. All groups were involved in a process of building on community aspirations from past work to develop success criteria and priorities for user experiences. The design parameters have been considered in the context of guiding documents, including the Kai pākōkō Local Board Plan 2017 outcomes, and the Kai pākōkō Connections Greenway Network Plan.

Stakeholder engagement process
Over six months – June to November 2017, the design parameters and opportunities for the Awstaha Greenway were shaped with project partners, stakeholders and community groups, including site walkarounds, workshops, co-design sessions and conversations.

- 5 Kai pākōkō Local Board sessions
- 4 x Mana Whenua KaTiki Project Working Group workshops
- 2 x Greenway Community Reference Group workshops
- 1 x workshop (co-design session) with Northcote Intermediate
- 1 x Pacific Island Group Workshop
- 4 x meetings/site walkarounds with Auckland Council Community Facilities/Services
- 3 x Healthy Waters workshops/learnings
- 1 x Auckland Transport feedback meeting
- 1 x Combined Council family meeting_update
- 1 x Community Information Day
- Northcote Information Kiosk: regular public engagement (Wed-Sat) and weekly kids & parents workshops (Saturday)

The Design Reference Framework captures the outcome of these conversations, so that the collaborative design of each portion of the Greenway can commence.

Establishing parameters: based on residential and town centre masterplanning progress, character analysis and design considerations captured from initial site observations and walkarounds.

Framing: Reviewing where the Greenway idea came from, recognising what has shaped it up to now. Building on success criteria and developing cultural narratives.

Imagining: Exploring potential features of the Greenway based on role play (various people who might use the Greenway) and ‘card-sort’ co-design sessions to explore the Greenway experience.

Testing: Seeking responses to unifying design principles (white weaving the layout), opportunities for (each of the four) refining the greenway scope and communicating initial plans through a Community Information Day.
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HLC Masterplan Testing.

Urban Design testing, investigating the potential outcomes of reconfiguring Cadness Loop Reserve
The spatial and urban design opportunities plan looks to ensure all open spaces within Northcote are well connected, contribute to the overall play strategy and are safe inviting places. Cadness Loop Reserve was identified early on as a problematic space due to it being surrounded by roads (unsafe), its dimensions did not provide for a wide range of activities (great for ball space) and is not well connected to the wider community.
Proposed Greenway Character Rooms.

1. Josie Tonar Scout Reserve
   Enhanced existing bush remnant and neighbourhood park

2. Kikā Street
   Upgraded existing cul-de-sac and link to Josie Tonar Scout Reserve

3. Kikā Street extension
   New street through the HNZ development

4. Greenside Reserve
   An improved playing field and stormwater detention space, connected to the centre

5. Town Centre
   A new community hub that is part of a connected, legible, people-focused heart

6. Cadness Reserve
   An enlarged and improved Cadness Reserve to include play opportunities

7. School’s Edge
   A play and learning environment overlooked by new housing

8. Cadness Loop Reserve
   A reconfigured and enlarged neighborhood open space with play opportunities

9. Link to Hato Petera College
   New street through the HNZ development

10. Linear Park
    A new street and pocket park through the HNZ development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Rooms</th>
<th>Proposed Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cadness Loop Reserve Plan Change Document</td>
<td>HLC 17 April 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urban Development Concept Plan.
Existing vs Proposed (Cadness Loop Reserve).

Existing Cadness Loop Reserve

The current arrangement of Cadness Loop Reserve is surrounded by roads with no clear or safe crossing points. All the existing buildings that surround the park are setback and provide limited passive surveillance. There is also no formal connection to the adjacent school fields which limit its use within the community.

Proposed Cadness Loop Reserve

The proposed realignment of Cadness Loop Reserve will seek to resolve anumber of issues that currently exist, such as:

- Safe crossing locations (raised tables)
- Good building frontage (passive surveillance)
- Create a strong connection to the adjacent school (Greenway)
- Facilitate a wider range of play activities
Attached is a plan for the proposed private plan change request for Cadness Loop Reserve, Northcote. The plan shows the existing and proposed planning changes, with different symbols indicating the type and height of buildings. The plan is marked as 'Draft for discussion only'.

Legend:
- Existing MRZC Development
- Proposed MRZC Superlots
- 1-2 Storeys
- 3 Storeys
- 4 Storeys
- 5 Storeys
- 6+ Storeys
- Road Stop Required
- Street Door Access

This plan is part of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) and is intended for discussion and feedback before final approval.
Frontage Relationship Plan.

Legend:
- Orange: Front
- Yellow: Rear
- Green: Side

Specific design required at superslot level to achieve dual frontage

Draft for discussion only
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Proposed Zoning Change.

Existing AUP Zoning

Legend.
- Open Space - Informal Recreational
- Existing Residential - Terrane Housing and Apartment Building Zone

Proposed AUP Zoning Change

Legend.
- Existing Open Space - Informal Recreational
- Future Open Space - Informal Recreational
- Proposed Future Residential - Terrane Housing and Apartment Building Zone

Cadness Loop Reserve Plan Change Document | HLC 17 April 2019
Future Zoning Pattern Following Future Subdivision and Council rezoning

Legend:
- Green: Future Open Space - Informal Recreational
- Orange: Future Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Building Zone
- Black dashed line: Proposed Future Road
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Illustrative Reserve Strategy

A greenway for Northcote

For more information visit panuku.co.nz/northcote
### SECTION 32 OPTION EVALUATION TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1 – Do Nothing/ Status Quo</th>
<th>Option 2 – Only rezone Reserve land (i.e. exclude Section 2 road)</th>
<th>Option 3 – rezone acquired land to Terrace Housing and Apartments (preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option description and purpose</strong></td>
<td>This option would retain the existing situation, consisting of legal road reserve and Open Space – Informal Recreation zoning in respect of the land exchanged to HLC. This option would also imply delaying any proposed changes to the existing Unitary Plan (&quot;AUP&quot;) zones, until a subdivision application has been approved (or at least lodged) to formalise the intended road and reserve layout of the land exchange and Northcote Master Plan.</td>
<td>This option would delay the rezing of the road (section 2), until future subdivision in accordance with the Northcote Master Plan and land exchange, establishes new roads and the Cadness Reserve layout. Following subdivision and road closure, the zoning of Section 2 would revert to the adjacent zonings (which are sought to be THAB as a result of the AUP(OP) Infrastructure standard E26.2.3.2(4)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriateness</strong> (whether the objectives of the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA (s321)(a))</td>
<td>Option 1 does not address the identified issue associated with the Land Exchange, being the incompatible zoning for future residential development of the land acquired by HLC – currently consisting of open space zone and legal road. Any future development over this portion of the site will continue to incur costs from resource consents due to the inappropriate zoning.</td>
<td>Option 2 does not address the identified issue associated with the Land Exchange, being the incompatible zoning for future residential development of the land acquired by HLC – currently consisting of open space zone and legal road. While there is provision on the AUP(OP) for closed road to revert to its adjacent zoning under Infrastructure standard E26.2.3.2(4); this will require Council to include in future Plan updates. In this regard, Option 2 would be an inefficient use of resources where the intended future development of this section of road is known, agreed to through the Land Exchange agreement, and will align with planned future-subdivision. For this reason, it is considered that Option 2 is not the most appropriate option to achieve the purpose of the RMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency and effectiveness</strong> (whether the provisions are the most efficient and effective means of)</td>
<td>Option 1 does not address the identified issue associated with the Land Exchange, being the incompatible zoning for future residential development of the land acquired by HLC – currently consisting of open space zone and legal road.</td>
<td>Option 2 would be an inefficient use of resources where the intended future development of this section of road is known, agreed to through the Land Exchange agreement, and will align with planned future-subdivision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Campbell Brown
### Attachment D

#### Item 12

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

**Achieving the Objectives of the Proposal (s32(1)(b))**

In this regard, Option 1 would not be effective or efficient in achieving the objectives of the proposal.

A further plan change process would be required to alter the (stopped) road reserve. This may not be able to occur by Council if the land is exchanged and legal under the ownership of HLC. Consequently, a further private plan change request may be required due to the advanced status of the land exchange. While the Unitary Plan makes provisions for this situation under Unitary Plan standard E26.2.3.1(4), it is efficient to address this zoning disparity now. Inclusion of the stopped road in this process at this time, will avoid any potential future split zoning complications that might arise where differing zonings are applied to the centreline of the road under the above standard.

For the above reasons, it is considered that Option 2 is not the most appropriate option to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

The proposal will ensure that the land under HLC ownership is rezoned to THAB through this process, with no further plan changes or updates being required. This will ensure that the land can then be developed for its intended purpose.

For the above reasons, Option 3 is the most appropriate option to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion 1</th>
<th>Opinion 2</th>
<th>Opinion 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Option 1 would ensure that the land within the site would be available for Open Space activities, and leave the stopped road as half THAB, half Open Space until Council undertakes a plan update in respect of the road (in accordance with Unitary Plan Standard E26.2.3.1(4)).

However, this is not a benefit in the long term as the land in question will cease to be under the ownership of Council. In addition, use of the existing road is an inefficient use of land in the context of the road stopping process having been completed in parallel to the land exchange (refer AT resolution attached in Appendix H).

There is no appreciable benefit to this situation in the context of the very large amount of growth projected in the region as a whole, and the immediate need for social housing provision and intensification by HNZC.

Option 1 would create no trade competition or adverse indirect effects on other existing centres nearby.

There are no benefits to Option 2.

Cessation of the stopped road in this process at this time, may give rise to potential future split zoning complications when differing zonings are applied to the centreline of the road under AUP standard E26.2.3.1(4).

Option 3 will benefit the surrounding environment by applying the dominant zoning within Northcote to the land in question, as Terrace Housing and Apartments (‘THAB’).

Rezoning will enable a comprehensive design response to the future Cadness Reserve land, which will have Urban Design and safety outcomes for the future use of that public space (refer Ihumātao Report in Appendix B).

The THAB zone description notes that the zone is intended to make efficient use of land, and to ensure that residents have convenient access to public open space (amongst other matters). The proposed zoning will give effect to this intention, enabling an appropriate intensity of residential development that is consistent with the surrounding area.

The land will be adjacent to the future Cadness Reserve which directly connects to the wider greenway network running through Northcote. Increased recreation opportunities will therefore be available through the eventual creation of a noticeably larger reserve for the enjoyment of local residents, with additional residential development being enabled directly adjacent to this reserve on the subject land.

Rezoning of the land exchanged to HLC at this time, will avoid the costs (whether public or private) associated with future plan change processes were Option 2 pursued.

Retention of the existing Open Space zone and road reserve under Option 1 would preclude the opportunity to provide comprehensive residential intensification, with an ideal northerly aspect and interface with the future Cadness Reserve.

Any future development over this portion of the site will continue to incur costs from resource consents due to the

The costs associated with Option 2 are that a further plan change process would be required to alter the (stopped) road reserve.

The use of the stopped road site for Open Space is a cost in an economic sense, because retaining this zoning will not align with the intended development pattern in Northcote. This will also add delays to the HNZC development program which is intended to provide additional housing for relocated and new HNZC.

There would be few costs arising under Option 3, other than the cost associated with the loss of Open Space zoned land for informal recreation purposes.

This cost is outweighed by the substantive and positive increase in the size of Cadness Reserve as a result of the overall master planning and land exchange processes taking place.
### Employment (s.32(2)(e) and (b))

Inappropriate zoning. Delaying rezoning will add unnecessary inefficiencies and cost to land development through incompatible zoning, where the land has already been identified for exchange and development through the land exchange process and the master planning of Northcote.

The use of the site for Open Space is a cost in an economic sense, because retaining this zoning will not align with the intended development pattern in Northcote. This will also add delays to the HNZC development program which is intended to provide additional housing for relocated and new HNZC tenants. This will have a social cost and consequential economic costs if social housing cannot be delivered in a timely manner without technical planning non-compliances through inappropriate zoning.

There are no trade competition or employment costs directly attributable with this option due to the nature of the zonings in question.

### Risk Assessment of the Risk of Acting or Not Acting if there is Uncertain or Insufficient Information about the Provisions (s.32(2)(c))

There is no uncertain information or insufficiency of information about the requested zone change, which is to give effect to the agreed land exchange and will precede subdivision of the site in accordance with those agreements between the applicant and Council. There are therefore, no identified risks arising as a consequence of the proposal.

There is no uncertain information or insufficiency of information about the requested zone change, which is to give effect to the agreed land exchange and will precede subdivision of the site in accordance with those agreements between the applicant and Council. There are therefore, no identified risks arising as a consequence of the proposal.

There is no uncertain information or insufficiency of information about the requested zone change, which is to give effect to the agreed land exchange and will precede subdivision of the site in accordance with those agreements between the applicant and Council. There are therefore, no identified risks arising as a consequence of the proposal.

### Summary

**Option 1** does not address the identified issue associated with the Land Exchange, being the incompatible zoning for future residential development of the land acquired by HLC — currently consisting of open Space zone and legal road.

Any future development over this land will continue to incur costs from resource consents due to the inappropriate zoning. Delaying re zoning will add unnecessary inefficiencies and cost to land development through incompatible zoning, where the land has already been identified for exchange and development through the land exchange process and the master planning of Northcote.

Option 1 is not the preferred option for these reasons.

**Option 2** would provide some of the outcomes that are sought by the proposal, but not to the extent that is required to optimise benefits to the community by zoning land intended for future housing, as residential. A further plan change process would be required to alter the (stopped) road reserve, and while the Unitary Plan makes provisions for this situation under Unitary Plan standard E26.2.3.1(4), it is efficient to address this zoning disparity now.

Option 2 is not the preferred option for this reason.

**Option 3** will enable HLC/HNZC to progress redevelopment to the south of the future Cadness Reserve in a comprehensive manner and with a zoning that is appropriate and consistent with the surrounding residential environment. Inclusion of the stopped-roading in this process at this time, will avoid any potential future split zoning complications that might arise where differing zonings are applied to the centres of the road under AUP standard E26.2.3.1(4). The proposal will ensure that the land under HLC ownership is rezoned to THAB through this process, with no further plan changes or updates being required. This will ensure that the land can then be developed for its intended purpose.

It is noted that the THAB zone description notes that the zone is intended to make efficient use of land, and to ensure that residents have convenient access to public open space (amongst other matters). The proposed zoning will give effect to this intention and provide greater opportunity for passive surveillance and activation of the reserve interface with the THAB zone.

Option 3 is the preferred option for these reasons.
Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) - proposed private plan change request - Cadness Loop Reserve, Northcote

Planning Committee
02 July 2019

Item 12

Attachment E

NORTHCOTE REDEVELOPMENT - CADNESS STREET

OVERALL PLAN
LAND EXCHANGE, ROAD TO BE STOPPED, LAND TO BE ACQUIRED FOR RECREATION RESERVE AND LAND TO BE SET APART FROM RECREATION RESERVE

SCHEDULE OF LANDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANDS</th>
<th>CURRENT PURPOSE</th>
<th>PREVIOUS PURPOSE</th>
<th>AREA (Ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SECTION 1</td>
<td>ROAD</td>
<td>RESERVOIR</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION 2</td>
<td>ROAD</td>
<td>RESERVOIR</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION 3</td>
<td>ROAD</td>
<td>RESERVOIR</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION 4</td>
<td>ROAD</td>
<td>RESERVOIR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: 1. CURRENT PURPOSE AND PREVIOUS PURPOSE ARE SUBJECT TO FURTHER REVIEW.
2. MEASUREMENTS WERE BASED ON VERY LIMITING INFORMATION.

SCHEDULE OF EXISTING STRIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGAL DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>IDENTIFICATION</th>
<th>TITLE (LPSA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOT 1 DP 178296</td>
<td>027/6741/66055</td>
<td>OKA PROD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT 2 DP 178297</td>
<td>027/6741/66056</td>
<td>OKA PROD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT 3 DP 178298</td>
<td>027/6741/66057</td>
<td>OKA PROD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT 4 DP 178299</td>
<td>027/6741/66058</td>
<td>OKA PROD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AREA ALLOCATED FOR PARTITION OF CADNESS STREET TO BE STOPPED: 7.498
11 March 2019

Mark Thode
Campbell Brown Planning Limited
PO Box 147001
Ponsonby
AUCKLAND 1144

Via email: mark@campbellbrown.co.nz

Dear Mark

CADNESS LOOP RESERVE PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE: TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT

As per your recent instruction, Flow Transportation Specialists Ltd (Flow) has undertaken a transport assessment of the proposed Cadness Loop Reserve Private Plan Change, proposed as part of the HLC Northcote development. We report as follows.

1 BACKGROUND

The HLC Northcote Development comprises the redevelopment of the Housing New Zealand (HNZ) land located within the area generally bound by Ocean View Road, Raleigh Road, College Road, and Tonar Street. The extent of the redevelopment is shown in Figure 1 overleaf. In total, some 300 existing HNZ dwellings will be demolished, and at least 1,200 new dwellings of mixed typologies constructed. The development also includes the construction of new parks/greenways, and new roads to provide access to the intensified land use. Additionally, a redevelopment of the Northcote Town Centre is proposed by Panuku, which may include more dwellings.

As part of the masterplanning for the HLC Northcote Development, an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) was prepared by Flow. The ITA included the following:

• A description of the existing environment relevant to the study area including:
  • The location of the site and surrounding land uses and transport network, including existing traffic flows
  • Existing accessibility for all transport modes to, from and within the area, including by vehicle, public transport, walking and cycling
  • An overview of the existing area where the HNZ and Panuku housing developments are proposed, including existing land use and transport provisions

---

Note: Northcote HNZ Masterplan Integrated Transport Assessment, prepared by Flow transportation Specialists, Rev B, dated 31 May 2017

flow TRANSPORTATION SPECIALISTS LTD
Level 1, 11 Blake Street. Ponsonby | PO Box 47497, Ponsonby, Auckland 1144 | p 09 970 3820 | f 09 970 3890 | www.flownz.com
2 PROPOSAL

The existing Cadness Loop Reserve is shown in Figure 2 overleaf. The reserve is located to the west of Cadness Street, with an extension of Cadness Street circumnavigating/looping it to provide property access. As indicated in Figure 1, as part of the HLC Northcote Development Masterplan, it is proposed to reorientate the reserve to an east-west alignment, with a new network of roads proposed to the west of Cadness Street providing superlot access.

flow TRANSPORTATION SPECIALISTS LTD
Level 1, 11 Blake Street, Ponsonby 1 PO Box 47497, Ponsonby, Auckland 1144  09 970 3820  970 3890  www.flownz.com
This proposal requires the following:

- The closure of the Cadness Street loop on the western and southern sides of the existing Cadness Loop Reserve (via a separate process)
- The re-zoning of the southern section of both the road and reserve to Terrace Housing and Apartments (THAB) Zone
- The re-zoning of land HNZ land to the west of the existing Cadness Reserve to Open Space

The existing and proposed zoning is shown in Figure 3. It is understood that the re-zoning of the HNZ land to Open Space will be covered via a separate process.

Figure 2: Existing Cadness Loop Reserve

![Image of existing Cadness Loop Reserve]

Figure 3: Proposed Cadness Loop Reserve Re-Zoning

![Image of proposed Cadness Loop Reserve re-zoning]
3 TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT

As outlined previously, the proposal results in the removal of the Cadness Street loop from the road network in this area of Northcote. The function of Cadness Street loop is solely to provide access to the properties to the north, south, and west of the Cadness Loop Reserve. There is no public access to facilities other than the reserve (specifically, there is no existing access through to the schools to the west), and the road does not form part of any bus route. The HLC Northcote Development Masterplan will see this whole area transformed with a new network of streets providing access to the land to the west of Cadness Street. As such, the removal of the Cadness Street loop will not have any adverse effects on public pedestrian or vehicle access to local amenities/facilities, the function of the surrounding road network, or on access to land in this area, as it is being undertaken in conjunction with execution of the HLC Northcote Development Masterplan.

The re-zoning of land from Road/Open Space to THAB will enable more dwellings to be built in this area (however it is noted that a similar sized area of land will be rezoned from THAB to Open Space, almost balancing this out). The traffic effects of the entire HLC Northcote Development and the residential component of the potential Panuku Town Centre Development have been assessed as part of the ITA. The ITA proposes improvements at the Lake Road/Ocean View Road/Northcote Road, Lake Road/Raleigh Tonar/Exmouth Road, and Pukuke Road/Ocean View Road/Raleigh Road intersections, and notes that bus service frequencies will need to increase overtime as the population increases. Additionally, the HLC Northcote Development Masterplan proposes improved footpaths, a greenway though the centre of the area, and improved traffic calming which will improve safety and amenity for people who walk and cycle, and improvements to bus stops on Lake Road and College Road have already recently been made by Auckland Transport, with bus stop facilities in the Northcote town centre likely to be improvements when the Panuku development proceeds. As such, any potential additional vehicular and non-vehicular traffic created by the re-zoning has already been catered for/mitigated by the HLC Northcote Development Masterplan.

4 CONCLUSION

Based on the assessment included in this letter, it is considered that the proposed closure of the Cadness Street loop and rezoning of land to enable the re-orientated Cadness Loop Reserve will have no effect on the surrounding road network and no transportation effects beyond what has already been considered as part of the HLC Northcote Development Masterplan and ITA. As such, there is no reason from a transportation perspective to preclude this private plan change being approved.

Yours sincerely

Russell Brandon
SENIOR TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER
Cadness Loop Reserve Plan Change and Infrastructure Memo

AUP(OP) Deviation

Under the current HLC master plan for the Northcote Redevelopment, Stage 4B (under TOC5) proposes to alter the current Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) zoning by the addition of Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings (THAB) zone on an existing area deemed an Informal Recreation Zone.

The area of land within superblock N30 that is currently deemed an Informal Recreation Zone is ~525 m², and with the existing road there will be an additional ~1365 m² deemed THAB zone within Stage 4B.

This memo confirms that the change in zoning can be accommodated by the proposed infrastructure upgrades throughout the Northcote area as the networks have been designed to take flows that assume the proposed zoning changes.

Stormwater

The proposed stormwater network both within the Stage 4B area and downstream has been designed with the proposed additional THAB land and sized to accommodate flows required under the Stormwater Code of Practice. The new network will be laid along Road 6 and will be deep enough to provide the appropriate lot connections to all of superblock N30 within Stage 4B according to the Building Code.

Wastewater

Like the new stormwater network, the proposed wastewater network, both within Stage 4B and downstream, has been sized to take flows assuming that the southern area of the Cadness Loop Reserve will be developed under THAB zoning. The pipelines will be laid along Road 6 and will be deep enough to service all lots within superblock N30 as per the standards outlined in the Building Code.

Water

The proposed water supply network for Stage 4B will be laid along Road 6 and Road 10 and be sized to accommodate the additional THAB zoning. The ‘Future Water Supply Analysis Memo’ by GHD confirms that the future proposed network upgrades will be adequate to service superblock N30.

Roading

All proposed lots within superblock N30, including those currently within the Cadness Loop Reserve area, will be accessible via the new Road 10 on the southern side of Stage 4B and via a JIOAL that will run from either the existing Cadness Street, proposed Road 6 or proposed Road 10.

Thomas McClory – LD Engineer
Marcel Waldvogel – Precinct Manager
8.4 Strategic Land Acquisition, Encroachment and Designations

That the Board:

i. Approves additional capital budget of $17.535m in FY2018/2019 for land acquisitions required to support Greenfields growth.

ii. Approves additional capital budget of $3.5m in FY 2018/2019 for land acquisitions required as a result of historic encroachments and designations.

iii. Notes that these budget increases will be able to be accommodated within the overall 2018/19 capital budget.

iv. Notes that there will be no overall change to the allocated funding in the 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP).

v. Delegates authority to the Chief Executive to approve the individual acquisitions covered by these budgets.

[Mary-Jane Daly / Paula Rebstock]: Carried

8.5 Road Stoppings and Real Estate Inventory Optimisation

That the Board:

i. Approves the transfer to Auckland Council (AC) of a property at 24 Totara Ave, New Lynn being Sections 1 and 2 on Survey Office Plan 524295 comprising approximately 102m² (Attachment 1), with a current book value of $130,410 as at 30 June 2018.

ii. Notes that the transfer of 24 Totara Avenue, New Lynn is subject to AT completing the legalisation of Section 3 on Survey Office Plan 524295 of land required for future transport purposes.

iii. Approves the transfer of Brigham Street, Wynyard Quarter, which has been stopped by special legislation for the purposes of the America’s Cup, from the AT fixed asset register to the AC Fixed asset register at Nil value.

iv. Approves the commencement of road stopping procedures under the Public Works Act 1981 (PWA) and subject to no iwi objections being received, then notification to AC of the sections of legal road for disposal being:

a) Cadness Street, Northcote; an area of approximately 1,625 m² as shown on the survey plan Survey Office Plan 528876 (Attachment 2).

b) The public accessway connecting Lake Road with Greenslade Crescent, Northcote; an area of approximately 242 m² described as Lot 216 Deposited Plan 45328. (Attachment 3).

c) Cessna Place, Mangere; an area of approximately 103 m² as shown on the survey plan Survey Office Plan 519787 (Attachment 4).

d) Balfron Avenue, Mount Roskill; an area of approximately 152 m² as shown on the survey plan Survey Office Plan 525326 (Attachment 5).

e) Unnamed unformed legal road adjoining Peach Hill Road, Drury; an area of approximately 3.1369 Ha as shown on the survey plan Survey Office Plan 467556 (Attachment 6).

f) 528 Elerslie-Panmure Highway, Mount Wellington; an area of approximately 2,526 m² of legal road shown as Section 15 on Survey Office Plan 471986 (Attachment 7).
v. Notes that in the event of objections being received in relation to the road stoppings, the matter will be reported to the board for a decision.

vi. Notes that in the event of no objections, AC will be notified to complete the disposals.

[Wayne Donnelly / Mary Jane Daly]: Carried

8.11 Approval of New Retail Lease

That the Board:

i. Approve Auckland Transport (AT) entering into a nine (9) year lease agreement with Ship To Shore Restaurant Group Limited (Lessee) for a new tenancy occupying Unit 3, Devonport Wharf, for a seafood restaurant and takeaway, at a rental of $108,340 per annum.

ii. Delegate the Chief Executive to approve final lease terms and sign an Agreement to Lease between AT (“Lessor”) and Ship To Shore Restaurant Group Limited (“Lessee”).

iii. Appoint two (2) directors to execute the Deed of Lease between AT and Ship To Shore Restaurant Group Limited.

[Paula Rebstock / Wayne Donnelly]: Carried
Komiti Taiao ā-Hapori Hoki / Environment and Community Committee

OPEN MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of the Environment and Community Committee held in the Reception Lounge, Auckland Town Hall, 301-305 Queen Street, Auckland on Tuesday, 12 March 2019 at 9.35am.

PRESENT

Chairperson
Cr Penny Hulse
Cr Alf Filipaina
Cr Josephine Bartley
IMSB Member Renata Blair
IMSB Member James Brown
Cr Dr Cathy Casey
Deputy Mayor Cr Bill Cashmore
Cr Ross Clow
Cr Fa’anana Efeso Collins
Cr Linda Cooper, JP
Cr Chris Darby
Cr Hon Christine Fletcher, QSO
Mayor Hon Phil Goff, CNZM, JP
Cr Richard Hills

Cr Mike Lee

Cr Daniel Newman, JP
Cr Greg Sayers
Cr Deasley Simpson, JP
Cr Sharon Stewart, QSM
Cr Sir John Walker, KNZM, CBE
Cr Wayne Walker
Cr John Watson
Cr Paul Young

ALSO PRESENT

Greg Presland, Chair
Waitakere Ranges Local Board
Sandra Coney, Member
Waitakere Ranges Local Board

Environment and Community Committee
12 March 2019

1 Apologies

Resolution number ENV/2019/12

MOVED by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Filipaina:

That the Environment and Community Committee:
a) accept the apology from Cr C Fletcher for lateness.

CARRIED

Note: Apologies were subsequently received from Cr R Hills, Cr G Sayers and Cr W Wayne for lateness.

2 Declaration of Interest

Cr E Collins entered the meeting at 9.39 am

Cr C Casey advised the meeting that she is an ambassador for the SPCA but had no conflict with Item 10 – Adoption of the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029.

Cr R Clow and Cr C Darby advised the meeting that they are members of the Forest and Bird Society but had no conflict with Item 10 – Adoption of the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029.

3 Confirmation of Minutes

Resolution number ENV/2019/13

MOVED by Cr D Simpson, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Filipaina:

That the Environment and Community Committee:
a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 12 February 2019, as a true and correct record.

CARRIED

4 Petitions

There were no petitions.

5 Public Input

5.1 Extinction Rebellion Auckland - effective action against climate change

Rosie Gee and Dr Chris Holland, Extinction Rebellion Auckland were in attendance in relation to Auckland Council taking a lead in Aotearoa, towards effective action against climate change.

A PowerPoint presentation was provided. A copy has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Cr M Lee entered the meeting at 9.46 am.
Cr W Walker entered the meeting at 9.49 am.
Cr R Hills entered the meeting at 9.55 am.

Resolution number ENV/2019/14

MOVED by Cr C Darby, seconded by Chairperson P Hulse:
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the presentation from Rosie Gee and Dr Chris Holland, Extinction Rebellion Auckland, in relation to Auckland Council taking a lead in Aotearoa towards effective action against climate change and thank them for their attendance.

b) agree to forward the presentation to the Chief Sustainability Office for their information.

CARRIED

Attachments

A 12 March 2019, Environment and Community Committee: Item 5.1 - Extinction Rebellion Auckland - effective action against climate change, Presentation.

5.2 Marcus Reynolds - Tennis Auckland

Marcus Reynolds, Chief Executive Officer and Simon Vannini, Board Chairman Tennis Auckland were in attendance to address the committee regarding Item 11: Tennis Auckland Region – Redevelopment of ASB Tennis Arena – Grant Allocation.

A PowerPoint presentation was provided. A copy has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Cr C Fletcher entered the meeting at 10.07 am.
Cr G Sayers entered the meeting at 10.12 am.

Resolution number ENV/2019/15

MOVED by Cr D Simpson, seconded by Cr W Walker:

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the presentation from Marcus Reynolds, Chief Executive Officer, and Simon Vannini, Board Chairman - Tennis Auckland, regarding the ASB Tennis Arena redevelopment project and thank them for their attendance.

CARRIED

Attachments

A 12 March 2019, Environment and Community Committee: Item 5.2 - Auckland Tennis - the ASB Tennis Arena redevelopment project, Presentation.

5.3 Kim Kerrigan - Glenesk Road, Piha - Flooding

Kim Kerrigan, resident Glenesk Road, Piha was in attendance to address the committee in relation to Item 8: Engagement on options in response to flood safety risk in Piha.

A PowerPoint presentation was provided. A copy has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Resolution number ENV/2019/16

MOVED by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Cr L Cooper:

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) thank Kim Kerrigan for her presentation in relation to Glenesk Road, Piha – Flooding and thank her for her attendance.

CARRIED

Attachments

A 12 March 2019, Environment and Community Committee: Kim Kerrigan - Glenesk Road, Piha - Flooding, Presentation

6 Local Board Input
6.1 Waitakere Ranges Local Board - Consultation on options in response to flood safety risk in Piha

Chairperson Greg Presland and Member Sandra Coney, Waitakere Ranges Local Board, were in attendance to address the committee in regards to Item 8: Engagement on options in response to flood safety risks in Piha

Resolution number ENV/2019/17

MOVED by Cr L Cooper, seconded by Chairperson P Hulse:

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) thank Greg Presland and Sandra Coney from the Waitakere Ranges Local Board for their presentation and attendance regarding the options in response to flood safety risk in Piha.

CARRIED

7 Extraordinary Business

There was no extraordinary business.

8 Engagement on options in response to flood safety risk in Piha

Resolution number ENV/2019/18

MOVED by Cr L Cooper, seconded by Chairperson P Hulse:

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) agree to engage the Waitakere Ranges Local Board, Piha community and landowners as well as Te Kawerau a Maki and Ngāti Whātua on a long-list of options in response to a high flood safety risk in Piha.

b) request a report back to the Environment and Community Committee on 11 June 2019 with a summary of the engagement findings and decision of the next steps for the options.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 11.27 am and reconvened at 11.37 am.

9 Safe Communities Accreditation for Auckland: Approval of Application

A PowerPoint presentation was provided. A copy has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Resolution number ENV/2019/19

MOVED by Cr E Collins, seconded by Cr C Casey:

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the Auckland Safe Communities accreditation application (Attachment A to the agenda report).

CARRIED

Attachments

A 12 March 2019, Environment and Community Committee: Item 9 - Safe Communities Accreditation for Auckland: Approval of Application Presentation

Precedence of Business

Resolution number ENV/2019/20
MOVED by Cr W Walker, seconded by Chairperson P Hulse:

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) agree that Item 11: Tennis Auckland Region - Redevelopment of ASB Tennis Arena - Grant Allocation be accorded precedence at this time.

CARRIED

11 Tennis Auckland Region - Redevelopment of ASB Tennis Arena - Grant Allocation

Note: changes were incorporated under clause d) with the agreement of the meeting.

Resolution number ENV/2019/21

MOVED by Cr D Simpson, seconded by Cr W Walker:

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) acknowledge the work undertaken by Tennis Auckland Region to progress a redevelopment plan that increases seating capacity to the minimum requirements of the international professional tennis bodies, with the view to securing future tournaments in Auckland.

b) confirm and approve the $3.0 million grant incorporated into the 2012 Long Term Plan for the redevelopment of the West and South stands - Stages 1A and 1B of the revised development plan.

c) approve the allocation of $2.5 million from allocated grant funding to the redevelopment of the West and South stands - Stages 1A and 1B of the revised development plan.

d) delegate the General Manager Parks, Sport and Recreation to prepare a Development Funding Agreement documenting the grant to Tennis Auckland Region, noting that the total grant pool of $5.5 million is recommended to be allocated as: $3.0 million to Stage 1A, and $2.5 million to Stage 1B.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 12.45 pm and reconvened 1.21 pm.
Cr J Bartley, Cr E Collins, Cr D Newman and Cr J Walker were not present.

10 Adoption of the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029

Cr C Casey, Cr R Clow and Cr C Darby declared interests but had no conflict with this item.

A PowerPoint presentation was provided. A copy has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Cr D Newman returned to the meeting at 1.28 pm.
Cr E Collins returned to the meeting at 1.28 pm.
Cr J Bartley returned to the meeting at 1.34 pm.

Note: clauses j) and k) were added with the agreement of the meeting.

The motion was put in parts.

Resolution number ENV/2019/22

MOVED by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Filipaina:

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) determine that it is satisfied that the consultation that has taken place in relation to the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 complies with section 72(1) of the Biosecurity Act 1993

CARRIED
Resolution number ENV/2019/23
MOVED by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Filipaina:
That the Environment and Community Committee:
b) approve the preparation of a final plan in accordance with section 73(1) of the Biosecurity Act 1993
CARRIED

Resolution number ENV/2019/24
MOVED by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Filipaina:
That the Environment and Community Committee:
c) determine under section 100(1) of the Biosecurity Act 1993 that Auckland Council is the management agency for the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029
CARRIED

Resolution number ENV/2019/25
MOVED by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Filipaina:
That the Environment and Community Committee:
d) determine that it is satisfied that the contents of the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 meet the requirements of section 74 of the Biosecurity Act 1993
CARRIED

Resolution number ENV/2019/26
MOVED by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Filipaina:
That the Environment and Community Committee:
e) adopt the final Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 (Attachment A to the agenda report)
CARRIED

Resolution number ENV/2019/27
MOVED by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Filipaina:
That the Environment and Community Committee:
f) incorporate by reference the Pest Free Warrant conditions for commercial transport operators moving people or goods within the Hauraki Gulf Controlled Area as part of the final Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 under part 6 of the Biosecurity Act.
CARRIED

Resolution number ENV/2019/28
MOVED by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Filipaina:
That the Environment and Community Committee:
g) adopt the agenda report and attachments as Auckland Council’s report under section 75 of Biosecurity Act.
CARRIED

Resolution number ENV/2019/29
MOVED by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Filipaina:
That the Environment and Community Committee:
h) determine under section 100T of the Biosecurity Act 1993 that the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 will be funded by a combination of general
rates (approximately $85m over 10 years) and targeted rates (approximately $161m over 10 years):

CARRIED

Resolution number ENV/2019/30
MOVED by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Filipaina:
That the Environment and Community Committee:

i) delegate to the Chair of the Environment and Community Committee the power to edit the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 to correct any identified errors or typographical edits, and to give effect to changes to the final plan requested by the committee at this meeting.

CARRIED

Resolution number ENV/2019/31
MOVED by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Filipaina:
That the Environment and Community Committee:

j) authorise the Chief Executive and General Counsel to fix the councils official seal to the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 in accordance with section 77 of the Biosecurity Act.

CARRIED

Resolution number ENV/2019/32
MOVED by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Filipaina:
That the Environment and Community Committee:

k) support the establishment of a working group including SPCA and cat welfare agencies to establish best practice guidelines for cat ownership and welfare.

CARRIED

Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 1.8.6, the following councillors requested that their dissenting votes be recorded against clause e):

- Cr G Sayers
- Cr D Simpson

Note: Cr G Sayers requested that the minutes record that he does not support cats being included in the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029.

Attachments

A 12 March 2019, Environment and Community Committee: Item 10 Adoption of the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029, presentation

Note: Item 11: Tennis Auckland Region - Redevelopment of ASB Tennis Arena - Grant Allocation was considered before Item 10: Adoption of the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029.

12 Proposed land exchange at Cadness Loop Reserve, Northcote

Note: clause c) was added with agreement of the meeting.

Resolution number ENV/2019/33
MOVED by Cr C Darby, seconded by Cr R Hills:
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the exchange of 525m$\text{^2}$ of land in Cadness Loop Reserve (subject to survey) with 525m$\text{^2}$ of the land at 68-74 and 76-82 Cadness Street, Northcote (subject to survey) owned by Housing New Zealand Corporation.

b) recommend to the Finance and Performance Committee that, under delegated authority, it authorise the disposal of 525m$\text{^2}$ of land within Lot 393 DP 48335 to complete the land exchange.
c) note the playground and basketball court are outside of the land exchange process but all endeavours will be made to reinstate these into a reconfigured reserve at no cost to the Kaipatiki Local Board.

CARRIED

13 Submission to the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) and the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (EECA) technical report “Process Heat in New Zealand: Opportunities and barriers to lowering emissions”.

A presentation was provided. A copy has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Cr M Lee left the meeting at 2.53 pm.
Cr R Hills left the meeting at 2.53 pm.
IMSB Member J Brown left the meeting at 3.00 pm.
Cr R Clow left the meeting at 3.08 pm.

Resolution number ENV/2019/34

MOVED by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Cr W Walker:

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) retrospectively endorse the officer submission on process heat to MBIE's and EECA's technical document, 'Process Heat in New Zealand: Opportunities and barriers to lowering emissions'.

CARRIED

Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 1.8.6 the following members requested that their dissenting votes be recorded:

- IMSB Member R Blair
- Cr C Fletcher
- Cr D Newman
- Cr Sayers
- Cr Simpson

Attachments


14 Summary of Environment and Community Committee Information - updates, memos and briefings - 12 March 2019

Resolution number ENV/2019/35

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson A Filipaina, seconded by Cr D Simpson:

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the summary of the Environment and Community Committee information report – 12 March 2019.

CARRIED

15 Consideration of Extraordinary Items

There was no consideration of extraordinary items.
3.08 pm

The Chairperson thanked Members for their attendance and attention to business and declared the meeting closed.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD AT A MEETING OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEE HELD ON

DATE: .................................................................

CHAIRPERSON: .............................................................
21 May 2019

To whom it may concern:

This letter is to confirm that HLC (2017) Limited (‘HLC’) is a wholly owned subsidiary of Housing New Zealand Corporation (‘HNZC’).

HLC and Auckland Council have recently agreed to a land exchange to facilitate the reorientation of the existing Cadness Loop Reserve, in accordance with the HLC master plan for the Northcote redevelopment. The land exchange would see sections 7 (currently private land held by HNZC) exchanged for section 5 (currently Open Space zone held by Council and part of the existing ‘Cadness Loop Reserve’). Parallel processes are also taking place to stop the existing legal road within sections 1 and 2. Through the road stopping process, HLC will acquire section 2 from Auckland Transport. Auckland Council will acquire section 4 from HLC/HNZC.

In accordance with the land exchange agreed between Auckland Council and HLC (2017) Ltd, and the acquisition processes also taking place to give effect to the Northcote Masterplan to create the reoriented reserve; a Private Plan Change request (PPC) is sought to undertake the following changes to the planning maps:

- Section 2 changes from legal road to THAB;
- Section 5 changes from Open Space – Informal Recreation to Terrace Housing and Apartment zone.
- Any consequential amendments to the planning maps to appropriately reconcile the zoning with the boundaries of the applicant’s land.

This is illustrated in Attachment 1. The land affected is across the existing land located at southern half of the Cadness Loop Reserve and Cadness Loop Road. The road has no address or legal description, but the reserve has 96 Cadness Street, Northcote and the legal description is Lot 393 DP 48335. The land exchange and proposed rezoning is shown in the attached plan prepared to support the private Plan Change request. Rezoning of land acquired by the Council will be undertaken through rolling plan updates at a future date, such that the PPC is limited only to the land (sections 2 and 5) to be acquired by HLC.

Therefore, in respect of the Private Plan Change request being made by HLC to rezone existing Open Space zone land (and legal road) to the Terrace Housing and Apartment zone, HNZC provide their implicit approval to that proposal as dominant landowner within Northcote, and as owner of the land particularly affected by the Private Plan Change request.

Acting under delegated authority,

[Signature]
Brendon Liggett
Development Planning Manager
Housing New Zealand Corporation
Attachment 1 – Proposed AUP Zoning Change as part of the Private Plan Change Request
Hi Ross,

Please refer to the below correspondence from Tamsyn, regarding consultation with residents. This reiterates my comments to you over the phone last week, that much of consultation and greenway-specific discussions (of which the Cadness Loop Reserve forms a part of) have been undertaken in concert with the wider consultation on the Northcote redevelopment.

Please let me know if you require any further information in regards to the above.

Kind regards

Mark Thode | Principal Planner | MNZP
Campbell Brown Planning Limited
Level 1, 56 Brown Street, Ponsonby | PO Box 147001, Ponsonby, Auckland 1144
Cell 021 811 885 | DDI - Ph 09 394 1698 | Ph 09 378 4936 | mark@campbellbrown.co.nz | www.campbellbrown.co.nz

Hi Mark,

This email is to address Council’s query around consultation that has occurred, specifically with Housing New Zealand tenants that may be impacted by the Cadness Loop plan change.

I can confirm that all tenants residing in Northcote at the time were visited in September 2016 to be advised of the redevelopment of the Housing New Zealand land within Northcote. Since then a number of tenants have relocated, are in the process of being relocated or are yet to commence the relocation process. Those tenants directly affected by the plan change and residing on Cadness St have either moved, are in the process of moving or are yet to accept an alternative home.

Further HLC has communicated with the general Northcote community throughout the 3 years HLC has been working in Northcote. This communication has been carried out through various channels including community open days and events, the issue of four “Everyday Northcote” magazines, website and email updates, manned information centre based in the Northcote town centre, etc. Further the design of the Greenway has been undertaken in consultation with Mana Whenua (specifically Panuku’s forum) and a community reference group who have influenced the outcome on the Greenway.

Regards

Tamsyn McDonald
Associate Project Director
Hi Sophia

Please find attached a summary timeline of Lwi engagement to-date through the wider Awataha Greenway process. The Cadness Loop Reserve is a key part of that wider strategy and delivery so HLC advise me that consultation on the reserve has been taking place through those wider discussions. Those discussions are still ongoing as noted in the PCR report, and we will forward any relevant correspondence through as it becomes available.

Kind regards

Mark Thode | Principal Planner | MNP

Campbell Brown Planning Limited
Level 1, 56 Brown Street, Ponsonby | PO Box 147001, Ponsonby, Auckland 1144
Cell 021 811 885 | DDI - Ph 09 394 1698 | Ph 09 378 4936 | mark@campbellbrown.co.nz | www.campbellbrown.co.nz

Disclaimer: This electronic message together with any attachments is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, do not copy, disclose or use the contents in any way. Please also advise us to return email that you have received the message and that it is genuine. We are not responsible for any changes made to this message and/or any attachments after sending. We use anti-virus software but exclude liability for viruses or anything similar in this email or any attachment. Views expressed in this email may not be those of Campbell Brown Planning Limited.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.
Nothcote Masterplan Engagement:

- HLC has over the past 12 months established its partnership arrangement’s with Mana Whenua across the AHP. This has been advanced via individual relationship agreements (kawenata) as well as the institution of collective and individual engagement forums that now meet regularly with HLC staff.

- HLC has developed a co-design process with Mana Whenua for the development of a guidelines series informed by mātauranga Māori, including a design guideline, an environmental standards framework, a social outcomes programme and commercial/investment strategies.

- Engagement with Mana Whenua across the Northcote precinct is evolving, and we are currently engaging directly via HLC’s engagement forums, the Panuku forum for the Awataha Greenway project, with individual Mana Whenua through the commissioning of cultural values assessments (CVA) as well as in response to statutory processes. In addition to this, we are working directly with Mana Whenua including the Tāmaki Collective - Limited Partnership to explore commercial/investment opportunities in the Northcote precinct.

- Design input into the masterplan is progressing via HLC’s Marutūahu and Ngāti Whātua/Kawerau ā Maki Mana Whenua collective forums both of which meet separately with HLC on a fortnightly and monthly basis respectively. HLC will continue to work with the collectives as well as individual iwi to develop its cultural design response specific to the Northcote precinct.
1.5 Mana Whenua Engagement Timeline

The following engagement timeline illustrates where and how Mana Whenua have been involved in the design process and development of this tool.
Proposed land exchange at Cadness Loop Reserve in Northcote

On 11 September 2018, the Environment and Community Committee resolved that Auckland Council publicly notify, under section 15(2) of the Reserves Act 1977, the intention to undertake a land exchange between 525m² of Cadness Loop Reserve and 525m² of land at 68-74 and 76-82 Cadness Street, Northcote.

Housing New Zealand Corporation are redeveloping this area and the proposed land exchange along with a land acquisition and road stopping will reconfigure and enlarge Cadness Loop Reserve.

The intended land exchange will go towards:

- increasing the size of the reserve from approximately 1,756m² to 3,215m²
- improved safety of the reserve
- providing increased recreational opportunities for the community

As shown in diagram 1 below, Cadness Loop Reserve currently comprises sections 5 and 6 with an area of 1,756m² (orange shading).

Diagram 1
The intended land exchange will swap section 5 for section 7, which is represented in diagram 2. The proposed reconfigured and expanded reserve is shaded in green – there would be an increase in reserve area from 1,756m² to 3,215m².

Diagram 2
Hi Mark,

Apologies for the delay in responding; I was on leave last week. Yes, your understanding is correct. The priority will be to request sections 5 and 2 be zoned as THAB. The remaining areas can be picked up in our omnibus POS plan changes, the next of which will be around August I’m advised.

Regards
Dave

David Sanders | Team Leader
North, West and Islands Planning Unit,
Plans and Places
Auckland Council, 135 Albert Street, CBD.
mob 027 217 2151
E david.sanders@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Visit our website: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Hi David

Hope you are well. You may recall a meeting we had late January around a Private Plan Change by HLC to rezone land as a result of the land exchange process taking place with Cadness Loop Reserve.

Following our meeting (granted this was some time ago now), my understanding was that we were advised to only make a plan change request for Section 5 and Section 2 (road). That is essentially the pink area in ‘image004’ as shown in the attached. The remaining areas would be dealt with through Council’s rolling plan updates at a future date and following the eventual subdivision application to form and vest roads surrounding the new Cadness Reserve etc.

Are you able to please confirm that Plans and Places are still comfortable with that approach, rather than all the land affected by the exchange.

That obviously makes things a lot simpler on my end, but quite important there is a common understanding there.
Thanks so much

Mark Thode | Principal Planner | MNZPI

Campbell Brown Planning Limited
Level 1, 56 Brown Street, Ponsonby | PO Box 147001, Ponsonby, Auckland 1144
Cell 021 811 885 | DDI - Ph 09 394 1698 | Ph 09 378 4936 | mark@campbellbrown.co.nz | www.campbellbrown.co.nz

------Original Appointment------
From: Mel Chow [mailto:mel.chow@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz]
Sent: Friday, 25 January 2019 11:12 a.m.
To: Mel Chow; Allina Winnier; Ezra Barwell; Mark Thode; David Sanders; Gurv Singh; Tamsyn McDonald
Subject: Proposed Plan Change around Cadness Loop Reserve
When: Wednesday, 30 January 2019 9:00 a.m.-10:00 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington.
Where: RES CEN ALBERT ST L28 R8 (seats 10)
Importance: High

Dear all,

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the plan change application for the land at Cadness Loop reserve that involves the land swap.

Proposed Section 5 and Section 2 will need to be rezoned from open space zone (section 5) to Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone, and from road reserve (section 2) to Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone.

I hope this time suits everyone.

Kind regards,
Mel

Existing: << File: image007.png >>

Proposed: << File: image001.jpg >> << File: image003.jpg >>
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Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) - Private Plan Change Request from James Kirkpatrick Group Limited at 1, 3, 5, 7, 10 and 12 Florence Carter Avenue, Flat Bush

File No.: CP2019/07381

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To consider the private plan change request from James Kirkpatrick Group Limited (the applicant) to rezone 9.34 hectares of land at 1, 3, 5, 7, 10 and 12 Florence Carter Avenue, Flat Bush from Business – Light Industry to Business – Mixed Use in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report considers a private plan change request (the request) received on 19 November 2018 from James Kirkpatrick Group Limited. The request seeks to rezone 9.34ha of land at 1, 3, 5, 7, 10 and 12 Florence Carter Avenue, Flat Bush from Business – Light Industry to Business – Mixed Use in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part). The request also seeks to introduce new precinct provisions over the subject site.

3. Under clause 25 of Part 2 of Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), the council is required to make a decision that either:
   a) adopts the request as if it were a proposed plan made by the Council, which must then be processed in accordance with the provisions of Part 1 of Schedule 1 (clause 25(2)(a)); or
   b) accepts the private plan change request, in whole or in part, which then triggers a requirement to notify the request, or part of the request, under clause 25 (clause 25(2)(b)); or
   c) reject the private plan change request in whole or in part, in reliance on one of the limited grounds set out in clause 25(4); or
   d) decide to deal with the request as if it were an application for a resource consent (clause 25(3)).

4. It is recommended that the private plan change request is accepted under clause 25(2)(b) and notified for submissions.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) accept the private plan change request by James Kirkpatrick Group Limited for the rezoning of land (comprising 9.34 ha) at 1, 3, 5, 7, 10 and 12 Florence Carter Avenue, Flat Bush included as Attachment A to the agenda report pursuant to clause 25(2)(b) of Part 2 of Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991 for the following reasons:
   i) having regard to relevant case law the request does not meet the limited grounds for rejection under clause 25(4); and
   ii) it is more appropriate to accept the request than 'adopt' it or treat it as a resource consent application.
b) delegate authority to the Manager Central and South Planning to undertake the required notification and other statutory processes associated with processing the private plan change request by James Kirkpatrick Group Limited pursuant to Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991.

**Horopaki Context**

5. The site subject to the request is located at 1, 3, 5, 7, 10 and 12 Florence Carter Avenue, Flat Bush, at the corner of Ormiston Road and Te Irirangi Drive (refer to Figure 1). The subject site contains an area of 9.34 hectares and is currently vacant and grassed. The land is generally flat, with a gentle slope towards the northern boundary.

6. The subject site comprises six vacant lots recently created by an approved subdivision consent. All of the lots have access from Florence Carter Avenue and respectively front Ormiston Road to the north, Te Irirangi Drive to the east and Rongomai Park to the south.

7. To the north of the sites, on the opposite side of Ormiston Rd, is an area of sites zoned Mixed Use, described as the Bishop Lenihan Place subdivision. All of these sites have been developed with predominantly 1-2 level buildings used for retail, commercial and industrial uses.

8. Diagonally across from Te Irirangi Drive is an area of land zoned Open Space covered in native bush, centred by a stream.

9. Across Te Irirangi Drive to the east is land zoned Business – Local Centre, known as the ‘Botany Junction’ shopping centre. The centre contains several two-storey retail/commercial buildings and ancillary parking. Immediately to the east and south of this shopping centre are several three-storey apartment buildings, with a Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone. To the south-east the area is zoned Mixed Housing Urban.

10. To the south is Rongomai Park, zoned Open Space – Sport and Active Recreation zone, and currently used as sports fields.

11. To the west, running for approximately 700m, sites on both the north and south of Ormiston Road are zoned Light Industry, with a wide range of uses from childcare centres to industrial uses.

*Figure 1: Locality Plan – plan change area in yellow*
Private Plan Change Request

12. The request was lodged on 19 November 2018 (see Attachment A) and seeks to rezone 1, 3, 5, 7, 10 and 12 Florence Carter Avenue, Flat Bush from Business – Light Industry to Business – Mixed Use.

13. The request seeks to establish a Business – Mixed Use zone which according to the applicant aims ‘to provide an appropriately scaled mixed use centre, with a range of supporting activities that are complementary, well designed and integrated with the surrounding area’. The request also seeks to introduce new precinct provisions over the subject site. The precinct provisions would limit the gross floor areas for retail, office and commercial services in order to avoid adverse effects to nearby centres, provide for an additional height variation control within the precinct that will change the existing 20m height limit to between 20m and 28m and to manage any potential transport effects should they arise. These precinct provisions will apply to the entirety of the rezoning request.

14. The proposed rezoning of land at 1, 3, 5, 7, 10 and 12 Florence Carter Avenue, Flat Bush is shown in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2: Existing zones under the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) – plan change area in red
Figure 3: Proposed rezoning under the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) – plan change area in red

15. The applicant has provided documentation relating to the following in support of the request:
   - Private Plan Change Request
   - Certificates of Title
   - Section 32 evaluation report
   - Integrated Transport Assessment
   - Economic impact assessment
   - Urban Design Statement
   - Acoustic Assessment
   - Infrastructure and flood report
   - Ecology report
16. The subject sites are also subject to a number of approved land use resource consents and whilst unimplemented, do provide for a wide range of activities, including traveller’s accommodation, a hotel, retail and office activities. These consents are still valid at this time. As such, the request is also seeking through this plan change to bring the zoning of the subject site into better alignment with the existing approved consents and likely future use of the subject sites.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

Resource Management Act

17. The process for considering private plan change requests is set out in Part 2 of Schedule 1 to the RMA. A request can be made to the appropriate local authority by any person under clause 21 of Schedule 1. After a request has been lodged, a local authority can request further information under clause 23, and modify a request under clause 24, but only with the applicant's agreement.

18. Under clause 23(6), if an applicant refuses to provide any requested further or additional information, a local authority that considers it has insufficient information to enable it to consider or approve the request, may reject the request or decide not to approve the plan change requested.

19. Following requests from council for further information, additional information was received on 15 March 2019 in relation to planning, urban design, transport and economics matters. At the time of preparing this report the council and the applicant are in the process of finalising the outcomes of the additional information requests in relation to transport matters. None of the information requested is material to this stage of the plan change process. The information being sought is primarily to further refine the specificity of the precinct and to provide a reasonable degree of certainty for how effects can be managed.

20. While there are a number of matters that need to be resolved, a fine-grained merits assessment of the request has not been considered in this report. Should the request be adopted or accepted by council, such matters would be assessed through the submission and hearing process or for non-RMA matters, resolved in parallel to the plan change process.

21. Under clause 25, after receiving the request, receiving all required information and modifying the request (where relevant), the local authority is required to make a decision to either:
   a) adopt the request as if it were a proposed plan made by the council, which must then be processed in accordance with the provisions of Part 1 of Schedule 1 (clause 25(2)(a)); or
   b) accept the private plan change request, in whole or in part, which then triggers a requirement to notify the request, or part of the request, under clause 25 (clause 25(2)(b)); or
   c) reject the private plan change request in whole or in part, in reliance on one of the limited grounds set out in clause 25(4); or
   d) decide to deal with the request as if it were an application for a resource consent (clause 25(3)).

22. See Attachment B for the full wording of the clauses that make up Part 2 of Schedule 1 to the RMA.
Options available to the council

23. Council staff consider that the applicant has provided sufficient information to enable the request to be considered, and so do not consider the ground of rejection in clause 23(6) to be available. The next sections of this report assess the various options available to the council under clause 25.

**Option 1 - Reject the private plan change request, in whole or in part (clause 25(4))**

24. The council has the power to reject a private plan change request, in whole or in part, in reliance on one of the limited grounds set out in clause 25(4). If the private plan change request is rejected by the council, the applicant has the ability to appeal that decision to the Environment Court under clause 27 of Schedule 1.

25. The grounds for rejection under clause 25(4) are as follows:

a) the request or part of the request is frivolous or vexatious; or

b) within the last two years, the substance of the request or part of the request:
   
   i. has been considered and given effect to, or rejected by, the local authority or the Environment Court; or
   
   ii. has been given effect to by regulations made under section 360A; or

   c) the request or part of the request is not in accordance with sound resource management practice; or

   d) the request or part of the request would make the policy statement or plan inconsistent with Part 5; or

   e) in the case of a proposed change to a policy statement or plan, the policy statement or plan has been operative for less than two years.

Is the request frivolous or vexatious?

26. The private plan change request contains a comprehensive section 32 report evaluation, including an assessment of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) objectives and policies, and a sufficiently detailed assessment of environmental effects. The request is also accompanied by a range of specialist assessments in relation to the key matters considered to be material to the request, including transport, economic effects and urban design/landscape. The request enables the nature of the plan change and its effects to be reasonably understood.

27. It is therefore recommended that the council **not reject** the private plan change request on the basis that it is frivolous or vexatious.

Has the substance of the request been considered and given effect to or rejected by the council within the last two years?

28. These provisions largely seek to discourage repetitive private plan change requests that are substantially the same, with the associated costs to the council and the community. A similar request (to rezone the same land to the Business – General Business Zone) was considered during the Auckland Unitary Plan hearings process.

29. However, it has been more than two years since the council made its decisions in response to the recommendations made by the Auckland Unitary Plan Independent Hearings Panel.

30. It is therefore recommended that the council **not reject** the request on the basis of this ground of rejection.
Has the substance of the request been given effect to by regulations made under section 360A?

31. Section 360A of the RMA relates to regulations amending regional coastal plans pertaining to aquaculture activities. The substance of this private plan change request or part of the request, being rezoning land from a business zone to another business zone does not relate to section 360A of the RMA.

32. It is therefore recommended that the council not reject the request on the basis of this ground of rejection.

Is the request in accordance with sound resource management practice?

33. The term "sound resource management practice" is an often used planning term but is not defined in the RMA. The High Court in Malory Corporation Limited v Rodney District Council (CIV-2009-404-005572), where the issue on appeal was determining the correct interpretation of clause 25(4), considered this term in light of clause 25(4)(c) of Schedule 1 and stated:

"... the words "sound resource management practice" should, if they are to be given any coherent meaning, be tied to the Act's purpose and principles. I agree too with the Court's observation that the words should be limited to only a coarse scale merits assessment, and that a private plan change which does not accord with the Act's purposes and principles will not cross the threshold for acceptance or adoption."

34. The applicant has considered the zoning options for the site and concluded that the proposed rezoning along with the introduction of new precinct provisions will result in a mixed use development which makes a positive contribution to the existing mixed business and residential character and amenity of the area, while adverse effects of future development proposals can be managed through the provisions of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part).

32. The request includes a number of specialist reports, which all support the proposed plan change. Council has consulted Auckland Transport, Healthy Waters and Watercare and engaged experts to consider the plan change. While there are aspects of the private plan change request that need to be tested through the submission and hearings process, the scope and extent of the changes sought do not, in themselves, threaten the purpose and principles of the RMA when considered at this stage.

35. Having reviewed the applicant's planning and specialist reports and taken the purpose and principles of RMA into account, the private plan change request is considered to be in accordance with sound resource management practice. It is therefore recommended that the council not reject the private plan change on the basis that it is contrary to sound resource management practice.

Would the request or part of the request make the policy statement or plan inconsistent with Part 5 of the RMA?

36. Part 5 sets out the role and purpose of planning documents created under the RMA, including that they must assist a local authority to give effect to the sustainable management purpose of the RMA. The private plan change request will not make the Auckland Unitary Plan inconsistent with Part 5 of the RMA.

37. It is therefore recommended that the council not reject the private plan change request on the basis that the substance of the request would make the Auckland Unitary Plan inconsistent with Part 5 of the RMA.

Has the district plan to which the request relates been operative for less than two years?

38. The district plan provisions of the Auckland Unitary Plan relevant to this request were made operative on 15 November 2016. The provisions have therefore been operative for more than two years.
39. It is therefore recommended that the council not reject the private plan change request on the basis that the relevant parts of the Auckland Unitary Plan have been operative for less than two years.

**Option 2 - Decide to deal with the request as if it were an application for a resource consent**

40. The council can, in some circumstances, decide to deal with a private plan change request as if it were an application for resource consent. However, in this case, the private plan change request seeks to rezone the site from Business – Light Industry to Business – Mixed Use zone and introduce precinct provisions to manage use and development. It is considered that the most appropriate process for achieving rezoning for this mixed-use development of the site is through a plan change process.

41. It is therefore recommended that the council not decide to deal with the request as if it were an application for resource consent.

**Option 3 - Adopt the request, or part of the request, as if it were a proposed plan made by the council itself**

42. The council is able to decide to adopt the request and process it as though it were a Council initiated proposed plan change. A decision to adopt triggers the process set out in Part 1 of Schedule 1, which would then require the council to consult as required in clauses 3 to 3C of Part 1.

43. Following consultation, the council would then need to notify the proposed plan change for submissions and conduct a hearing into submissions, if required. If a request is adopted, all costs associated with the plan change would rest with the council. It is relevant to note that the applicant has not requested that the council adopts the private plan change.

44. Given that the applicant has not requested that the council adopts the request and that the council would need to account for all costs associated with the adopted request, it is not recommended that the council decide to adopt the private plan change request.

**Option 4 - Accept the private plan change request, in whole or in part, and proceed to notify the request, or part of the request, under clause 26**

45. If the council accepts the request, in whole or in part, it must then proceed to notify the request, or part of the request under clause 26. After the submission period has closed, the council would need to hold a hearing to consider any submissions, and a decision would then be made by the council in relation to the request in accordance with Schedule 1 of the RMA. All costs associated with the request (including notification and any hearing) would rest with the applicant.

46. This is the only remaining option and is supported on the basis that the request does not meet the criteria for rejection under clause 25(4) of Schedule 1 to the RMA, having regard to relevant case law, and it is more appropriate to accept the request than adopt it or treat it as a resource consent application.

47. It is therefore recommended that the council accepts the private plan change request.

**Conclusion**

48. Having carefully assessed the request against the relevant matters set out in the RMA and associated case law, it is recommended that council decide to accept the request and notify it for submissions. If accepted, a further assessment by council staff would take place prior to and during the course of the subsequent hearing.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

49. Watercare Services has advised that in principle there do not appear to be any water or wastewater constraints that would prevent the rezoning of the site. However, it advises that Watercare Services will need to undertake a capacity assessment for water and wastewater at the resource consent stage, and that the cost of any infrastructure upgrades that are required would need to be met by the applicant.

50. Auckland Transport has reviewed the private plan change request and has not reported any fundamental constraints which would prevent the plan change from being accepted. AT has provided detailed feedback and identified several transport issues where further information will be required. Auckland Transport will review the response when it is available and will continue to be involved in the plan change process.

51. Healthy Waters has been sent a copy of the private plan change and accompanying infrastructure assessment for review. No issues of concern have been raised.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe

Local impacts and local board views 52. The site subject to the request is located within the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board area. The views of both the Ōtara-Papatoetoe and Howick Local Boards (due to close proximity to the subject site) were sought on the private plan change request following lodgment of the plan change with council.

53. The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board provided a memo to Council dated 12 December 2018, noting their support for the private plan change. In providing their support the board has requested consideration on the following matters:

- Provision of community spaces (eg hall and pocket parks)
- Provision of easy public access and interface between this development and Rongomai Park, including good design on the boundary
- Public transport requirements - if this is to be a retail and residential area then public transport must be factored into the design, flowing through the development, and future proofing for Te Irirangi light rail
- (Advocacy) Encourage the group to recruit locals for the range of jobs that the development will create (across the range, not just in construction). This may not be a planning issue/requirement but is something the local board would like to strongly advocate for and communicate to this applicant as it will meet identified needs in the local community in this area.
- Impact of proposed height on Rongomai Park specifically in relation to blocking light/shadow. The local board would oppose a height that would diminish the public use of the park

54. A number of the above matters are outside the scope of what can be considered under this request whilst others have been adequately addressed through the range of specialist assessments accompanying this request. Notwithstanding this position the applicant has advised that they have made a commitment to meet with the Local Board once all submissions are received: this will be honoured once they get to that position.

55. No comments have been received from the Howick Local Board.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

56. On 17 April 2017, a number of amendments to the RMA came into force which place an increased focus on engagement and consultation with iwi authorities as part of various plan-making processes. This is particularly the case for plan change processes that are initiated or adopted by the Council. In relation to private plan change requests, although engagement with mana whenua and relevant iwi authorities is encouraged before lodgement under clause 21, it is not clear whether it is a mandatory requirement under Part 2 of Schedule 1. If the council accepts a private plan change request for notification, it is not required to complete any additional pre-notification steps.

58. The applicant has advised that it has engaged 11 iwi groups (see below). The proposed rezoning information including plans were sent to the iwi groups via email, providing an opportunity for queries and feedback on 17 September 2018, before the plan change request was lodged with the council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mana Whenua Group</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Pāoa</td>
<td>Defer to other Mana Whenua groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara</td>
<td>Defer to Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki</td>
<td>No objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Maru</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Tamaoho</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Tamaterā</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Te Ata</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Ākitai Waiohua</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato - Tainui</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. If the council accepts the plan change for notification, the iwi groups engaged by the applicant will have the opportunity to make submissions on the private plan change on issues that are important to them.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

60. If accepted, the council’s costs associated with processing the private plan change request would be met by the applicant.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

61. The only risk associated with the recommendations made in this report is a judicial review by a third party. This risk is considered to be very low and mitigated by the analysis provided in this report.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

62. If the private plan change is accepted for notification, the implementation of this decision will follow the process set out in clause 26 of Schedule 1 of the RMA. This requires that the private plan change is notified within four months of being accepted, unless this time frame is waived in accordance with section 37 of the RMA.
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PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE

1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 12 Florence Carter Avenue, Flatbush

JKGL Group Ltd
1. THE APPLICANT AND PROPERTY DETAILS

Site Address: No.'s 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 12 Florence Carter Avenue, Flatbush (Formerly part of 79 Ormiston Rd), Flat Bush

Applicant's Name: JKGL Group Ltd

Address for Service: MHG. Box 37964 Parnell, Auckland 1151. Attention: Hamish Firth

Legal Description: Lot 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 DP 508357,

Site Area: 93444m² (approx.)

Operative District Plan: Auckland Unitary Plan

Zone: Light Industry

Precinct: N/A

Overlays: N/A

Controls: Macroinvertebrate Rural and Urban

Modification: NOR No.7 Proposed Northern Runway

Designation: Airspace Restriction ID 1102

Description of proposal: Plan change to rezone land from Light Industry to Mixed Use with height variation and maximum GFA controls as per the attached proposed plan being Appendix 1.
2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 BACKGROUND

The land subject to the plan change request (the site) is located on the corner of Te Irirangi Dr and Ormiston Rd in a commercial portion of Flatbush. The sites were formerly part of a subdivision of 79 Ormiston Rd, which gave rise to 12 Lots and a new road being Florence Carter Avenue. Six of the lots form part of the plan change as noted on the attached proposed plan. All of the 9.344Ha (approx.) land subject to the plan change request, which is owned by the applicant, is vacant.

The balance of the subdivision (2, 4, 6, 8 Florence Carter Avenue), adjacent to 55 Ormiston Rd are not subject to this plan change request. The applicant and owner recently obtained resource consents for various discretionary activities in the light industry zone.

2.2. PROPOSED AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN PROCESS AND CONSENT PROCESS

Under the notified version of the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (‘PAUP’), the land was zoned Light Industry. Through submissions on the PAUP, the previous owner requested that the site be rezoned General Business. However, the current owner of the site did not wish to pursue the site to be zoned General Business.

It was the intention of the current owner to develop the site in a way that maximised the previous Operative plan’s zoning and the site’s location being on a major intersection. As such, a number of resource consents were approved for a wide range of activities including traveller’s accommodation, hotel use and retail. These consents are still valid at this time.

The site was previously known as 79 Ormiston Rd. A 12 lot subdivision, referenced as 49033 & SP12145, including a new road, was approved on the 16th of May 2016. This consent has been given effect to and the individual titles have been issued and the road vested to Auckland Council. The land remains vacant at the behest of the owner.

On three of the sites that adjoin 55 Ormiston Rd (not part of this proposal but owned by the applicant) resource consent, through a notified process, under the PAUP have been recently issued, for a supermarket, retail and department store.
2.3. SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF SURROUNDS

The land subject to this plan change request is flat and comprised of six vacant lots recently created by an approved subdivision consent. All of the lots have access from Florence Carter Avenue and front Ormiston Rd to the east, Te Irirangi Dr to the north and Rongomai Park to the south.

To the north of the sites, on the opposite side of Ormiston Rd, is a pocket of sites zoned Mixed Use, described as the Bishop Lenihan Place subdivision. All of these sites have been development with predominance of 1-2 level buildings used for retail, commercial and industrial uses.

Diagonally across from Te Irirangi Dr is sleeve of land zoned Open space covered in native bush, centred by a stream.

Across Te Irirangi Dr to the east is land zoned Business – Local Centre, known as the ‘Botany Junction’ shopping centre. The centre contains several two-storey retail/commercial buildings and ancillary parking. Immediately to the east of this shopping centre are several three-storey apartment buildings, whilst to the south/south-east is a typical single lot residential zoned and developed subdivision, currently zoned Terrace House and Apartment and Mixed Housing Urban.

To the South is Rongomai Park, zoned Open Space – Sport and Active Recreation zone, and currently used as sports fields.

To the west, running for approximately 700m, sites on both the north and south of Ormiston Road are zoned Light Industry, with a wide range of uses from childcare centres to industrial uses.

Attached in Appendix 2 of this application are the Auckland Council Geo Maps and Unitary Plan maps set out the matters described.
3. STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS

3.1. PLAN CHANGE REQUEST

It is noted that a plan change needs to be prepared in accordance with the requirements of Clause 22 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) which states:

22 Form of request

(1) A request made under clause 21 shall be made to the appropriate local authority in writing and shall explain the purpose of, and reasons for, the proposed plan or change to a policy statement or plan and contain an evaluation report prepared in accordance with section 32 for the proposed plan or change.

(2) Where environmental effects are anticipated, the request shall describe those effects, taking into account clauses 6 and 7 of Schedule 4, in such detail as corresponds with the scale and significance of the actual or potential environmental effects anticipated from the implementation of the change, policy statement, or plan.

Section 32 of the Act sets out the requirements for an evaluation report.

32 Requirements for Evaluation Reports

(1) An evaluation report required under this Act must—

(a) Examine the extent to which the objectives of the proposal being evaluated are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of this Act; and

(b) Examine whether the provisions in the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives by—

(i) identifying other reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives; and

(ii) assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the objectives; and

(iii) summarising the reasons for deciding on the provisions; and
(c) Contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.

(2) An assessment under subsection (1)(b)(ii) must—

(a) identify and assess the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions, including the opportunities for—

(i) economic growth that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and

(ii) employment that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and

(b) if practicable, quantify the benefits and costs referred to in paragraph (a); and

(c) assess the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions.
4. DESCRIPTION OF PLAN CHANGE REQUEST

The proposed amendments to the plan are two changes to the Auckland Unitary Plan (‘AUP’) GIS Viewer (the planning maps):

1. Amend the zone of the subject site from Light Industry to Mixed Use; and
2. Provide for a height variation control.
3. Provide for a maximum total retail GFA control of 15,000m².
4. Provide for a maximum total office GFA control of 15,000m².
5. Provide for a maximum total commercial services control of 2,500m².
6. Provide for a ‘Florence Carter Avenue’ precinct, which will contain the additional rules proposed for the plan change area.

These amendments are also shown on the plans contained in Appendix 1.

4.1. AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN ZONE

The site is currently zoned Light Industry. The Light Industry zone, noted in the zone description as being:

“The Business – Light Industry Zone anticipates industrial activities that do not generate objectionable odour, dust or noise. This includes manufacturing, production, logistics, storage, transport and distribution activities. The anticipated level of amenity is lower than the centres zones, Business – General Business Zone and Business – Mixed Use Zone. Due to the industrial nature of the zone, activities sensitive to air discharges are generally not provided for. The air quality of the zone is managed by the air quality provisions in E14 Air quality”

Provisions for the zone are contained in Chapter H17 of the AUP.

The proposed change to the AUP GIS viewer is to amend the zone to Mixed Use. The Mixed Use zone is “typically located around centres and along corridors served by public transport. It acts as a transition area, in terms of scale and activity, between residential areas and... other business zones. It also applies to areas where there is a need for a compatible mix of residential and employment activities”. Provisions for the Mixed Use zone are contained in Chapter H13 of the AUP.

Amending the zone will provide consistency with the zoning of surrounding land uses, will better enable the type of development that Council has signalled for this area [based on the
AUP zoning pattern) and will also remove a fragmented piece of Light Industrial land that has no connection to the existing consented uses on the sites and on the other Lots created by the recent subdivision of 79 Ormiston Rd.

4.2 AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN CONTROLS

4.2.1 Maximum Height

Under the current Light Industry zoning, the height limit for the site is 20m. The default maximum building height in the Mixed Use zone is 16m with an additional 2m allowed for roof form.

As shown on the proposed plans (Appendix A), a 20m maximum height limit is proposed for the first 24m of frontage to Te Irirangi Drive and Ormiston Road, a 26m maximum height limit is proposed for the next 26m from the road, and for a 24m setback from Rongomai Park. A 28m height limit is proposed for the rest of the sites.

We believe that a height control to alter the maximum permitted height on these sites is appropriate, given the context of the wider Ormiston area. Approximately 1km to the east is the Ormiston Town Centre, which has a maximum permitted height of 32.5m. In addition, given the width of Te Irirangi Drive and the 20m maximum height proposed at these frontages, any potential building dominance to the adjacent residential area will be minimised.

This proposed height variation control is discussed in more detail in the Visual Impact Assessment attached as Appendix 7.

4.2.2 Maximum Retail, Office and Commercial Services GFA

A 15,000m² maximum GFA cap is proposed for both retail and office use within the sites identified under this plan change. As discussed in the Economic Cost-Benefit Analysis provided in Appendix 4, these controls have been proposed to ensure the proposed plan change does not impact the commercial performance of existing centres, particularly the Ormiston Town Centre to the east. Given that the site has 12,000m² of retail and 11,000m² of office space already consented, it is considered that there would not be a discernible difference between the permitted baseline, and the proposed GFA caps.
As commercial services perform a similar function to both office and retail, and have similar potential effects to the environment, a GFA cap of 2,500m² is also proposed for the same reasons stated above.

4.2.3 Florence Carter Avenue Precinct

A precinct is proposed for the plan change area, to be called the Florence Carter Avenue Precinct.

The primary purpose of the precinct is to contain the additional rules and provisions discussed above, in particular the additional height and GFA caps.

In addition, the precinct chapter will outline triggers for when a comprehensive traffic assessment is required, which will in turn inform if and when an upgrade is required to the Ormiston Road and Florence Carter Avenue intersection.
5. STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

5.1. AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN

The AUP is now Operative in Part and is a combined document that provides one comprehensive planning framework for the Auckland Region, replacing the previous district plans, regional plans and regional policy statement. The purpose of the AUP is to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (‘the RMA’) and promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. As stated in the AUP itself, the plan has three key roles:

(1) it describes how the people and communities of the Auckland region will manage Auckland’s natural and physical resources while enabling growth and development and protecting the things people and communities value;

(2) it provides the regulatory framework to help make Auckland a quality place to live, attractive to people and businesses and a place where environmental standards are respected and upheld; and

(3) it is a principal statutory planning document for Auckland. Other relevant planning documents include the Auckland Plan, the Auckland Long-Term Plan and the Auckland Regional Land Transport Plan.

The Plan has a hierarchical framework with regional and district plan provisions required to effect to the Regional Policy Statement (‘RPS’).

The AUP (OIP) sets out Auckland-wide provisions (Chapters A to G), followed by zone and then precinct provisions. The Auckland-wide provisions apply to the use and development of natural and physical resources across the region and the zone provisions manage the use, development and protection of land and the coastal marine area. The plan change only seeks a change to the zone of a group of adjacent and related sites, with the only changes to the zone provisions being a height variation control, and two maximum GFA controls.

With regard to the individual zone objectives and policies, development in the Mixed Use zone is guided by the following objectives and policies of the AUP (OIP):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIXED USE ZONE OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>The proposed plan change will provide for high density residential and employment opportunities in a location that is in close proximity to a Local Centre and the public transport network.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6) Moderate to high intensity residential activities and employment opportunities are provided for, in areas in close proximity to, or which can support the City Centre Zone, Business – Metropolitan Centre Zone,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Business – Town Centre Zone and the public transport network.

(7) Activities within the zone do not compromise the function, role and amenity of the City Centre Zone, Business – Metropolitan Centre Zone, Business – Town Centre Zone and Business – Local Centre Zone.

The proposed GFA caps for office, retail and commercial service use has been provided to ensure future development does not compromise nearby Town Centre and Metropolitan Centre zones.

(8) A mix of compatible residential and non-residential activities is encouraged.

The proposed plan change will enable a mix of compatible residential and commercial uses within the sites.

(9) Business – Mixed Use Zone zoned areas have a high level of amenity

While the proposed plan change will enable a far greater level of amenity than the Light Industry zone, this objective will be more relevant at the resource consent stage, when detailed design proposals can be scrutinised by Council.

### MIXED USE ZONE POLICIES

(16) Locate the Business – Mixed Use Zone in suitable locations within a close walk of the City Centre Zone, Business – Metropolitan Centre Zone and Business – Town Centre Zone or the public transport network.

The sites are directly adjacent to a Local Centre and are within walking distance to the Ormiston Town Centre and the public transport networks, including a future rapid transit line.

(17) Provide for a range of commercial activities that will not compromise the function, role and amenity of the City Centre Zone, Business – Metropolitan Centre Zone, Business – Town Centre Zone and Business – Local Centre Zone, beyond those effects ordinarily associated with trade effects on trade competitors.

The proposed GFA caps for office, retail and commercial service use has been provided to ensure future development does not compromise nearby Town Centre and Metropolitan Centre zones.

(18) Enable the development of intensive residential activities.

The proposed plan change will enable high-density residential dwellings and visitor accommodation.

(20) Promote and manage development to a standard that: (a) recognises the moderate scale, intensity and diversity of business, social and cultural activities provided in the zone; (b) recognises the

While the proposed plan change will provide for a greater scale, intensity and diversity of business, social and cultural activities than the current Light Industry zoning, any adverse effects on residents...
increases in residential densities provided in the zone; and (c) avoids significant adverse effects on residents.

cannot be managed until the resource consent stage, when detailed design proposals can be scrutinised by Council.

(21) Require activities adjacent to residential zones to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on amenity values of those areas.

While the proposed plan change will enable a far greater level of amenity than the Light Industry zone, this objective will be more relevant at the resource consent stage, when detailed design proposals can be scrutinised by Council.

It is considered that future development on the subject site is better aligned with these objectives in achieving the strategic direction of the AUP, particularly when compared to the objectives of the current zone (Light Industry) which are:

(1) Light industrial activities locate and function efficiently within the zone.

(2) The establishment of activities that may compromise the efficiency and functionality of the zone for light industrial activities is avoided.

(3) Adverse effects on amenity values and the natural environment, both within the zone and on adjacent areas, are managed.

(4) Development avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the amenity of adjacent public open spaces and residential zones.

Furthermore the sites subject to this plan change are subject to a number of approved resource consents which are not considered compatible with the provisions and outcomes sought by the Light Industry zone. These approved resource consents ensure that in essence the light industrial zoned land is not being lost to light industrial use as the approved resource consents ensured it should never have been included in overall land use for this category. These consents were approved under the previous Auckland District Plan – Manukau Section for various uses including hotels, traveller’s accommodation and retail uses.

As stated, it is unlikely that future development of the site will achieve the objectives of the zone. It is not currently developed in an industrial manner, and remains a vacant greenfield site. The plan change relates to land in an existing commercial area of Flatbush, adjacent to a Local Centre and existing residential area. The proposed zone change will allow for the establishment of pre-dominantly higher density accommodation activities located in a mixed use environment. The sites also have over 650m of frontage to a major intersection.
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and over 350m of frontage to Rongomai Park. It is considered that better built form and urban design objectives will be achieved and reinforced by the Mixed Use zone.

As discussed throughout this preliminary report, it is considered that the Mixed Use zone is more appropriate for this site.

5.2 AUCKLAND PLAN

Section 79 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 required Auckland Council to prepare a spatial plan (the Auckland Plan). The purpose of the plan is to:

Contribute to Auckland’s social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being through a comprehensive and effective long-term (20- to 30-year) strategy for Auckland’s growth and development.

A central component of the Auckland Plan is the high-level development strategy that sets out how Auckland will change and grow over the next 30 years to become the world’s most liveable city. Key elements of the development strategy include integration between land use and infrastructure and moving towards a quality, compact urban form based on intensification of activity around urban centres and transport nodes. The Auckland Plan has guided the approach to preparing the Auckland Unitary Plan which will shape the way Auckland grows.

The plan change seeks to enable the development of the site for mixed use purposes, consistent with surround zoning and developing activities in the area that has access to public transport (including bus and the future Botany to Airport transit line). The plan change is considered to be consistent with the overall intent of the Auckland Plan.

5.3 AUCKLAND REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT

The statutory framework for the Auckland regional policy statement is in sections 59 to 62 of the Resource Management Act 1991. The purpose of the regional policy statement is to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 by providing:

(1) an overview of the resource management issues of the region; and

(2) policies and methods to achieve integrated management of the natural and physical resources of the whole region.
The regional policy statement must be prepared in accordance with:

(1) the Auckland Council’s functions as a regional council and as a territorial authority under sections 30 and 31 of the Resource Management Act 1991;

(2) the provisions of Part 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991; and

(3) the requirement to complete an evaluation report in accordance with section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

As well, the Council must:

(1) have regard to other relevant statutory planning documents and regulations as set out in section 61(2) and (2A) of the Resource Management Act 1991; and

(2) not have regard to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

The proposed plan change has been assessed against the relevant provisions of the Auckland Regional Policy Statement below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RPS SECTION</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Urban Growth and form</td>
<td>B2.2 seeks to enable a quality, compact urban form that provides for greater productivity and economic growth, better use of infrastructure, improved public transport and social vitality. The proposed plan change will be consistent with the goal above, as it will enable a high-density mixed use development within the existing urban area, thereby using a scarce land use far more efficiently than the existing light industry zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 A quality built environment</td>
<td>B2.3 seeks to enable a high-quality built environment, with development responding to the characteristics of the site and area, and reinforcing the hierarchy of centres and corridors. The proposed plan change will be consistent with this goal, as it will respond to the characteristics of the site and area by providing for additional height</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.4 Residential growth

B2.4 seeks to enable residential intensification and an increased range of housing choice, particularly within or adjacent to centres, growth corridors, public transport, public open space or employment opportunities.

The proposed plan change will be consistent with this goal, as it will provide for residential opportunities on a collection of sites that are adjacent to the Botany Junction Local Centre, a large park and several public transport routes.

### 2.5 Commercial and industrial growth

B2.5 seeks to enable commercial development, primarily within centres and growth corridors to support a compact urban form and employment opportunities.

The proposed plan change will be consistent with this goal, as it will enable a wide range of employment opportunities, such as retail, commercial services or offices adjacent to a Local Centre.
6. ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Schedule 4 of the Act sets out the matters to be considered when preparing an Assessment of Effects on the Environment. In this case it is considered that the relevant effects that require consideration as part of the plan change request are:

1. Bulk and location
2. Loss of land zoned for light industrial activities
3. Traffic
4. Infrastructure
5. Visual Impact

These matters are set out and discussed below.

6.1 BULK AND LOCATION (URBAN DESIGN)

The existing maximum height of the light industrial zone is 20m. The proposed height limit varies from 20-28m. The proposed 20m height limit runs adjacent to Te Irirangi Dr and Ormiston Rd with the height limit increasing to 28m in from the two main roads.

With regards to the increase in height and the effects generated by that in terms of bulk, Mr Ian Munro has provided an urban design assessment, attached as Appendix 3. Mr Munro makes the following comments:

“The existing zoning enables built form of a low-to-modest quality and is unlikely to respond ideally to the site’s context and urban design opportunities, specifically the local centre and residential zones adjacent to the site; the large public open space abutting the site to the immediate south; and the width and scale of both Ormiston and Te Irirangi Roads. The Mixed Use zone is more likely to result in development that positively responds to those characteristics and contributes to a high-quality urban node around this major transport junction.

The site’s previous subdivision and approved resource consents have established a framework of lots which are of dimensions and orientations that lend themselves to workable and well-laid out Mixed Use building footprints.

The loss of 9.34ha of Light Industry-zoned land in this part of Auckland will not give rise to any urban design effects of concern, and overall the change to Mixed Use zone is a
considerably more efficient use of land within walkable access of a Local Centre zone and schools, and along major passenger transport routes. The change will also be very likely to result in much-improved built form outcomes.

The proposed additional height overlay, for buildings up to 28m tall, has been located logically within the site and well away from any external road boundary. The overall flatness of Flat Bush means that the additional height will likely be screened from the immediate environment by buildings along the site’s frontage within the zone height limit, and will not be prominent or block any existing views from within the wider environment.

The existing Mixed Use zone methods (including the additional height overlay) will be sufficient to manage the built form urban design effects of development on the land.

No additional Plan methods are required to manage the interface along the site’s western boundary with the existing Light Industry zone at 2, 4, 6 and 8 Florence Carter Avenue because that land is within the control of the JKGL Ltd and has already been consented by the Council for a supermarket / department store (2, 4 and 6 Florence Carter Avenue) and a trade supplies outlet (8 Florence Carter Avenue). The proposed Mixed Use zoning will not negatively impact these activities (and in the case of the supermarket and department store are likely to support them).

The Private Plan Change could be approved on urban design grounds subject to the recommendations outlined in this report.”

Based on this assessment and relying on the professional opinion of Mr Ian Munro, it is concluded that the proposed plan change will result in no adverse urban design effects.

6.2 LOSS OF LAND ZONED FOR LIGHT INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES

Urban Economics have provided an economic analysis of the potential loss of land zoned for ‘Light Industry’ activities, attached at Appendix 4. They conclude that:

“The permitted baseline for the site includes 12,000m$^2$ of retail space. In the MU zone retail stores of up to 200m$^2$ GFA are permitted. Based on a conventional at grade development yield of 35%, 33,000m$^2$ of retail space could occur on the site under the MU zone, around three times the permitted baseline. When combined with the retail on the balance of the JKGL site (2, 4, 6 and 8 Florence Carter Avenue) the proposal could result in a total of around 45,000m$^2$ of retail GFA, the scale of a small sub-regional shopping centre such as Glenfield Mall.
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The MU zone provisions do not in themselves enable a large shopping centre to establish, as only smaller retail store are generally permitted and sub-regional retail centres require a number of larger anchor tenants, most notably department stores. However, the proposed MU zone in combination with the retail enabled by the consented development could result in a large sub-regional centre establishing on the site, and this would potentially have adverse economic effects, particularly on the Ormiston Town Centre.

A retail GFA cap is common mechanism to address such potential effects. Given the permitted baseline of 12,000m² of retail space, it is recommended that a retail GFA cap of 15,000m² is applied to the site. The net difference between the consented baseline for retail GFA and the recommended retail cap, of 3,000m², would not have any discernible effect on existing centres.

The permitted baseline for the site includes 11,000m² of office floorspace. In the MU zone offices of 500m² GFA per site are permitted. The MU zone allows sites of 200m² and the site could therefore enable over 200,000m² of office space.

An office GFA cap is also common mechanism to address the potential effects relating to the distribution of office. Given the permitted baseline of 11,000m² of office space, it is recommended that an office GFA cap of 15,000m² is applied to the site. The net difference between the permitted baseline for office GFA and the recommended office cap, of 4,000m², would not have any discernible effect on existing centres.

The recommended retail and office GFA caps would fully remove any potential for adverse trade competition and associated economic effects on centres raised by the application of the MU zone to the site. There are no other potential adverse economic effects from the proposal. Council’s consulting economists (Market Economics Limited) have not identified any other potential economic effects in the list provided by the Auckland Council¹.

The existing resource consents were based on a concept plan for 20-30 buildings with a total of 65,000m² GFA. The concept plan was based on estimates of demand and the building requirements for a range of tenants. It is however inevitable that the consented development plan is not the optimal commercial use of the site, and that particular parts of the consented development plan may not find suitable tenants. As a development of this scale moves through the construction period of 5-10 or more years, the consented plan is likely to become increasingly out of step with the market.

The MU zone would ensure the significant investment in land and building resources on the site (several hundred million dollars) is directed to its most efficient use over time. For example, the owner could allocate parts of the site and design buildings to meet the specific

¹ Email from Mr Michael Luong to Mr Hamish Firth, dated Thursday, August 30, 2018.
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needs of businesses as they arise over time. This flexibility and ability to change over time is fundamental to the success of mixed-use developments and precincts.

Since the AUP became operative, around half of commercial development has been consented on greenfield rather than urban infill sites, highlighting the inherently difficult and slow process of redeveloping brownfield sites in existing centres. The same trend has been evident in the housing market, with two thirds of new dwellings being built on peripheral greenfield rather than urban infill sites. The economic value of a large undeveloped urban infill site within this context is significant, particularly as it would make an important contribution to the AUP’s ‘quality compact city’ objective.

It is worth noting the principles for allocating business zones land outlined by Mr John Duguid in his evidence for the Plan review. Mr Duguid describes the MU zone as being applied to areas that are adjacent to centres and along arterial roads, and to enable a range of uses which will not impact the vitality and viability of centre existing centres. The proposal meets both business zone allocation principles outlined by Mr Duguid.

When considered in terms of the ex Territorial Authority areas, Manukau has a disproportionately low ‘per capita supply’ of ‘centre zone’ land (around 85% of regional average) and the lowest supply of ‘other commercial’ zone land (around 41% of regional average). By contrast, the ex Manukau TA area has a relatively strong supply of industrial zone land (around 163% of the regional average).

Within the sub-regional area including Botany, Ormiston and Manukau CBD, there is only 2 hectares of vacant ‘other commercial’ zone land. Auckland Council’s recent comprehensive study estimates demand for a further 130 hectares of ‘other commercial’ zone land in Urban South area over the next decade. This indicates a significant shortage of this type of land.

The proposal would enable a large intensive commercial mixed-use development, and thereby would increase the supply of ‘other commercial floorspace’ in this part of Auckland which is presently in short supply.

Based on this assessment and relying on the professional opinion of Urban Economics, it is concluded that the proposed plan change will result in no adverse effects relating to the loss of industrial zoned land.

---

2 Mixed Use, General Business and Business Park zones.
6.3 TRAFFIC

Following on the comprehensive work undertaken by TDG to provide for the consented and proposed environment for the sites, TPC have provided a full traffic assessment attached at Appendix 5. In summary, they conclude that:

“Based on the analyses described in this report, the following conclusions can be made in respect of the Proposed Plan Change to enable the Proposed Mixed-Development to be accommodated at 79 Ormiston Road:

- The weekday peak hour traffic generation of the activities enabled by the Plan Change will be in the order of 1,150 and 2,360 traffic movements per hour in the AM and PM Peak hours respectively. This is 180 and 45 traffic movements per hour higher in the AM and PM Peak hours respectively than that anticipated for the currently consented development of the site.
- To cater for PM Peak Hour traffic generation above that previously consented for the site the intersection of Florence Carter Avenue and Ormiston Road will need to be upgraded to include a double right turn exit from Florence Carter Avenue onto Ormiston Road. A Traffic Generation Threshold provision should be included in the Plan Change such that if anticipated traffic flows exceed the trigger level, the upgrade works are carried out.
- The intersection of Florence Carter Avenue and Te Irirangi Drive will continue to operate with adequate capacity to cater for the anticipated additional traffic generated by the Proposed Plan Change.
- An analysis of the potential traffic effects of the Plan Change traffic on the intersection of Te Irirangi Drive and Ormiston Road indicates that the traffic effects associated with the activities enabled by the Plan Change are similar to those anticipated for the previously consented development.
- To appropriately manage transport demands generated by the commercial activities that may be developed on the site, TDM measures can be implemented to appropriately mitigate the effects of transport demands in this location.
- Development enabled by the Plan Change will be served by parking, loading and servicing arrangements designed to an appropriate standard consistent with the requirements of the AUP-OIP or as otherwise approved by way of a Resource Consent.

Overall, it is considered that the traffic engineering effects of the potential activities enabled by the Proposed Plan Change can be accommodated on the road network without compromising its function, capacity or safety. Therefore, the proposal is considered to have a less than minor impact.”
As mentioned previously, the proposed Florence Carter Avenue Precinct will contain detailed provisions relating to traffic generation, and will require any activity within each ‘block’ that generates traffic beyond what was previously consented to undertake a detailed traffic assessment. This will inform if and when an upgrade is required to the intersection of Florence Carter Avenue and Ormiston Road.

Based on this assessment and relying on the professional opinion of TPC, it is concluded that the proposed plan change will result in no adverse traffic or transport effects.

**6.4 INFRASTRUCTURE**

An assessment prepared by AR and Associates covering infrastructure capacity matters is attached at Appendix 6. Andres Roa concludes that:

“The subdivision has existing stormwater infrastructure available which connects to the 1050mm diameter stormwater pipe on Ormiston Avenue. As agreed with Auckland Council, this infrastructure has been designed for a 1 in 5-year ARI event (climate change) to be consistent with underlying legacy council design requirements. An assessment of the downstream network confirms that there is adequate capacity to service the contributing catchments from the site under a maximum probable development scenario, based on the agreed design criteria.

The site is also subject to a Discharge Consent (permit 25478) as modified through consent variation No. 47993, and is located in a SMAF1 area. The water quality and SMAF1 requirements will be addressed at source for the lot areas while biofiltration devices have been constructed to address the quality of runoff from road areas.

Utility services including power, gas and telecommunications have been provided as part of the underlying subdivision and are adequate for the development.

In conclusion, all services available within the subdivision will adequately support the proposed Plan Change and intended land use.”

Based on this assessment and relying on the professional opinion of Mr Roa, it is concluded that the proposed plan change will not result in adverse infrastructure issues.
6.6 VISUAL IMPACT

A Visual Impact Assessment has been undertaken by LA4 Landscape Architects, and they conclude the following:

“The site is part of an established and varied predominantly commercial environment with peripheral residential activities, adjacent to two main arterial roads and an expansive area of open space. The site and surrounding landscape has the capacity to visually absorb the landscape and visual effects of development enabled by the Plan Change through the physical characteristics and prevailing commercial attributes and urban fabric within the Te Irirangi Drive and Ormiston Road environs.

The development will have minimal adverse landscape or visual effects on the streetscape and surrounding environment and can be readily accommodated in the prominent location adjacent to the arterial roads.

The additional height will have minor adverse visual effects over and above the permitted height limit for the zone. The hierarchy and location of heights within the site has reduced the bulk and scale of the building and addressed the prominent site in a sensitive and appropriate manner.

The potential adverse effects upon the landscape character and visual amenity values will be minimised to an acceptable level. The additional height of the development will introduce low adverse visual effects and on the whole the development will be compatible with the surrounding existing and future planned urban environment.”

Based on this assessment and relying on the professional opinion of Mr Rob Pryor, it is concluded that the proposed plan change will not result in adverse visual impact.

6.5 CONCLUSION

The above assessment has concluded that the built form and land use activity enabled by the plan change is appropriate to the site and surrounding environment in terms of bulk and location, character and amenity, loss of business zone land, traffic and urban design/visual impact outcomes, and that any adverse effects arising from the plan change will less than minor.
7. SECTION 32 ANALYSIS

7.1 APPROPRIATENESS OF PROPOSAL TO ACHIEVE THE PURPOSE OF THE ACT

Section 32(1)(a) of the Act requires an evaluation to examine the extent to which the objectives of the proposed plan change are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.

The objectives of the plan change are to enable an intensity and scale of built form and development that is consistent existing and preferred development on surrounding land, while also responding to the particular context and characteristics of the local environment.

Section 5 of the Act identifies the purpose of the RMA as being the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. This means managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way that enables people and communities to provide for their social, cultural and economic well-being and health and safety while sustaining those resources for future generations, protecting the life supporting capacity of ecosystems, and avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment.

It is considered that the plan change will achieve this purpose in that it will provide for the redevelopment of the land resource for residential and mixed use activities and enable the community to provide for their economic and social wellbeing. It is intended that the zoning will facilitate more appropriate redevelopment than what the current zoning has, and encourage and enable the establishment of a high quality mixed use development. Therefore, the plan change will not detract from people's social wellbeing. The assessment of effects has confirmed that adverse effects on the environment arising from the plan change will be less than minor.

Section 6 of the Act sets out a number of matters of national importance which need to be recognised and provided for in achieving the purpose of the RMA. This includes the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins; protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes, the protection of areas of significance indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna; maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes, and rivers; the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga; the protection of historic heritage; the protection of protected customary rights and the management of significant risks from natural hazards.
The proposed plan change does not compromise the recognition of or provision for these matters of national importance within the Auckland Region, as none of the above are present on the site.

Section 7 of the Act identifies a number of “other matters” to be given particular regard by Council. Specific matters from section 7 that are relevant to the plan change include:

   b) The efficient use and development of natural and physical resources – The plan change will enable and encourage the development of the site to provide for the community’s economic wellbeing;
   c) The maintenance and enhancement of amenity values; and
   f) Maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment – The proposed zone is cognisant of the surrounding development and established land uses and will maintain and enhance the amenity and the quality of the existing environment by encouraging the development of the site.

Section 8 requires Council to take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. It is considered that this proposal will not offend against the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.

The proposed zone change is a more effective means of achieving the sustainable management purpose of the Act than the current zone for which development is unlikely to meet the intent of the zone. It is considered that the objectives of the plan change are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.

7.2 APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PROVISIONS TO ACHIEVE THE PLAN CHANGE OBJECTIVES

Section 32(1)(b) of the Act requires an evaluation to examine whether the provisions in the proposed plan change are the most appropriate way to achieve its objectives by:

- Identifying other reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives.
- Assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the objectives.
- Summarising the reasons for deciding on the provisions.

These matters are addressed overleaf.
7.2.1 Other Reasonably Practicable Options

In determining the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the plan change, consideration has been given to the following other reasonably practicable options:

- Option One: Do nothing (Status Quo) and rely on resource consent application(s)
- Option Two: Alternative provisions for the land
- Option Three: Wait for Auckland Council to undertake a corrections plan change

Each of these alternatives is discussed below:

Option One: Do nothing (status quo)

Under this option, rather than proceeding with the proposed plan change, the owners would rely on the existing AUP provisions to develop the land and make resource consent applications according to the process under Part 6 of the Act.

Sections H17.2 and H17.3 set out the objectives and policies for the Light Industry zone. Section H17.4 sets out the activity status of land use and development activities.

The existing provisions generally facilitate the development of industrial and manufacturing activities, in addition to other lower amenity uses such as drive-through restaurants and service stations.

Activities such as retail, residential accommodation and offices, unless accessory to an industrial activity, are non-complying and will require assessment against the objectives and policies of the zone, which are focussed on industrial use. As such, these activities are unlikely to be seen as compatible with the intended outcomes of the zone.

The resource consent option to facilitate residential and mixed use development of the site (which is considered the most desirable option at this location) therefore carries a time and cost burden and uncertainty of outcome due to the process for assessing non-complying consent applications. It is considered that this option may result in the land being underutilised, as this option does not address the identified issue.

It is therefore considered that the ‘do nothing’ option is not an appropriate means of managing the future development of the land.
Option Two: Alternative provisions for the site

The plan change will enable the redevelopment of the site and the establishment of new built form and activities. In deciding upon what provisions may be appropriate for the site, consideration was given to:

- The purposes and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991;
- The relevant strategic and statutory planning documents;
- The provisions applying to the surrounding land and established activities on properties within the immediate vicinity; and
- The character of the site in terms of its immediate environment and also its wider context within the Light Industry zone.

Having regard to the above, it was considered that there are two options for alternative provisions may be considered as reasonably practicable alternatives for the site:

- Apply the provisions of an alternative AUP zone, for example General Business or Residential Terrace Housing and Apartment Building. Given the Local Centre and Terraced Housing & Apartment Building zoning immediately to the east of the sites, and the Light Industry zoning to the west, it is considered that a transition zone would be more appropriate on this site.
- Create a new set of provisions that apply to the subject site and provide for mixed use type development. It is considered that creating an individual set of controls would not be the best way to achieve the purpose of the plan change as the request applies to a relatively small collection of sites. In addition, bespoke, site-specific provisions are not considered to be efficient plan development.

Either of these options may address the issue however they are not the most efficient means to do so and the resultant outcomes can be more efficiently addressed through a proposed zone change.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the most appropriate provisions to achieve the purpose of the plan change are those that currently apply to the Mixed Use zone.

Option Three: Wait for Council-initiated Plan Change(s)

As mentioned earlier in this report, resource consents have been granted to this site for a mixed use development, including the provision for visitor’s accommodation, retail, commercial services and other such activities provided for in the former Business 5 zoning.
of the Auckland District Plan (Manukau Section). If this was the case, then the Council may consider including the proposed rezoning in a ‘corrections’ plan change that bundles other possible rezoning inconsistencies or anomalies.

While this would result in less financial cost for the applicant, there is no certainty that this site would be included in a corrections plan change, or when such a plan change might occur. If the applicant were to wait for a Council-initiated plan change, the potential delay creates a risk that the regulatory environment or market conditions may have changed so that future development of the land would be uncertain.

The current plan change request will therefore provide the land owner and the public with a greater level of certainty regarding the future expectations for the site and will allow development to proceed in a co-ordinated and integrated manner.

7.2.2 Costs and Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES OF THE UNITARY PLAN</th>
<th>COSTS</th>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Nothing (Status Quo)</td>
<td>If the do nothing option was progressed, development on the site would likely entail 20m tall warehouse buildings. This option would not meet the objectives of the Unitary Plan, as the sites would have a low standard of amenity, and</td>
<td>• Activities that have previously been consented on these sites are not provided for and will be a non-complying activity; • The land may be underutilised due to unsuitable zoning; • Industrial zoned land will be located immediately adjacent to a future</td>
<td>• No loss of land specifically zoned for industrial use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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would not support residential and employment growth in a location that is in close proximity to the public transport network, public open space and other employment opportunities.

**Alternative Provisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative provisions for the site, such as a new or different zone, may achieve some of the objectives of the Unitary Plan, notably they may provide for new medium to high residential and/or employment opportunities in an appropriate location.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>However, a different zone, such as the THAB or General Business zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No transition zone between the existing Local Centre and Light Industrial zoned sites;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a new set of provisions specifically for the site would not be the best way to achieve the purpose of the Unitary Plan, and would lead to spot zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A different zone or site-specific provisions may address the underlying issue in part.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

481 Parnell Rd, Auckland 1052
Postal Address: PO Box 37964, Parnell, Auckland 1151
www.mhkg.co.nz  Email: henuh@mhkg.co.nz
will not be able to provide for a range of both housing types and employment choice for the surrounding area.

Further, creating a new zone or site-specific provisions would not meet the overall intent of simplicity and consistency of planning provisions across the Auckland Region.

### Wait for Council-initiated PC

As with the do-nothing option, waiting for a Council-initiated Plan Change will likely result in development entailing 20m tall warehouse buildings due to a lack of certainty or other viable options.

This option would not meet the objectives of the

- Potential uncertainty for the public and landowner over the future zoning of the sites;
- Potential uncertainty regarding timing of possible changes to the sites;
- Council may not include these sites in a future Plan Change or Unitary

- Some of the burden of cost can be shared with Council;
- Council may have a greater say in the future provisions for the sites.
Unitary Plan, as Plan review.
the sites would
have a low
standard of
amenity, and
would not
support
residential and
employment
growth in a
location that is in
close proximity to
the public
transport
network, public
open space and
other
employment
opportunities.

Preferred Option

Due to the reasons described above, the preferred option is for a change in zoning to the Mixed Use Zone, with corresponding GFA caps and height variation controls.

The PPC will be consistent with the intent of both the Regional Policy Statement and the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part), as it will enable a high-density mixed use development in an appropriate location, in close proximity to public transport services, public open space, a growth corridor and employment opportunities.

The Mixed Use zoning would act as an appropriate transition between the Local Centre and residential Terraced Housing and Apartment zones to the east, and the Light Industry zone to the west. The proposed zone provides for more efficient development than the existing zone, for which development is unlikely to be in accordance with the intent of the zone, especially given the mixed use development already consented for this site.
The simplicity of this plan change request is a reflection that is consistent with the relevant objectives of the Mixed Use zone and that the existing provisions are robust and have been tested against s32 of the RMA through the AUP:OIP process.

7.2.3 Efficiency and Effectiveness of Provisions

In summary, it is considered that the provisions of the plan change are the most efficient and effective means for providing for the future development of this strategically located site. In particular:

- The Mixed Use zoning would act as an appropriate transition between the Local Centre and residential Terraced Housing and Apartment zones to the east, and the Light Industry zone to the west.
- The proposed zone provides for more efficient development than the existing zone, for which development is unlikely to be in accordance with the intent of the zone, especially given the mixed use development already consented for this site.
- The simplicity of this plan change request is a reflection that is consistent with the relevant objectives of the Mixed Use zone and that the existing provisions are robust and have been tested against s32 of the RMA through the PAUP process.

7.2.4 Risk of Not Acting

It is considered that sufficient information has been gathered to justify proceeding with the plan change request and that the risk of acting on this information is less than not acting. It is also considered that there is sufficient information to enable timely processing of the Plan Change request.

7.3 SECTION 32 EVALUATION CONCLUSION

Pursuant to Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991, the evaluation contained in this report confirms that the proposed zone is considered to be the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act, being a better zoning than the existing zone, meeting the requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 and are the most efficient and effective means of facilitating the use and development of the subject land into the foreseeable future.
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8.0 CONSULTATION

As part of preparing the application for the plan change and in assessing the proposal against s32 of the RMA, Mt Hobson Group has undertaken consultation with a number of parties on behalf of the applicant. This is summarised below and a table containing who has been contacted and outcomes to date is provided at Appendix 8.

8.1 OTARA-PAPATOETOE LOCAL BOARD

The Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board was first contact on the 10th of September regarding this proposed plan change. We met with the Local Board on 25th of October to discuss this plan change in detail, answer any questions they may have, and to respond to feedback. No concerns were raised by the Local Board.

8.2 IWI

10 Mana Whenua Groups who have expressed interest in the sites were contacted on the 11th of September regarding this proposed plan change, with follow up contact on the 18th and 25th of September.

We received responses from Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki and Ngāti Paoa, who both had no objections to the proposal. No other Iwi provided responses.

A full list of the responses we received is attached in Appendix 8.
9. CONCLUSION

This report has been prepared in support of JKGL Group Ltd’s request for a plan change to the provisions of the Auckland Unitary Plan – Operative in Part as they relate to 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 12 Florence Carter Avenue, Flatbush. The request has been made in accordance with the provisions of Schedule 1 and Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Based on an assessment of environmental effects and a specialist traffic and infrastructure input, it is concluded that the proposed plan change rezoning will ensure that effects result in less than minor adverse effects.

An assessment against the provisions of Section 32 of the RMA is provided in section 7 of the report. This includes an analysis with respect to the extent to which the objectives of the plan change are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the Act and an examination of whether the provisions of the plan change are the most appropriate way to achieve its objectives.

For the above reasons, it is considered that the proposed plan change accords with the sustainable management principles outlined in Part 2 of the Act and should be accepted and approved.

Regards

HAMISH FIRTH
Mt Hobson Group
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Extract from Clause 25 Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

25 Local authority to consider request

(1) A local authority shall, within 30 working days of—

(a) receiving a request under clause 21; or

(b) receiving all required information or any report which was commissioned under clause 23; or

(c) modifying the request under clause 24—

whichever is the latest, decide under which of subclauses (2), (3), and (4), or a combination of subclauses (2) and (4), the request shall be dealt with.

(1A) The local authority must have particular regard to the evaluation report prepared for the proposed plan or change in accordance with clause 22(1)—

(a) when making a decision under subclause (1); and

(b) when dealing with the request under subclause (2), (3), or (4).

(2) The local authority may either—

(a) adopt the request, or part of the request, as if it were a proposed policy statement or plan made by the local authority itself and, if it does so,—

(i) the request must be notified in accordance with clause 5 or 5A within 4 months of the local authority adopting the request; and

(ii) the provisions of Part 1 or 4 must apply; and

(iii) the request has legal effect once publicly notified; or

(b) accept the request, in whole or in part, and proceed to notify the request, or part of the request, under clause 26.

(2AA) However, if a direction is applied for under section 80C, the period between the date of that application and the date when the application is declined under clause 77(1) must not be included in the calculation of the 4-month period specified by subclause (2)(a)(i).

(2A) Subclause (2)(a)(iii) is subject to section 86B.

(3) The local authority may decide to deal with the request as if it were an application for a resource consent and the provisions of Part 8 shall apply accordingly.
(4) The local authority may reject the request in whole or in part, but only on the grounds that—

(a) the request or part of the request is frivolous or vexatious; or

(b) within the last 2 years, the substance of the request or part of the request—

(i) has been considered and given effect to, or rejected by, the local authority or the Environment Court; or

(ii) has been given effect to by regulations made under section 360A; or

(c) the request or part of the request is not in accordance with sound resource management practice; or

(d) the request or part of the request would make the policy statement or plan inconsistent with Part 5; or

(e) in the case of a proposed change to a policy statement or plan, the policy statement or plan has been operative for less than 2 years.

(5) The local authority shall notify the person who made the request, within 10 working days, of its decision under this clause, and the reasons for that decision, including the decision on notification.


Schedule 1 clause 25(1A): inserted, on 3 December 2013, for all purposes, by section 86 of the Resource Management Amendment Act 2013 (2013 No 63).


Schedule 1 clause 25(4)(b): replaced, on 1 October 2011, by section 60 of the Resource Management Amendment Act (No 2) 2011 (2011 No 70).

Request to make Plan Change 10: Historic Heritage Schedule (errors, anomalies and information update) operative in part

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To make operative in part Plan Change 10: Historic Heritage Schedule (errors, anomalies and information update) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (operative in part).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. In November 2017, the Planning Committee approved the proposed Historic Heritage Schedule (errors, anomalies and information update) Plan Change (Plan Change 10) for public notification (PLA/2017/144). Plan Change 10 seeks to amend a number of historic heritage places identified in the Auckland Unitary Plan (operative in part) (the Unitary Plan) Historic Heritage Overlay. The amendments correct errors and update place information for 146 historic heritage places.

3. Plan Change 10 was notified on 25 January 2018. Submissions were heard in November 2018. The independent hearings commissioners released their decisions, and these were publicly notified on 21 March 2019. The period for lodging appeals has closed. One appeal has been received on Plan Change 10. The appeal is from the Auckland Hebrew Congregation and relates only to the Auckland Synagogue and community centre at 108-116 Greys Avenue, Auckland Central.

4. There are three historic heritage places included in Plan Change 10 that are located (in part) in the Coastal Marine Area. These places are subject to the regional coastal plan provisions of the Unitary Plan. Section 28 of the Resource Management Act 1991 requires approval from the Minister for Conservation before provisions relating to these places are made operative. The committee can adopt the proposed amendments to these three historic heritage places and refer these to the Minister of Conservation for approval.

5. The proposed amendments to the remaining 142 historic heritage places subject to Plan Change 10 are submitted to the Committee for approval. An index of these historic heritage places is included in Attachment A to this report.

6. Staff recommend that Plan Change 10 be made operative in part except for:
   - proposed amendments subject to appeal
   - proposed amendments to the part of the historic heritage places located in the Coastal Marine Area and therefore subject to the provisions of the regional coastal plan, identified in Attachment B.

7. Both the appeal and the proposed amendments to the historic heritage places located (in part) in the Costal Marine Area are discrete issues. These parts of Plan Change 10 will be made operative separately, at a later date.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) approve the proposed amendments under Plan Change 10: Historic Heritage Schedule (errors, anomalies and information update) that are not subject to appeal or subject to the provisions of the regional coastal plan, being the proposed amendments to the 142 historic heritage places set out in Attachment A to the agenda report.

b) adopt proposed amendments to the historic heritage places subject to the provisions of the regional coastal plan, set out in Attachment B to the agenda report, and refer to the Minister of Conservation for approval.

c) request the General Manager, Plans and Places to undertake the steps in Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 to make operative in part Plan Change 10 to the Auckland Unitary Plan (operative in part).

d) request the General Manager, Plans and Places to undertake the steps in Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 to make the parts of Plan Change 10 to the Auckland Unitary Plan (operative in part) subject to the provisions of the regional coastal plan operative once they are approved by the Minister of Conservation.

Horopaki
Context

8. Plan Change 10: Historic Heritage Schedule (errors, anomalies and information update) seeks to amend a number of historic heritage places in the Auckland Unitary Plan (the Unitary Plan). These places are identified in the Historic Heritage Overlay, and Schedule 14.1, Schedule 14.2 and the GIS viewer/planning maps. The amendments correct errors and update place information for 146 historic heritage places.

9. An index of the historic heritage places subject to Plan Change 10 is Attachment A.

10. In November 2017 the committee approved Plan Change 10 for public notification (PLA/2017/144). Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act) sets out the process for a change in a policy statement or plan. Following Schedule 1 of the Act, Plan Change 10 was:
   - publicly notified on 25 January 2018
   - open for public submissions until 8 March 2018, with submissions for identified owners / occupiers open for submissions until 24 July 2018
   - open for further submissions until 4 May 2018
   - heard by independent commissioners for one day in November 2018
   - publicly notified the decisions from the independent commissioners on 21 March 2019.

11. The independent commissioners were delegated the authority to make decisions on Plan Change 10 by the Regulatory Committee in May 2019 (REG/2018/46).

12. The Plan Change 10 decisions are available on the council’s website. The decisions supported the position of Council at the hearing, with the exception of one recommendation.

13. The period for lodging any appeals in the Environment Court has closed and one appeal on Plan Change 10 was received, from the Auckland Hebrew Congregation, outlined below.

14. There are three historic heritage places subject to Plan Change 10 that are located (in part) in the Coastal Marine Area and therefore subject to regional coastal plan provisions. These places are identified in Attachment B. Amendments to regional coastal plan provisions cannot be made operative until these are approved by the Minister of Conservation.
Staff recommend that Plan Change 10 be made operative in part except for:

- proposed amendments subject to appeal
- proposed amendments to the part of the historic heritage places located in the Coastal Marine Area and therefore subject to the provisions of the regional coastal plan, identified in Attachment B.

The proposed amendments to the remaining 142 historic heritage places subject to Plan Change 10 are submitted to the Committee for approval.

Both the appeal and the proposed amendments to the historic heritage places located (in part) in the Coastal Marine Area are discrete issues. These parts of Plan Change 10 will be made operative separately, at a later date.

Appeal from the Auckland Hebrew Congregation

The Auckland Hebrew Congregation’s appeal relates to the identification of the Auckland Synagogue and community centre at 108-116 Greys Avenue (Unitary Plan Schedule 14.1, ID#01965), being a Category B historic heritage place within the Historic Heritage Overlay. The Congregation seeks to amend the identified heritage values, amend the extent of place, and include more extensive exclusions for the exterior and interior of the Synagogue.

Regional coastal plan amendments require approval by the Minister of Conservation

There are three historic heritage places subject to Plan Change 10 that are located (in part) in the Coastal Marine Area and are therefore subject to the regional coastal plan provisions. These places are identified in Attachment B.

As per section 28 of the Act, any amendments to the regional coastal plan will require the approval of the Minister of Conservation before these can be made operative.

The committee can adopt the regional coastal plan amendments and refer these to the Minister of Conservation for approval.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

As this report is procedural in nature, no further analysis and advice is required.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views

As part of Plan Change 10, submissions were received from Auckland Transport and Panuku Development Auckland. Following discussions, both submissions were subsequently withdrawn and neither organisation were part of the formal process of Plan Change 10.

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

As part of Plan Change 10, local boards were advised of the public notification and were invited to provide feedback. No formal feedback was given on Plan Change 10.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

As part of the development of Plan Change 10, staff:

- sent a letter to all 19 iwi authorities in July 2017 to signal that the proposed plan change was in the pipeline and to determine interest in consulting on this plan change
- sent the draft proposed plan change in September 2017 for feedback in accordance with Clause 4 of Schedule 1 of the Act.
24. Four iwi authorities responded (Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust, Waiohua – Te Ahiwaru – Makaurau, Te Kawerau Iwi Tribal Authority & Settlement Trust, and Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei) seeking further information, which was provided. Council staff met representatives from Waiohua – Te Ahiwaru – Makaurau and Te Kawerau Iwi Tribal Authority & Settlement Trust to discuss the draft proposed plan change. No amendments were sought to the draft proposed plan change during these discussions.

25. No submissions were received from iwi authorities during the public notification process.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

26. There are no financial implications associated with making this plan change operative.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

27. There are no risks associated with making this plan change operative.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

28. Proposed amendments under Plan Change 10 are currently annotated as such in the Unitary Plan (text and maps). Staff will incorporate amendments from Plan Change 10 into the Unitary Plan (text and maps) and remove/ amend annotations by 12 July 2019. Proposed amendments subject to appeal and regional coastal plan provisions awaiting ministerial approval will remain annotated until these are resolved and approved, respectively.

29. The part of Plan Change 10 that is subject to the regional coastal plan will be sent to the Minister of Conservation for approval.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Index of historic heritage places subject to Plan Change 10</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Historic heritage places subject to Plan Change 10 that are subject to the provisions of the regional coastal plan</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Megan Patrick - Principal Advisor Special Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>John Duguid - General Manager - Plans and Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Megan Tyler - Chief of Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Index of historic heritage places subject to Plan Change 10

to the Auckland Unitary Plan (operative in part)

Schedule 14 Historic Heritage Schedule, Statements and Maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Local Board Area</th>
<th>Change proposed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00033</td>
<td>Glen Eden Railway Station</td>
<td>145 West Coast Road, Glen Eden</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00076</td>
<td>War Memorial</td>
<td>500 South Titirangi Road, Titirangi</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00198</td>
<td>New Lynn Police Station</td>
<td>3092 Great North Road, New Lynn</td>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00245</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>85B Woodglen Road, Glen Eden</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00253</td>
<td>Swanson Railway Station</td>
<td>Swanson Station Park, 760 Swanson Road, Swanson</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00453</td>
<td>Dr Meinhold’s Helensville Hospital (former)</td>
<td>23 and 27 Garfield Road, Helensville</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00454</td>
<td>Becroft Home</td>
<td>22 Garfield Road, Helensville</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00469</td>
<td>Methodist Church (former)</td>
<td>118 Commercial Road, Helensville</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00478</td>
<td>Dr Meinhold’s Helensville Hospital (former)</td>
<td>23 Garfield Road, Helensville</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00486</td>
<td>Wech House (former)</td>
<td>1212 State Highway 1, Pohuehue</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00603</td>
<td>Orewa House and watchhouse</td>
<td>498 Hibiscus Coast Highway, Orewa</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00604</td>
<td>Orewa House Watchhouse</td>
<td>498 Hibiscus Coast Highway, Orewa</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00609</td>
<td>Silverdale Pioneer Village</td>
<td>Silverdale Reserve, 19 Wainui Road (also known as 31 and 33 Silverdale Street), Silverdale</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00851</td>
<td>Albany Hotel</td>
<td>276 Dairy Flat Highway, Albany</td>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00855</td>
<td>Mission Hall</td>
<td>411 Glenfield Road, Glenfield</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>Text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00923</td>
<td>Northcote Methodist Church</td>
<td>137-139 Queen Street, Northcote Point</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00929</td>
<td>Auckland Harbour Bridge Memorial</td>
<td>Stokes Point Northcote Reserve, Princes Street, Northcote Point</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00931</td>
<td>Northcote Point flag staff</td>
<td>Stokes Point Northcote Reserve, Princes Street, Northcote Point</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01065</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>14 Bayview Road, Hauraki</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01142</td>
<td>Takapuna Dairy Company (former)</td>
<td>197 Victoria Road, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01218</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>37 King Edward Parade, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01332</td>
<td>Clevedon Post Office</td>
<td>2 Papakura-Clevedon Road, Clevedon</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01423</td>
<td>Selwyn Church</td>
<td>3 Hain Avenue, Mangere East</td>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01470</td>
<td>Memorial Gates</td>
<td>Papatoetoe Central School, 3175 Great South Road, Papatoetoe</td>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01483</td>
<td>Papatoetoe Central Theatre (former)</td>
<td>77 St George Street, Papatoetoe</td>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01541</td>
<td>Kohekohe Presbyterian Church (former) and plaque</td>
<td>1189 Awhitu Road, Waiuku</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01653</td>
<td>Worker's residence</td>
<td>15 Findlay Street, Ellerslie</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01655</td>
<td>Worker's residence</td>
<td>32 Findlay Street, Ellerslie</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01658</td>
<td>Rob Roy Hotel (former)/The Birdcage</td>
<td>123-133 Franklin Road, Freemans Bay</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01676</td>
<td>Grey Lynn Public Library</td>
<td>474 Great North Road, Grey Lynn</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>Text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01702</td>
<td>Ponsonby Baptist Church and Chapel/hall</td>
<td>43 Jervois Road, Herne Bay</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01710</td>
<td>Seccombe's Well</td>
<td>269 Khyber Pass, Epsom</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01726</td>
<td>School House</td>
<td>Diocesan School for Girls, 44 Margot Street, Epsom</td>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01741</td>
<td>Marino Gardens Apartments</td>
<td>145-147 Mount Eden Road, Mount Eden</td>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01767</td>
<td>Orange Ballroom</td>
<td>141-149 Newton Road, Eden Terrace</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01779</td>
<td>Kent's Bakery (former)</td>
<td>2-8 Osborne Street, Newmarket</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01782</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>189 Park Road, Newmarket</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01784</td>
<td>Horse hitching post</td>
<td>Adjacent to 439 Parnell Road, Parnell</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01794</td>
<td>Royal New Zealand Foundation for the Blind office and workshops (former)</td>
<td>545 Parnell Road, Parnell</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01799</td>
<td>Gas lamp</td>
<td>Adjacent to 8 Ponsonby Road, Ponsonby</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01808</td>
<td>St John’s Church</td>
<td>229A Ponsonby Road, Ponsonby</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01811</td>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>264-272 Ponsonby Road, Ponsonby</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01813</td>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>286-292 Ponsonby Road, Ponsonby</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01862</td>
<td>Fire Brigade Building (former)</td>
<td>13 St Marys Road, Ponsonby</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>Text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01931</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>10 Bankside Street (also 9 Princes Street), Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01937</td>
<td>Barrington Building</td>
<td>10-12 Customs Street East, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01938</td>
<td>Columbus House (former)</td>
<td>14-18 Customs Street East, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01939</td>
<td>Excelsior Block</td>
<td>22-28 Customs Street East, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01940</td>
<td>Stanbeth House</td>
<td>22-28 Customs Street East, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01942</td>
<td>Entrican Building (former)</td>
<td>36 Customs Street East, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01943</td>
<td>Nathan Building</td>
<td>42 Customs Street East, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01953</td>
<td>Brooklyn Flats</td>
<td>66-70 Emily Place, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01954</td>
<td>Foster &amp; Co. Building</td>
<td>30, 32, and 34-36 Fanshawe Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01984</td>
<td>Housing Corporation Building (former)</td>
<td>66-68 Lorne Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01991</td>
<td>Braemar</td>
<td>7 Parliament Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01992</td>
<td>Middle Courtville</td>
<td>9 Parliament Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01993</td>
<td>Courtville</td>
<td>11 Parliament Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02001</td>
<td>Masonic Hall (façade)</td>
<td>9 Princes Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>Text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02002</td>
<td>Grand Hotel (façade)</td>
<td>9 Princes Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02007</td>
<td>Synagogue (former)</td>
<td>19A Princes Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02031</td>
<td>Bank of New Zealand (façade)</td>
<td>125 Queen Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02034</td>
<td>Whitcombe and Tombs Ltd. Building</td>
<td>186 Queen Street (corner of Durham Street East), Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02035</td>
<td>Auckland Electric Power Board Building</td>
<td>187-189 Queen Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02036</td>
<td>Lewis Eady Building</td>
<td>192 Queen Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02037</td>
<td>John Court's Building (former)</td>
<td>210 Queen Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02041</td>
<td>Civic House and Fergusson Building</td>
<td>291-297 Queen Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02042</td>
<td>Fergusson Building</td>
<td>291-297 Queen Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02045</td>
<td>Auckland Sunday School Union Building</td>
<td>323-327 Queen Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02058</td>
<td>Residence (former)</td>
<td>16 Symonds Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02059</td>
<td>Residence (former)</td>
<td>12 Symonds Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02060</td>
<td>Residence (former)</td>
<td>14 Symonds Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02269</td>
<td>Blacksmiths (former)</td>
<td>85 Waimauku Station Road, Waimauku</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>Text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02070</td>
<td>Sargood, Son and Ewen Building (façade)</td>
<td>19-25 Victoria Street West (also known as 22 Durham Street West), Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitemā</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02498</td>
<td>Bell Homestead</td>
<td>62 Monument Road, Clevedon</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02515</td>
<td>Herne Bay Historic Heritage Area</td>
<td>6 Herne Bay Road, Herne Bay</td>
<td>Waitemā</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Map 14.2.5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02615</td>
<td>Courts Building</td>
<td>186-188 Onehunga Mall, Onehunga</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02654</td>
<td>Glenfield Library</td>
<td>88-94 Bentley Avenue, Glenfield</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02655</td>
<td>Wild residence (former)</td>
<td>24 Chivalry Road, Glenfield</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02656</td>
<td>Matthews' bach</td>
<td>1019 Beach Road, Torbay</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02657</td>
<td>Pillbox</td>
<td>17 Bournemouth Terrace, Crows Nest Rise Walk, R 16 Brighton Terrace, Murrays Bay</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02658</td>
<td>Mairangi Bay Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>9 Hastings Road, Mairangi Bay</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02659</td>
<td>All Hallows Methodist Church</td>
<td>218 Beach Road, Campbells Bay</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02660</td>
<td>St Joseph’s Convent and chapel (former)</td>
<td>87B Penzance Road, Mairangi Bay</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02662</td>
<td>Levesque residence (former)</td>
<td>205 Birkdale Road, Birkdale</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02663</td>
<td>McCullough farmhouse (former)</td>
<td>48 Eskdale Road, Birkdale</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02664</td>
<td>Monument to John Green Kay</td>
<td>John Kay Park, R 89 Waipa Street, Birkdale</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>Text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02665</td>
<td>Carlquist residence (former)</td>
<td>4 Hinemoa Terrace, Birkenhead</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02666</td>
<td>Button house (former)</td>
<td>73 Hinemoa Street, Birkenhead</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02667</td>
<td>Stott’s Building</td>
<td>136-140 Hinemoa Street, Birkenhead</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02668</td>
<td>Fishers Building</td>
<td>102-108 Hinemoa Street, Birkenhead</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02669</td>
<td>Souster residence (former)</td>
<td>146 Hinemoa Street, Birkenhead</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02670</td>
<td>Victoria Hall (former)</td>
<td>17 Mariposa Crescent, Birkenhead</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02671</td>
<td>McGovern’s Store</td>
<td>147 Mokoia Road, Birkenhead</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02672</td>
<td>Payne’s Building (former)/Oborns Building</td>
<td>1-23 Mokoia Road, Birkenhead</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02673</td>
<td>Swindall farmhouse (former)</td>
<td>115 Mokoia Road, Birkenhead</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02674</td>
<td>The Gables Hospital (former)</td>
<td>32 Hinemoa Street, Birkenhead</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02675</td>
<td>St John the Baptist Anglican Church</td>
<td>43 Church Street, Northcote Point</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02676</td>
<td>Police residence (former)</td>
<td>11 Clarence Road, Northcote Point</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02677</td>
<td>Cobblestone Lane townhouses</td>
<td>7, 8, and 9 Cobblestone Lane, Hillcrest</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02678</td>
<td>Northcote Library</td>
<td>5 Ernie Mays Street, Northcote</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02680</td>
<td>Ormrod’s General Store (former)</td>
<td>141 Queen Street, Northcote Point</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02681</td>
<td>Northcote Methodist Church parsonage</td>
<td>137 Queen Street, Northcote Point</td>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02682</td>
<td>Winifred Chapple residence (former)</td>
<td>1 Kitchener Road, Takapuna</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02683</td>
<td>Cedric Firth residence</td>
<td>9 Kitchener Road, Takapuna</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Request to make Plan Change 10: Historic Heritage Schedule (errors, anomalies and information update) operative in part
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>LBA</th>
<th>Text?</th>
<th>Map?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02684</td>
<td>St Joseph’s Catholic Church</td>
<td>6-8 Taharoto Road, Takapuna</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02685</td>
<td>St George’s Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>2 The Terrace, Takapuna</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02687</td>
<td>North Shore Bridge Club</td>
<td>39 Killarney Street, Takapuna</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02688</td>
<td>Sumpter residence</td>
<td>12 The Esplanade, Castor Bay</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02689</td>
<td>Pillbox</td>
<td>12 The Esplanade, Castor Bay</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02690</td>
<td>St Peter’s Anglican Church</td>
<td>11 Killarney Street, Takapuna</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02691</td>
<td>School Hall</td>
<td>St Leo’s Catholic School, 4 Owens Road, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02692</td>
<td>Takapuna Jockey Club toilet block</td>
<td>Allenby Reserve, R 1 Allenby Avenue, Narrow Neck</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02694</td>
<td>Devonport Jubilee Clock</td>
<td>63 Lake Road, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02695</td>
<td>Devonport Jubilee Clock</td>
<td>89 Vauxhall Road, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02696</td>
<td>Devonport Jubilee Clock/Melrose Clock</td>
<td>Corner Victoria Road and Albert Road, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02697</td>
<td>Devonport Police Station (former)</td>
<td>7 and 9 Rattray Street, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02698</td>
<td>Balmain Reserve toilets and changing rooms</td>
<td>Balmain Reserve, R 18 Oxford Terrace, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02699</td>
<td>Residence and shop</td>
<td>116 Calliope Road, Stanley Point</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02700</td>
<td>Commercial building (former)/Terraced houses</td>
<td>24 Church Street, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02701</td>
<td>Masonic Cricket Club clubhouse</td>
<td>Vauxhall Sportsfields, 28 Vauxhall Road, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>Text?</td>
<td>Map?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02702</td>
<td>Alpers’ residence (former)</td>
<td>29A Glen Road, Stanley Point</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02704</td>
<td>Ford residence (former)</td>
<td>33 Mays Street, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02706</td>
<td>Canavan residence (former)</td>
<td>26 Oxford Terrace, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02707</td>
<td>Stanley Bay Primary School</td>
<td>Stanley Bay School, 15 Russell Street, Stanley Point</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02708</td>
<td>Lewin residence (former)</td>
<td>2 Seabreeze Road, Narrow Neck</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02709</td>
<td>Ngataringa Tennis Club clubhouse</td>
<td>Stanley Bay Park, R 166 Calliope Road, Stanley Point</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02710</td>
<td>Stanley Bay Bowling Club</td>
<td>20 Stanley Point Road, Stanley Point</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02711</td>
<td>Gittos residence (former)</td>
<td>52 Stanley Point Road, Stanley Point</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02712</td>
<td>Whites Dairy and residence</td>
<td>16 Vauxhall Road, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02713</td>
<td>Auckland Meat Company butcher shop (former)</td>
<td>87 Vauxhall Road, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02714</td>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>91A Vauxhall Road, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02715</td>
<td>Edward Bartley’s residence (former)/Orpheus Lodge</td>
<td>117 Victoria Road, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02716</td>
<td>Commercial building</td>
<td>161 Victoria Road, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02717</td>
<td>North Shore Croquet Club</td>
<td>Wairoa Road Reserve, R 1 Wairoa Road, Narrow Neck</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02718</td>
<td>Devonport Fire Station (former)</td>
<td>4-6 Calliope Road, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>Text?</td>
<td>Map?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02719</td>
<td>First Devonport Scout Group Den</td>
<td>Allenby Reserve, R 1 Allenby Avenue, Narrow Neck</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02720</td>
<td>Wakatere Boating Club starting tower</td>
<td>Narrow Neck Beach, R 2 Old Lake Road, Narrow Neck</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02721</td>
<td>Mays/Fairburn residence</td>
<td>7 King Edward Parade, Devonport</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02725</td>
<td>Waiuku War Memorial Town Hall and Backstage Theatre</td>
<td>80 Queen Street, Waiuku</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02726</td>
<td>Logan Bank (former)</td>
<td>110-112 and 114-116 Anzac Avenue, Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitmatā</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02727</td>
<td>World War I Memorial Beacon</td>
<td>Quay Street (adjacent to 149-159 Quay Street), Auckland Central</td>
<td>Waitmatā</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02736</td>
<td>Onehunga Wharf</td>
<td>55 Onehunga Harbour Road, Onehunga</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decisions Version: Plan Change 10

Schedule 14.1 Historic Heritage

Notes:
1. Only the historic heritage places in Plan Change 10 subject to the provisions of the regional coastal plan are shown
2. Amendments to the Auckland Unitary Plan as proposed by PC10 as notified and as confirmed by this decision shown as strikethrough and underline
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Place Name and/or Description</th>
<th>Verified Location</th>
<th>Verified Legal Description</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Primary Feature</th>
<th>Heritage Values</th>
<th>Extent of Place</th>
<th>Exclusions</th>
<th>Additional Rules for Archaeological Sites or Features</th>
<th>Place of Maori Interest or Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00233</td>
<td>Napier Quarter</td>
<td>Holmescroft</td>
<td>LOT 10 DP 49/RZ/1 497757</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Residences</td>
<td>A, F</td>
<td>Refer to planning maps</td>
<td>Interior of building(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00607</td>
<td>Birkenhead Point sea wall</td>
<td>Hinemoa Park, R1 Hinemoa Swain,</td>
<td></td>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Sea wall</td>
<td>A, B, G, H</td>
<td>Refer to planning maps</td>
<td>Buildings and structures that are not the primary feature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02653</td>
<td>Taupiri Sea Scouts' Den</td>
<td>R 17 Rahui Road, Greenlatho</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Scout hut</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Refer to planning maps</td>
<td>Interior of building(s); toilet block</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decisions Version: Plan Change 10

GIS Viewer/planning maps

Note:
1. Only the historic heritage places in Plan Change 10 subject to the provisions of the regional coastal plan are shown
2. Only the Historic Heritage Overlay extent of place maps for the subject property are shown.
ID 00233
Married Quarters, Hobsonville Royal New Zealand Air Force Base, Marlborough Crescent, Hobsonville
ID 00907

Birkenhead Point sea wall, Hinemoa Park, R 1 Hinemoa Street, Birkenhead
ID 02653
Tauhinu Sea Scouts’ Den, R 17 Rahul Road, Greenhithe
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 memos were circulated to members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29/5/16</td>
<td>Update on the Paturoa Road Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/19</td>
<td>Auckland Unitary Plan Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6/19</td>
<td>Supporting Growth Programme Update - CONFIDENTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/19</td>
<td>St James Update June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/19</td>
<td>Options for Protection of the Paturoa Road kauri Trees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The following workshops and briefing information is attached:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Workshop/Briefing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/6/19</td>
<td>Planning Committee/Finance and Performance Committee Joint Workshop: Unlock Northcote Programme Description and Indicative Financials – CONFIDENTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/6/19</td>
<td>Counties Manukau DHB Plans for Catchment - CONFIDENTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/6/19</td>
<td>City Centre Masterplan Refresh Workshop Minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. 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.

6. The attachments for this report have been published separately at the following link: http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz > Planning Committee > 2 July 2019 > Extra Attachments
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the Summary of Planning Committee information memos and briefings – 2 July 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Update on the Paturoa Road Tree <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Auckland Unitary Plan Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>City Centre Masterplan Refresh Workshop Minutes <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Memo - St James Update June 2019</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Memo - Options for Protection of the Paturoa Road Kauri Trees</td>
<td>311</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>Megan Tyler - Chief of Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: Planning Committee members
cc: John Duguid, General Manager Plans and Places
Subject: St James Theatre and adjoining apartment development update
From: Noel Reardon, Manager Heritage

Purpose
1. To provide an update to Planning Committee on the St James Theatre and adjoining apartment development.

Heritage Value
2. The richly-ornamented St James Theatre in Auckland’s Queen Street, designed by renowned New Zealand theatre architect Henry Eli White and completed in 1928, is one of the country’s great atmospheric theatres. Its high heritage values are recognised by its scheduling as a Category ‘A’ place in the city’s Unitary Plan, and a New Zealand Heritage listing as a ‘1’ item.

Background
3. Presently the apartment complex and the theatre are in separate ownership.
4. Resource consent has been granted for an apartment tower and its base podium on the adjacent former cinemas sites. Demolition of these cinemas has finished and there is now a clear site.
5. As part of the apartment development resource consent, conditions required aspects of the theatre’s restoration. These include earthquake strengthening the two adjoining walls between the theatre and the proposed apartment complex, providing toilets and lifts for the theatre within the apartment podium and restoration of the Queen Street tower and entrance.
6. The restoration of the theatre is therefore linked with the development of the apartment complex.

Funding of the theatre restoration
7. In recognition of the theatre’s importance Council has allocated (but not yet transferred) a 1:1 subsidy of $15 million towards the restoration – by far the largest grant given in the city, and probably the country - to a private heritage project.
8. The council’s funding is conditional on it being matched by the theatre owner. There is also a similar amount (approximately $15 million) anticipated to be spent on the theatre because of the apartment development resource consent conditions.
9. This combined funding ($45 million) is sufficient to see the theatre reopened at a basic operational level -however additional funding would still be required to bring the theatre back to full operating capacity.

Apartment Tower Development
10. All the apartments in the proposed tower were presold, when the BNZ for various reasons rescinded a $90 million loan to the project. This was after the demolition of the surrounding cinemas; theatre toilets and Queen Street entrance had taken place.
11. Due to lack of funding the apartment development is stalled.
Current condition of the theatre

12. Significant strengthening and wall restoration has taken place, and the richly decorated interior lobbies restored to their original look and character. The building has been secured from fire damage with the removal of faulty wiring. The highly modelled frontage to the Queen St entrance tower of the theatre is temporarily supported on a large steel gantry in the street, after the salt-compromised rear portions were demolished in the expectation of their reconstruction within the apartments' podium.

13. To date some $11 million has been spent by the current theatre owner on the infrastructural, structural and restoration work undertaken to the St James theatre itself.

Current position

14. Efforts have been made by the apartment site - and the St James owners - to secure alternative funding, but none of these have eventuated. Council officers have been involved providing advice on the resource consent conditions and future possible other development options.

15. The current situation therefore remains at a standstill, with the prospect of a possible sale of the site(s), and of a new owner perhaps proposing a new version of the full project, although there appears to be little prospect of such a party eventuating from within New Zealand, and none yet from elsewhere. The possible alternative is an indefinite mothballing of the theatre – not a particularly desirable outcome because of the risks involved with security and critically ageing service installations.

16. Technically the theatre could be restored even if the apartments do not immediately go ahead, but this would depend on the $1.5 million expected from the apartment project. Officers understand that this is being discussed between the owners of both sites.
Memo

To: Planning Committee Members
From: Phill Reid – Manager, Auckland-wide, Plans & Places

Subject: Options for Protection of the Paturoa Rd Kauri Trees

The purpose of this memo is to provide further information for members in relation to options for protection of the kauri tree/s on the property at 40/42 Paturoa Road (including those on road reserve). This information responds to a resolution from the meeting of the Planning Committee on 4 June 2019:

That the Planning Committee:

... 

(b) request staff to provide a report on all options to prevent the felling of Awhi Awhi and the kauri trees under threat at 40-42 Paturoa Road, Titirangi.

An earlier memo (dated 28 May 2019) was distributed to members outlining a brief history of the matter and the issues related to possible proposed plan changes to extend the Significant Ecological Area (SEA) overlay over the property and/or to include the kauri tree/s in Schedule 10 (Notable Trees Schedule) of the Auckland Unitary Plan.

At the Planning Committee meeting on 4 June 2019 it was agreed that interested Councillors would meet to discuss the options. That meeting took place on 13 June, and was attended by Councillors Darby, Hulse, Cooper, Deputy Mayor Cr Bill Cashmore. The Mayor was represented by his staff and then joined the meeting in its latter stages. Staff attended in support of the meeting and provided the following options for discussion.

Option 1: Plan Change/s to extend the SEA overlay over the property and/or including the kauri trees in Schedule 10 (Notable Trees Schedule)

The limitations around the options to promulgate proposed plan changes to include the trees in the SEA overlay and/or the Notable Trees overlay have previously been outlined. This is not considered to be an option for the following reasons:

- even if the SEA overlay had remained on the property, or if it were to be reinstated as part of a plan change, the ability of the property owner to apply for resource consent to clear a building platform and curtilage is part of the anticipated and reasonable use of the property;
- although a future resource consent outcome to develop the property cannot be anticipated, the area which was subject to the original assessment (and therefore from which the SEA was removed in the Auckland Unitary Plan) was considered the most appropriate based on factors which were extensively addressed by professional assessment, including topography and the need to protect other, mature vegetation towards the rear of the property;
• undertaking a plan change to add a small area of SEA overlay would have to be balanced against the overall gain, particularly when the outcome would likely be similar in determining the most appropriate building platform area;
• a case-by-case, piecemeal approach to individually address small areas of potential SEA by way of plan change is not an efficient use of Council resources;
• the kauri tree (known as “Awhi Awhi”) is the subject of a Certificate of Compliance (CoC). The landowner has a CoC which confirms the ability to remove the kauri tree as a permitted activity. Even if Council were to pursue plan changes to extend the SEA overlay or to include the kauri tree/s in Schedule 10, these plan changes would take an extensive period of time and resources and could not have retrospective effect. The landowner could still rely on the CoC to remove the tree, the consideration of adding one tree to the Council’s notable tree schedule via a plan change cannot be justified in the context of many similar others that fall outside of SEA (or other overlays which formally protect vegetation). In addition, the kauri tree May not meet the criteria for inclusion;
• any of the kauri trees that are located on the road reserve that are greater than 4m in height, require a resource consent to remove the trees pursuant to Rule A10 in Activity table E17.4.1 as a restricted discretionary activity: “Tree removal of any tree greater than 4m in height or greater than 400mm in girth”. Landowner approval is separately required from Auckland Transport before the kauri trees could be removed.

Option 2: Council becoming a party to the court proceedings

It is understood that the appeal by the neighbours to the High Court has now been withdrawn, and confirmed by the High Court. As a result, there are no longer High Court proceedings that the council could join as an interested party (intervener). The injunction that was in place to protect the kauri tree (known as “Awhi Awhi”) has now been set aside.

Option 3: Council purchases or leases the property or the portion of the property that the kauri tree is located on (for the purpose of scientific research)

The variations of this option (purchase or lease in whole or part) are not considered to be appropriate for the following reasons:

• they are expensive and resource-hungry options, of which the benefits to Council, to science or the wider community have not been clearly identified. There are similar kauri trees on publicly-owned land that currently are not exhibiting symptoms of Phytophthora (and which have not had their health compromised through ringbarking as has the Paturoa kauri tree known as “Awhi Awhi”) and which could be subject to such research;
• apportioning a section of the property for the purpose of lease/purchase may compromise the ability of the property owners to realise a reasonable and anticipated level of development and require them to seek additional areas for clearance to be able to develop the property/properties. Future consent assessment/s would need to factor in any alteration to the configuration of the land parcel as a result of any lease/purchase and may result in additional professional assessments at the expense of the landowner and Council;
• any acquisition of land requires a rigorous assessment in accordance with parks policies before Council funds and resources are committed. This requires a detailed assessment against acquisition criteria. While this exercise has obviously not been undertaken in this specific instance, the fundamental criteria are based primarily on whether the acquisition would result in a high, medium or low priority asset in accordance with community needs, connection to other public spaces, protecting and restoring unique features and any
improvement the acquisition would make to existing public open space. The acquisition of a small area of land containing a single compromised kauri tree may score low against these criteria.

Option 4: Council waives resource consent fees for future development consents in exchange for the tree being protected

This is a potential option but has the following limitations:

- the method by which the kauri would be protected would involve agreement from the landowner;
- a potentially large amount of Council resources would be required depending on how such protection might be achieved - e.g. by covenant, acquisition or negotiation as part of a consent application. It would rely on the goodwill of the current or future owner given that a CoC has been issued, that would allow the landowner to legally remove the kauri tree;
- the precedent that this option might set could raise issues for the Council. Any potential future development that compromises an unprotected tree could subsequently invoke a “fees free” scenario. Waiving consent fees for development of the land containing the Paturoa tree could thus set an unintended precedent for other similar situations.

Option 5: ‘Do Nothing’ approach

The do nothing option is preferred. This is preferred for the following reasons:

- allows Council to respond meaningfully and within the provisions of the Auckland Unitary Plan to future consent applications to develop this (and similar) properties
- does not compromise the Council in its response to future controversial issues
- allows Council to remain impartial to “neighbour disputes” and prevents the continuing undue costs and resources outlined at Options 1-4 above at ratepayers’ expense

Phil Reid
Manager – Auckland wide Planning, Plans & Places.