



Waitakere City Council  
*Te Taiāo o Waitakere*

## REPORT TO THE JOINT HEARINGS PANEL

### WAITAKERE CITY DISTRICT PLAN

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 13 (HOBSONVILLE AIRBASE)  
PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 14 (HOBSONVILLE VILLAGE CENTRE)  
PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 15 (MASSEY NORTH)  
PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 16 (MANAGING CITY GROWTH)  
PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 17 (NEW LYNN)  
PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 18 (CITY WIDE URBAN DESIGN RULES)

## TRANSPORTATION

File Reference : Report WCC 4  
Date : 26 October 2006

---

### 1. OUTLINE

This report considers submissions and further submissions which were received in response to proposed Plan Changes 13-18 to the Waitakere City District Plan (referred to in this report as “the Plan”). Other submissions to the Plan Changes will be considered in subsequent hearing reports.

This report has been prepared in accordance with section 42(a) of the Resource Management Act to assist the Joint RPS and District Plan Changes Hearings Panel (“the Hearings Panel”) with its consideration of submissions received in respect of the Plan Changes.

The report discusses each submission or groups of similar submissions and includes a recommendation on submissions that has been made by staff preparing the report, **but it is not the decision of the Waitakere City Council (WCC)**. Recommendations are not directly made with respect to further submissions in support of or in opposition to submissions. However, the recommendations follow that of the original submission.

Submitters and further submitters are invited to attend the hearing and present evidence in support of their submissions for the Hearings Panel to consider. Alternatively if submitters and further submitters are unable to attend the hearing they may provide written evidence which will be tabled for the Hearings Panel to consider.

Following consideration of all the submissions and supporting evidence, if any, presented by the submitters and further submitters at the hearing to the Hearings Panel, the Hearings

Panel will make recommendations to the Council. The Council will consider those recommendations and then make a decision concerning each submission.

The suggested amendments to the Waitakere City District Plan arising from the staff recommendations discussed throughout this report are listed in full in Appendix 1. The suggested amendments are set out in the same style as the Waitakere City District Plan. However it should be noted that a number of submissions, that will be considered separately from this report, have sought broad amendments to the content and direction of other proposed changes and the inclusion of additional matters. This may result in some changes to the wording, structure and format of these provisions, which is not reflected in Appendix 1.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

Proposed Plan Changes 13-18 (“the Plan Changes”) were notified on 31 March 2005 as a requirement of the Local Government (Auckland) Amendment Act 2004 (“the LGAAA”). Amongst other things, the Act required Auckland local authorities to prepare and notify changes to their district plans to provide for integrated land transport and land use provisions that are consistent with the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy (ARGS).

The LGAAA and the relationship between the LGAAA and the Resource Management Act 1991 (“the RMA”) is discussed further in section 3 of this report.

In response to the requirements of the Act, the Council publicly notified six Plan Changes (being Plan Changes 13 to 18 inclusive). The Plan Changes provide for:

- The establishment of three new peripheral urban growth areas, which are primarily intended to provide for the development of commercial and industrial activities (Plan Changes 13, 14 and 15); and
- The introduction of a new chapter in the Policy Section of the District Plan to provide additional objectives and policies concerned with the management of growth (Plan Change 16); and
- Specific rules and supporting policies intended to facilitate and encourage the intensification of development in and around the New Lynn town centre (Plan Change 17); and
- The establishment of new rules to more effectively manage the impacts of growth and intensification (Plan Change 18).

This report addresses those submissions that relate to general transportation principles and issues, primarily from submissions to Chapter 16. The transport submissions that are specific to geographic areas will be addressed in subsequent reports.

## **3. STATUTORY FRAMEWORK**

### **3.1 LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AUCKLAND) AMENDMENT ACT 2004**

The LGAAA requires that all councils in the Auckland Region integrate their land transport and land use provisions and ensure these are consistent with the ARGS, give effect to its growth concept and contribute to the matters specified in Schedule 5.

Part 2 of the LGAAA focuses on “Auckland Region Land Transport and Stormwater” and includes sections 6 to 44. The purpose of Part 2 is set out in section 6:

*The purpose of this Part is to-*

- (a) assign to the Auckland Regional Council principal responsibility for-*
  - i.) setting the strategy for the Auckland regional land transport system; and*
  - ii) integrating the planning, funding and development of the Auckland regional land transport system; and*
  - iii) stormwater funding in the long-term interests of the Auckland Region (to the extent that this function was, before the commencement of this Act, the responsibility of Infrastructure Auckland; and*
- (b) establish the Auckland Regional Transport Authority and Auckland Regional Holdings to assist the Auckland Regional Council to discharge that responsibility; and*
- (c) dissolve Infrastructure Auckland, and transfer its assets and liabilities to Auckland Regional Holdings and other organisations; and*
- (d) require Auckland local authorities to prepare and notify changes to the policy statement and plans under the Resource Management Act 1991 to provide for integrated land transport and land use provisions that are consistent with the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy.*

The subsection of key interest here is section 6 (d). It is important to note that the test in section 6 (d) is one of consistency, a more stringent requirement than that in the RMA where the test at the time of the notification of Proposed Plan Changes 13-18 was for regional and district plans not to be inconsistent with higher statutory documents, such as a regional or national policy statement.

Section 40 on the extent of land transport and land use changes states:

- (1) A land transport and land use change is a change or variation to an Auckland planning document by including issues, objectives, policies, and descriptions of methods for the purpose of-*
  - (a) Giving effect, in an integrated manner, to the growth concept in the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy prepared under section 37SE of the Local Government Act 1974; and*
  - (b) contributing, in an integrated manner, to the matters specified in Schedule 5.*
- (2) A change for the purposes of subsection (1)(a) and a change for the purposes of subsection (1)(b) must, in relation to each other, be integrated.*

A change for the purposes of subsection (1) (a) and a change for the purposes of subsection (1) (b) must, in relation to each other, be integrated.

Section 40 (1) further underscores the importance of the ARGS by requiring changes or variations to give effect to the ARGS growth concept. The importance of integration is stressed through Section 40 (1) b) and (2).

Schedule 5: Land transport and land use changes, indicates that for section 40 (1) (b) the matters are as follows:

- (a) *providing increased certainty in the assessment of resource consents, designations, and plan changes related to transport and urban form, and ensuring that transport and land use patterns are aligned to achieve sustainability, efficiency, and liveability in the Auckland Region; and*
- (b) *managing transport and transport infrastructure, facilitating a multimodal transport network, and facilitating integrated transport management; and*
- (c) *reducing adverse effects of transport on the environment (including improving air and water quality, reducing noise and stormwater, improving heritage protection and reducing community disruption and transport land use), and reducing the adverse effects and increasing the positive interactions of transport and land use; and*
- (d) *supporting compact sustainable urban form and sustainable urban land use intensification (including location, timing and sequencing issues, and associated quality, character, and values of urban form and design); and*
- (e) *integrating transport and land use policies to reinforce metropolitan urban and rural objectives of the Auckland Regional Policy Statement, the development of a competitive and efficient economy and a high quality of life, underpinned by a quality environment and amenity.*

The matters that the LGAAA requires to be included in changes to statutory documents support the RMA's purpose of promoting sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

### **3.2 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991 PROVISIONS**

The purpose of the RMA, as outlined in Part II of the Act, is the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Part II also outlines the matters, including those matters of national importance, to which Council must have regard to and provide for in achieving that purpose.

The purpose of a district plan as outlined in section 72 is to assist Council to carry out its functions. Councils' functions are outlined in Section 31 as the control of actual and potential effects of the use, development or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources in order to achieve the purpose of the RMA. Councils are obliged to establish, implement and review the objectives, policies and methods to achieve this and can also include rules, which prohibit, regulate or allow certain activities.

### **3.3 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RMA AND THE LGAAA**

The matters that the LGAAA requires be included in changes to statutory documents, that is, changes consistent with the ARGS and to give effect to its growth concept, can be taken as promoting the RMA's purpose of promoting sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

The impetus for the ARGS grew out of the statutory processes surrounding the region's first ARPS, and the region's desire to work together more strategically to enhance the region's future. Environmental protection and sustainable management of the region's natural and physical resources is central to the ARGS.

The Local Government Act (LGA 1974) gave statutory recognition to the Auckland Regional Growth Forum and legitimised work on a growth strategy through a 1998 amendment. Section SE37 stated that:

- (1) The Auckland Regional Council must prepare and adopt a regional growth strategy for its region.
- (2) The objective of the strategy for the Auckland Region will be to ensure growth is accommodated in a way that meets the best interests of the inhabitants of the Auckland Region.
- (3) The regional growth strategy prepared under this section may include (but need not be limited to)
  - (a) Identification of the anticipated and preferred locations of growth within the Auckland Region:
  - (b) A statement of key values for considering growth issues:
  - (c) Information about future growth to assist regional providers of infrastructure to plan to meet future requirements:
  - (d) Such other matters as are considered appropriate.

Subsection 4 required that an (Auckland) regional growth strategy not be inconsistent with any operative or proposed regional policy statement, while 5 provided for reviews.

It is acknowledged that the RMA and the LGAAA legislative language varies somewhat, and may give rise to a range of views about what is appropriate, and under what statute. For the avoidance of doubt, this hearing report assumes that the changes proposed are to meet the LGAAA requirements, and that these requirements fall within the RMA's requirements. Again, for the avoidance of doubt, if there are any doubts, or the appearance of potential conflicts between the two statutes and their requirements, the LGAAA, as the more specific legislation applies.

## **4 OTHER RELEVANT DOCUMENTS / STRATEGIES**

### **4.1 THE AUCKLAND REGIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY: 2050**

#### **AN OVERVIEW**

The ARGS represents the future vision for the Auckland region by its councils working jointly together in the Auckland Regional Growth Forum. It seeks to promote the sustainable management of the region's resources within a sustainable development framework. It was launched by Auckland councils in late 1999, with the then reviewed Regional Land Transport Strategy (ARLTS).

The strategy provides a vision for what Auckland could look like in 2050 when it may have a population of 2 million. It built on the policy approach in the ARPS. However it contrasts with the ARPS and District Plans that under the RMA are operative for 10 years, and tend to focus on a far shorter time horizon. The ARGS seeks to take an integrated strategic approach to regional growth management into the longer term. Its vision is to sustain:

- strong, supportive communities;

- a high quality living environment;
- a region that is easy to get around; and
- protection of the coast and surrounding natural environment.

The ARGS states that:

Three key themes relating to the major issues and growth pressures facing the Auckland region emerge from these prioritised desired outcomes. They are:

- Desirable communities and diversity and choice optimised
- Accessibility optimised
- Natural and physical environment optimised

When the ARGS was launched Auckland councils signed a Memorandum of Understanding committing themselves to its effective implementation through appropriate resourcing of growth work, through committing to develop sector agreements within two years of the ARGS having been signed, and implementing these.

One crucial aspect of implementation includes ongoing changes to RMA policy statements and plans to incorporate relevant aspects of the ARGS and its sector agreements.

## **THE GROWTH CONCEPT**

The “Growth Concept” is a snapshot of how the region could look at 2050 if growth is managed according to the vision, outcomes and principles.

Key features of the “Growth Concept” are:

- that growth will be managed by promoting quality, compact urban environments (intensification); this will assist with managing the effects of growth;
- most growth within the existing metropolitan area with development outside current urban limits only where environmental, accessibility and community principles can be met;
- most urban growth focused around town centres and major transport routes to create higher density communities, with a variety of housing, jobs, services, recreational and other activities (mixed use);
- much less emphasis on general infill throughout suburban areas;
- development of the most highly valued and sensitive natural areas is avoided.

Looking out to 2050, some expansion in new greenfield areas was seen as necessary to provide sufficient land and locational choice for dwellings and businesses. If all proposed greenfield development proceeds the Auckland region’s metropolitan area may increase by about 10% or 5000 hectares, over the 50-year timeframe.

By 2050, more than a quarter of the population (more than 500,000 people) could be living in higher density, multi-unit accommodation compared with less than an eighth or 125,000 people in 1996. However, even after 50 years, 70% of people could still live at lower densities in the suburbs and rural areas.

It is acknowledged that the LGAAA requirement to give effect to the growth concept, is somewhat problematic for the Section 32 evaluation. The ARGs is a broad brush strategic document, reliant on technical and consultative work done to underpin it but which is not part of it. The ARGs notes that:

*The Growth Concept is essentially a snapshot that illustrates how the Growth Forum believes the region could look in the year 2050 if growth is managed according to the vision, outcomes and principles contained in the strategy. The Growth Concept provides one possible future scenario for the Auckland region. The use of sector and local area agreements provides flexibility for a number of alternative scenarios to eventuate at a sector level. Therefore sector and local area agreements may result in changes to this Growth Concept as other options are assessed against the vision, priority outcomes and principles and agreed by the Growth Forum and its members at a sector level. (p27)*

In other words, further work may raise issues with the focus of growth in a specific area, and which could compromise the vision, outcomes and principles. Maintaining the commitment to the ARGs may require reconsideration of detailed aspects of sector and other agreements and thus changes to them, and to the growth concept.

In addition, further technical work may well be needed to implement sector agreements and to include relevant aspects in district plans. At times, such work may require details of sector agreements to be reconsidered and may result in changes to them.

The way that the ARGs is set up is important. It outlines a vision, key principles and outcomes with a growth concept; these are to be implemented through Memoranda of Understanding between the councils (and also with others), through the development of sector agreements, and sector agreement implementation of these through various mechanisms including changes to statutory documents. The ARGs broad brush picture is expected to remain the largely the same or similar, but the specifics may alter.

Each step in the process enables further consideration of whether what was envisaged in the higher, more general document actually continues to be a good fit with the ARGs vision, principles and outcomes, or whether further refinement is necessary. The ARGs acknowledges it is a living strategy, that reviews are important and implementation needs to reflect emerging issues.

## 5. DISCUSSION OF SUBMISSIONS

- **Submissions seeking amendments to consideration of the roading network**

### 5.1

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
264/32 264/39 264/46 264/53 264/60 264/67	Centre for Urban and Transport Studies	Amend the Plan Change to avoid overly aggressive public transportisation, i.e. of exacerbating road congestion through deferring arterial and motorway roadspace, and of allocation roadspace for bus lanes, unless those bus lanes actually deliver more people per hour than a normal travel lane etc.	

#### Discussion:

The submitter seeks that the plan changes do not lead to the roading network becoming dominated by public transport infrastructure and processes at the expense of other users, unless the bus lanes can deliver higher 'patronage' levels than a normal travel lane.

The LGAAA, through the proposed plan changes, seeks to integrate land use and transport, and facilitate a multimodal transport network. In addition the Regional Land Transport Strategy provides a framework for the development of the roading and public transport network, and has been developed through a consultation process.

The plan changes have been developed with regard to the above initiatives and it is considered that appropriate regard has been given to the roading network and the impact of public transport on it, in the context of the multimodal network.

It is considered that it would not be appropriate to reduce the public transport initiatives contained within the plan changes, as this will reduce the potential to integrate with the proposed new land uses.

#### Recommendation:

Submissions 264/32, 264/39 264/46, 264/53, 264/60, 264/67 are rejected.

### 5.2

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
264/35 264/42 264/63 264/70	Centre for Urban and Transport Studies	Amend the Plan Change to include proper consideration of arterial roading/motorway needs for the same planning horizon.	
264/49	Centre for Urban and Transport Studies	Amend the Plan Change to include proper consideration of arterial roading/motorway needs for the same planning horizon.	<b>Opposed By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited
264/56	Centre for Urban and Transport Studies	Amend the Plan Change to include proper consideration of arterial roading/motorway needs for the same planning horizon.	<b>Supported By:</b> 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand

		Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd
--	--	----------------------------------

**Discussion:**

The submitter seeks that the plan changes are amended to give proper consideration of the arterial roading/motorway. The submitter may wish to expand on this request at the hearing.

The LGAAA, through the proposed plan changes, seeks to integrate land use and transport, and facilitate a multimodal transport network. In addition the Regional Land Transport Strategy provides a framework for the development of the roading and public transport network, and has been developed through a consultation process.

The plan changes have been developed with regard to the above initiatives and it is considered that appropriate regard has been given to the roading network, in particular the arterial road and motorway, needs in the context of the multimodal network.

**Recommendation:**

Submissions 264/35, 264/42, 264/49, 264/56, 264/63, 264/70 are rejected.

- **Submissions seeking amendments relating to a Transport Audit**

**5.3**

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
258/191 13	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend to undertake comprehensive transport audit which looks at all modes of transportation, including public transport, walking and cycling and expresses the link between land use planning and transportation provision before any land use decisions are made operative in the Hobsonville Airbase area. The transport audit should be undertaken in consultation with ARTA and the final transport audit agreed by ARTA. ARTA can advise Waitakere City on the scope, content and requirements of such an audit, in due course.	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited <b>Supported and Opposed By:</b> 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)
258/196 14	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend to undertake a comprehensive transport audit which looks at all modes of transportation, including public transport, walking and cycling and expresses the link between land use planning and transportation provision before any land use decisions are made operative in the Hobsonville Airbase area. The transport audit should be undertaken in consultation with ARTA and the final transport audit agreed by ARTA. ARTA can advise Waitakere City on the scope, content and requirements of such an audit, in due course.	<b>Supported By:</b> 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 259 Transit New Zealand 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited <b>Opposed By:</b> 300 IMF Westland Ltd
258/201 15	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend to undertake a comprehensive transport audit which looks at all modes of transportation, including public transport, walking and cycling and expresses the link between land use planning and transportation provision before any land use decisions are made operative in the Hobsonville Airbase	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited <b>Opposed By:</b> 300 IMF Westland Ltd

		area. The transport audit should be undertaken in consultation with ARTA and the final transport audit agreed by ARTA. ARTA can advise Waitakere City on the scope, content and requirements of such an audit, in due course.	
258/221 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend to include a new policy in Section 5 Managing City Growth which states that a transport audit will be undertaken for any MUL shift, structure planning process for high density centres and corridors or major trip generating activities.	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 259 Transit New Zealand <b>Opposed By:</b> 218 AMP Capital Investors (NZ) Limited
258/222 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend to add an additional rule under Transport Environment with words to the effect of: <i>“requiring a comprehensive transport audit to be developed for any proposal to extend the MUL, any proposed structure planning process or any major trip generating proposals.”</i>	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 259 Transit New Zealand 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited

#### Discussion:

This group of submissions has requested that a Transport Audit is undertaken for Plan Changes 13 and 14 in Hobsonville, and Plan Change 15 in Massey, that the method of the audit is included within the policy of section 5 and that an audit for certain activities is requested within the rules of the Transport Environment. In addition Auckland Regional Transport Authority (ARTA) request that the audit is developed in consultation with them and that it is agreed with ARTA.

A consultation process commenced after the close of submissions in 2005 between WCC, ARTA and the Auckland Regional Council (ARC) (and other parties) that has seen both the development of the audit as a methodology, and a parallel transport audit assessment process being undertaken for the areas covered by WCC proposed Plan Changes 13, 14, and 15. The outcomes of this latter process are covered under the ARC submissions relating to those plan changes, and will be covered in the reports relating to those plan changes in future hearings. ARTA had produced a final draft version of the Transport Audit (date 31 July 2006), that was to be open to feedback from interested parties.

The draft versions of the Transport Audit document produced by ARTA indicate that the Transport Audit is to ensure that the public transport/walking /cycling measures have been incorporated into new development. This looks to expand on the previous narrow scope of the traffic generation based traffic impact assessments that have traditionally made up part of environmental impact assessments for proposed activities. It is understandable that ARTA, whose purpose is to deliver transport services, is interested that new development is supportive to, and provides public transport. It is also in the interests of Territorial Authorities in attempting to meet the purposes of the LGAAA that their proposed land use regimes are integrated with transport services, and that each local component fits into the regional framework.

It is to this end that WCC notified Plan Changes 13, 14 and 15, containing numerous transportation criteria to which all future development is subject. These criteria cover the more traditional traffic generation type criteria, and also include that regard is given to the provision of public transport, and features that support public transport e.g. appropriate infrastructure, walking accessibility, good urban form and so on. There is concern, that while it is acknowledged that the material within the draft Transport Audit is more comprehensive,

to undertake an audit at the level of the Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP) would be a replication of the proposed transportation criteria.

At the time of the plan changes being notified and submissions being made, the Transport Audit, as requested in this submission by Auckland Regional Transport Authority (ARTA), was in the process of development. It is noted that a transport audit is a proposed method (2.6.12(8)) of Proposed Plan Change 6 to the Auckland Regional Policy Statement (ARPS), for new major traffic generating activities. The text of the method is repetitive and is not definitive as to the desired content of the audit. In addition the term “major traffic generating activities” is not defined within the ARPS. It is anticipated that the ARC will provide clarity on this matter at the hearing. It would also be helpful if the finalised audit document became part of the appendix to the ARPS. With regard to the administration of the audit, as the proposed method stems from the ARPS, this is the path for the authority and subsequent approval of the use of method. Accordingly, while WCC will work in consultation with ARTA, as anticipated by PC 15: Transportation criteria 27(R), WCC consider that the final transport audit should be agreed by the ARC as the relevant statutory authority.

PC 15: Transportation criteria 27(R) states:

*The extent to which the development has been designed to integrate land uses with transport systems, including provision for public transport within the precinct and between the precincts (Note , it is expected that the development of the comprehensive development plans, there will be consultation with the Auckland Regional Council, the Auckland Regional Transport Authority and Transit New Zealand.*

It is considered that as the proposed method stems from a regional document the scope of the application of the method should be limited to matters of regional concern, and scale such as an application to shift the Metropolitan Urban Limits (MUL), a structure plan or major plan change. It is anticipated that such activities will be part of the definition of “major trip generating activities” within the revised method. Accordingly, it is recommended that no alteration needs to be made to the policy of the WCC plan, as these types of proposals will require an audit as they are developed in such a way as to give effect to the regional plan.

It is anticipated that the Territorial Authority would consult ARTA in the development of the MUL application or significant plan changes involving changes in landuses for example Hobsonville. ARTA also has the potential to become officially involved in such applications through the statutory notification process, should the previous consultation not be to their satisfaction. The audit process when developed in conjunction with activities at this level creates the framework, into which the lower level of activities fit.

However, for activities below this level to be subject to an audit process would create an additional level of assessment that unnecessarily replicates the measures already contained within the transportation criteria of the operative and proposed district plan (see example criteria above above). It may however, be appropriate that an “audit type” document is used as a guide for staff processing such applications to ensure that they are seeking comprehensive and consistent information from applicants.

With regard to submissions **258/191, 258/196, 258/201**, in relation to plan change 13,14, and 15 these are accepted in part, to the extent that the audit is accepted in principle, (subject to clarification of the content of the audit by the ARC at the hearing).

With regard to submission **258/221**, this is accepted in part, to the extent that the audit is accepted in principle, (subject to clarification of the content of the audit at the hearing by the ARC). It is not considered that the requirement for the audit needs to be reiterated within

the WCC plan, as it is anticipated that any MUL applications or plan changes will give effect to regional strategy.

With regard to submission **258/222**, this is rejected, as the submission requests a transport audit as part of the rules of the Transport Environment of the District Plan. As the audit process for an MUL shift or plan change cover the effects of the land use on the road- (Transport Environment) it is not considered necessary to replicate this process by making the audit part of the Transport Environment rules.

**Recommendation:**

Submissions.; 258/191, 258/196, 258/201, and 258/221 are accepted in part, although no amendments to the text are proposed.

Submission 258/222 is rejected.

- **Submissions seeking amendments to include Appendix H of the ARPS**

**5.4**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
258/228 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Retain Schedule Y and amend to better reflect the densities required in Appendix H of the Regional Policy Statement (Change 6).	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited

**Discussion:**

The submitter seeks that Schedule Y be retained and amended to better reflect the densities required in Appendix H of the Auckland Regional Policy Statement (ARPS). It is noted that Schedule Y does not contain specific densities for future development, as these matters are dealt with in policies that form part of Plan Change 16, and would be further detailed at the time of comprehensive concept planning for each new growth area. Schedule Y is intended to identify the areas where growth is to be encouraged and indicate priorities for that growth and a likely time frame within which it would occur.

As the residential densities are already identified elsewhere within the District Plan, it is considered that there is no need to add that information to Schedule Y. It is also considered that residential densities that are specified in the District Plan do not need to replicate those that are contained within Appendix H of the ARPS.

The ARPS densities are seen as targets rather than absolutes, indeed Appendix H cites that

*“The densities are not absolutes for all centres. In some cases these densities will be difficult to achieve. However, in cases other cases these densities could be easily exceeded”*

Therefore, there is no need for complete consistency between the densities set out in each document.

**Recommendation:**

Submission 258/228 is rejected.

**5.5**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
258/235 16	Auckland Regional Transport	Amend Table 6.1 by adding a column which states the household and employment	

	Authority	density required to support the public transport system, consistent with proposed Appendix H of the Regional Growth Strategy (Change 6).	
258/230 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend Table 6.1 by adding a column which states the household and employment density required to support the public transport system, consistent with proposed Appendix H of the Regional Growth Strategy (Change 6).	

**Discussion:**

The writer understands that aside from these submissions containing a typo error, in the reference to table 6.1 which is not part of the Waitakere City Council District Plan –Operative or Proposed, the submission seeks similar consistency as sought by the above submission. For the same reasons as above the submissions are rejected.

**Recommendation:**

Submission 258/235,258/230 are rejected.

- **Submissions seeking amendments to Issue 5: Managing City Growth**  
(Where relevant submissions relating to rules will also be discussed)

**5.6**

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
258/206 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend Issues, Objectives and Policies related to transport by promoting an increase the certainty around resource management procedures related to developing transport improvements, particularly public transport improvements	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited

**Discussion:**

The submitter seeks greater certainty through resource management procedures to the development of transport improvements and particularly public transport improvements.

The amendments sought by the submitter are captured by Schedule 5 of the LGAAA. The plan changes are required by the legislation to contribute, in an integrated manner, to the matters set out in Schedule 5. The earlier Growth Report has recommended that there is merit in amending Plan Change 16 to provide a more direct reference to the outcomes sought by the LGAAA. This will provide a clearer context for the new District Plan provisions that are proposed. This writer concurs with that earlier recommendation and as such, it is recommended that the amendment is made to meet the submitters concerns.

**Recommendation:**

Submission 258/206 is accepted to the extent of the changes that are recommended, as contained in Appendix 1 to this report.

**5.7**

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
250/181 16	Auckland Regional Council	Amend issue 5 by deleting provisions for intensive growth nodes on State Highway 16 and 18 to facilitate transport and land use integration.	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 107 Westfield (New Zealand)

			Limited <b>Opposed By:</b> 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd
--	--	--	---

**Discussion:**

The submitter seeks the deletion of references to the provision of growth nodes along State Highway (SH) 16 and 18.

State Highway 16 and 18 are the location of significant growth nodes, being Massey North, Hobsonville Village Centre and Hobsonville Airbase, contained within the plan changes of the LGAAA process. The intention of this process was to ensure the integration of land use and transportation occurs, as the state highways will become public transport corridors. The additional provision of intensification will allow additional employment opportunities for people in the area, rather than travelling out of the city.

However, the statement could be construed as encouraging development beyond the scope of the nodes/town centres that have already been identified. Accordingly the sentence below is amended as follows:

“The provision of growth nodes at Massey North, Hobsonville Village and Hobsonville Peninsula ~~along state Highway 16 and 18~~ is critical to transport and land use integration”

**Recommendation:**

Submission 250/181 is accepted.

**5.8**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
259/10 16	Transit New Zealand	Amend the Plan Change to add an additional clause under 5.0: Issues - Managing City Growth, or another amendment to the District Plan of like effect, by adding those words in italics and underlined:  “The issues which can arise from such development are outlined in the following Objectives of this Chapter and include adverse effects of development on:  <i><u>strategic land transport corridors (existing and designated) due to reverse sensitivity from adjacent or nearby sensitive land uses, particularly in relation to noise and air quality</u></i> ”.	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited <b>Opposed By:</b> 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd 157 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)

**Discussion:**

It is considered that the issues raised by the submitters are valid. The proposed plan changes have addressed these matters both at a policy and rules level. With regard to policy, these are to be enhanced in relation to reverse sensitivity, for example

Proposed Policy 0.4: bullet point 9: “Potential conflicts between incompatible land uses are recognised and provided for, including through managing traffic and noise”.

With regard to sites adjacent to roads it is appropriate that such matters are managed through in-built mitigation measures, rather than setbacks, as the setbacks have the potential to jeopardise the development of intensive housing and mixed use development around the transport nodes and corridors.

In addition, the Operative Plans rules address noise issues, providing for noise attenuation measures for dwellings fronting high noise routes, which would include the main transport corridors. It is noted that Plan Change 18 makes consequential amendments to the above mentioned noise rule, and to the general standard rule both of which are applicable to the development of land adjacent to high noise routes. In addition the site analysis rules of PC 18 City Wide Rule 2, Site Analysis Rule: requires that in a site analysis:

- *Potential noise sources should be included.*

If the noise source has been identified, measures can then be incorporated within the design of the proposed activity to mitigate any adverse effects.

It is accepted that these measures will only provide mitigation when the windows are shut but it is considered satisfactory that the occupier is provided with an option. In addition, proposed amendments to Objective 0 in the Growth report are considered to assist with the management of reverse sensitivity effects.

In relation to air quality it is considered that this issue cannot be strictly managed by a territorial authority, as many of the contributing factors are outside their control such as the content of vehicle emissions. However, it is anticipated that many of the developments that contain residential units within the mixed use environments will have ventilation systems to mitigate against the potential adverse effects from non residential activities (City Wide Rule 4, Appendix-Mixed Use Building Design Criteria), so by default providing mitigation against adverse air quality.

### **Recommendation:**

Submission 259/10 is accepted in part, to the extent that the relief sought is already provided through the Plan Changes or through recommended amendments to Objective 0. The recommended amendments are contained in Appendix 1.

### **5.9**

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
258/215 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend to add an additional policy to Issue 5 or elsewhere in the Objectives, Policies and Methods section which requires that decisions on land use and urban form must not foreclose or compromise planned opportunities for future transport improvements or investments.	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 259 Transit New Zealand 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited

### **Discussion:**

The submitter has requested an amendment to the Policy that requires that decisions on land use and urban form do not foreclose planned opportunities for future transport improvement or investments.

The key focus of the plan changes under LGAAA is the integration of land use and transportation, in the development of the new/revitalised urban form. This has been clearly identified through numerous policies within the plan changes. As with other significant decisions on land use and urban form, the decisions will be made within an iterative

statutory process. It is during this development process that regard will be given to matters identified in current relevant strategic documents, in addition to interested parties partaking in the submission process. It is not considered that additional policy is required over and above the policies that already refer to the importance of land use and transport integration.

**Recommendation:**

Submission 258/215 is rejected.

**5.10**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
258/226 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend to introduce under Part 5 Objectives, Policies and Methods which introduces the concept of Travel Plans and a method requiring Travel Plans	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 259 Transit New Zealand 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited
258/227 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend to develop Rules in the district plan which requires any resource consent requirement for all new schools and significant trip making activities to undertake a travel plan.	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 259 Transit New Zealand 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited

**Discussion:**

The submitter seeks that the district plan is amended to make provision for Travel Plans by requesting that objectives, policies and a method are introduced into proposed part 5 of the WCC Plan (258/226), and that a requirement for a Travel Plan is introduced as a rule within the plan changes (258/227). The text of the ARTA submissions refers specifically to travel plans being made a requirement for all new schools and other significant trip generating activities.

“Travel Plans” are currently not specifically defined within the WCC Operative District Plan or proposed LGAAA Plan Changes , but are generally understood to be ” *A package of measures that aim to reduce the number of car journeys and provide people with greater transport choice*” TravelWise Training Self-study book, ARTA 2006, pg 2. Typically in the resource consent process a travel plan (of sorts) has been produced, normally to justify a shortfall in parking. In addition this tool can only be utilised within the consent process if the establishment of a building is undertaken by those who then occupy the building. Unfortunately this is not the case in the majority of instances. In addition an activity could occupy a building and not require resource consent to trigger the requirement for a travel plan.

Recent practise within the region has shown that travel plans are working exceptionally well on a non-statutory basis, particularly in schools. It should be noted that the majority of schools are not subject to the standard resource consent process as they are designated sites, for which a travel plan could be recommended through an outline plan of works application but not imposed as a requirement on the school.

However given the potential value of the travel plan it is considered that there is merit to a part of the submitters request and the following changes to the methods of the policy, definitions, and transportation assessment criteria, so that a travel plan can be more readily utilised as part of the resource consent assessment process are recommended.

Definitions: An addition to the definitions: “Travel Plans: A package of measures that aim to reduce the number of car journeys and provide people with greater transport choice”

Policy Change: Make an addition to Policy 0.7 “Other Methods: Travel Plans”

New Transportation criteria: (to be included in plan changes 13,14, and 15. This matter is already covered in Plan Change 17)

*“The extent to which a travel plan can be developed for the proposed activity, so as to reduce the number of car journeys generated by the activity and provide those on site with greater transport choices”*

**Recommendation:**

Submission 258/226 and 258/227 are accepted in part, with amendments as recommended in Appendix 1.

**5.11**

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
258/242 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend to introduce a new policy (and associated method(s) etc) into Part 5 which requires that land use activities which rely on or make frequent use of freight facilities should locate close to freight corridors or major freight routes.	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited

**Discussion:**

At the time of writing this report the ARC had released the final version of the recently completed Auckland Regional Freight Strategy 2006. The Strategy, which WCC supports in principle, recognises the need for the efficient, safe and environmentally sustainable distribution of freight throughout the Auckland Region and contains objectives, policies and methods to fulfil the vision of the strategy. Appendix 1 of the Strategy contains the proposed implementation schedule which covers the development of the actual strategic freight network (Policy 4.1) and the development of supportive land use planning (Policy 4.2) that would support the strategic freight network. All of these latter matters are still subject to the agreement of the respective parties

The further work to be undertaken will have to recognise and resolve the potential conflicts between urban centre intensification, the location of business activities (Regional Strategy being prepared), the location of freight generating activities, and those parties who have an interest in the roading network. For example Transit New Zealand has a statutory interest in parties wishing to access the state highway system on which freight generating activities could be located.

It is not considered timely to develop policies relating to freight corridors that do not yet exist, as the policies could not be usefully implemented. It is anticipated that the implementation work in Appendix 1 of the Freight Strategy and potentially of the Business Location Strategy, would require a future plan change, the work of which would be applicable over the whole of the city. It is anticipated that the relevant local policies, land use methods and planning maps could be introduced as a package at that time if the Council considers that this is appropriate.

**Recommendation:**

Submission 258/242 is accepted in part but no amendments to the text are recommended.

- **Submissions seeking amendments to Policies of the Growth Chapter**

### 5.12

<b>NO.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
258/239 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend policy 0.1 or add an additional policy, which requires that higher density centres and corridors (including key intensive business activities) are located where they can be effectively and efficiently served by public transport and that growth corridors should be located on high frequency bus routes.	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited

#### **Discussion:**

The submitter seeks an addition to policy 0.1 or an additional policy, relating to the provision of high density centres and corridors (including key intensive business centres) being effectively served by public transport and those growth corridors should be located on high frequency bus routes.

Policy 0.1 relates to the provision of urban development or redevelopment and that this is to occur in particular locations, mainly being town centres. The explanation to this policy indicates that:

*"emphasis is given to achieving higher densities in critical locations such as around town centres and transport nodes.*

Therefore this policy already covers the submitter's request, and an addition that relates to growth corridors would be an inappropriate addition to this policy, which focuses on town centres.

With regard to growth corridors this matter is generically covered in Policy 0.3.

#### **Recommendation:**

Submission 258/239 is accepted in part but no amendments to the text are recommended.

- **Submissions relating to Car Parking**

### 5.13

<b>NO.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
258/223 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend Policy 0.1 by introducing Parking Policies or policy bullet points to enable a more appropriate (lenient) requirement for car parking in high density centre and corridors where good public transport services are provided and where they need to be supported.	<b>Supported By:</b> 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) <b>Opposed By:</b> 218 AMP Capital Investors (NZ) Limited <b>Support and Opposed By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited
258/224 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend Policy 0.2 by introducing Parking Policies or policy bullet points to enable a more appropriate (lenient) requirement for car parking in high density centre and corridors where good public transport services are provided and where they need to be	<b>Opposed By:</b> 218 AMP Capital Investors (NZ) Limited <b>Support and Opposed By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 107 Westfield (New Zealand)

	supported.	Limited
--	------------	---------

### Discussion:

The submitter has requested that additions are made to these policies to specifically refer to appropriate parking requirements to support public transport.

These policies refer to the overall outcomes sought by the plan changes being;

“Policy 01”; *the development or redevelopment of an urban area with regard to density, intensity, and mix of development, and*

“Policy 02”; *the areas that are a priority for intensification.*

These policies seek to emphasise the importance of locating intensive development in appropriate locations within the city, and to deter development in locations that are not supported by a town centre or transport hub, the latter potentially undermining the efforts to intensify the chosen town centres.

The matters raised by the submitter have already been given regard within the plan changes, evidenced through other policy, and rule changes, an example being policy 11.21, and the car parking rules relating to New Lynn as the development of residential, and sites under 1000m<sup>2</sup> do not require car parking.

### Recommendation

Submissions 258/223 and 258/224 are rejected.

#### 5.14

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/220 15	Waitakere City Council	Amend Policy 10.8 by adding the following additional bullets: <i><u>“encouraging the communal use of parking areas to encourage multi modal visits to town centres and to encourage efficient use of parking areas. to encourage visits to town centres by a range of transport modes; to encourage efficient use of parking areas; providing flexibility to parking standards within town centres, particularly for residential activities to recognise the mixed use nature and increased range of activities within walking distance of town centres and to encourage use of public transport.”</u></i>	<b>Supported By:</b> 300 IMF Westland Ltd 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority <b>Support and Opposed By:</b> 250 Auckland Regional Council
257/366 17	Waitakere City Council	Amend Policy 10.11 by adding the following sentence: <i><u>“Provided that within Major Town Centres or identified Special Areas the Council will encourage the communal use of parking to encourage the efficient use of parking areas. In addition, consideration will be given to flexible parking standards within town centres to recognise the mixed use nature of town centres and to encourage use of public</u></i>	<b>Supported By:</b> 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 250 Auckland Regional Council 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited

		<i>transport, provided that such flexibility does not compromise the roading hierarchy.”</i>	<b>Opposed By:</b> 153 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Ltd
257/221 15	Waitakere City Council	Amend Policy 10.11 by adding the following sentence: <i>“Provided that within Town Centres or identified Special Areas the Council will encourage the communal use of parking to encourage the efficient use of parking areas. In addition, consideration will be given to flexible parking standards within town centres to recognise the mixed use nature and increased range of activities within walking distance of town centres and to encourage use of public transport, provided that such flexibility does not compromise the roading hierarchy.”</i>	<b>Supported By:</b> 300 IMF Westland Ltd <b>Support and Opposed By:</b> 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 250 Auckland Regional Council

### Discussion:

The submitter seeks through these proposed additions, to strengthen the existing proposed policies, and to guide the use of the transportation assessment criteria that are to be utilised through the processing of the Concept Development Plans. The additions look to a holistic approach to parking, rather than the traditional demand based approach. The policies acknowledge the complexity of the decision in relation to car parking in providing for a mixed use environment, while acknowledging the importance of public transport.

### Recommendation

Submissions 257/220, 257/366, and 257/221 are accepted, and the recommended amendments are included in Appendix 1 to this report.

### 5.15

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
142/14 16	PLC New Zealand Ltd	Amend Policy 10.11 to require car parking for all residences.	<b>Opposed By:</b> 218 AMP Capital Investors (NZ) Limited

### Discussion:

The submitter has requested that Policy 10.11 is amended to require car parking for all residences. Policy 10.11 currently relates to car parking in New Lynn, stating that in certain situations car parking is not required for residences.

The effect of this amendment would be that the proposed intensive housing that is to be built in proximity to a town centre and transport hub would require additional land area to service the supply of this car parking requirement. This would result in the inefficient use of land within the town centre.

Such a situation would not be consistent with the overall purpose and intention of the plan changes under LGAAA. It is considered important that the land area within the town centre is maximised, which currently has not been the case. It is anticipated that the provision of the improved transport hub within New Lynn town centre will provide enhanced transport opportunities, decreasing the need for private vehicle journeys, thus requiring less private provision for parking spaces.

### Recommendation:

Submission 142/14 is rejected.

## 5.16

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
258/225 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend the rules in Community Environments (Rule 14) to have the effect of reducing the requirement for car parking spaces for developments within high density centers and corridors or developing car parking caps for high density centers and corridors.	<b>Opposed By:</b> 218 AMP Capital Investors (NZ) Limited <b>Support and Opposed By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited

### Discussion:

The submitter seeks that rule 14, in Community Environments is amended to have the effect of reducing the requirement for car parking spaces for developments within high density centers and corridors or developing car parking caps for high density centers and corridors. (The New Lynn Plan Change 17 has it's own car parking rule being community 14A, and is not part of this discussion)

The car parking requirements contained within Community Rule 14 have been transferred over from the Operative WCC Plan to Plan Change 13, and 15, and are primarily in the commercial areas of the plan changes. (The industrial areas-Working Environment have different controls). The controls have a standard ratio as a permitted activity, the exception being Massey North Town Centre, where in Core Precinct Area A no parking shall be required for residential activities located above the ground floor. The methodology is demand based and through a limited discretionary consent process the supply of car parks can be reduced. The proposed rules are not geared to penalise oversupply.

(This methodology is consistent with that of the Waitakere City Council Operative Plan, and typically applications have included the limited discretionary activity to achieve the lower levels of car parking supply. In terms of the Policy of the Operative Plan the emphasis in relation to car parking was primarily related to amenity and safety, although Policy 21 (subsequently enhanced in these plan changes) in relation to Henderson and New Lynn did encourage the sharing of car parking and the available access to public transport.)

However the current consideration of Community Environment Rule 14, within the proposed plan changes has to be within the context of the framework of both the new policy, and the new consenting requirements for development. The new policy direction emphasises the need for the more efficient use of land, and a more flexible approach to parking provision having regard to the nature of the new town centres.

An example of new policy from PC 16:is in Policy 0.7:

" In all new developments infrastructure shall be provided:.....

*Explanation Provision made for car parking is a particular concern in higher intensity developments, because it potentially utilises much space,that could otherwise be open space or a larger building footprint. In such developments provision for car parking may need to be made, but will not be regarded as a priority where that development has alternative access to other transport modes. In such cases it may need to be shown how resident's ownership or use of cars will be minimised*

(In addition see the proposed policy additions in the discussion of points 39 onwards in this report relating to policy additions in relation to plan changes 15 and 17)

With regard to the actual consenting process the majority of development that will occur will be through Comprehensive Development Plans (CDP) for parts of the Plan Change 13 and 15 areas. The CDP will provide an opportunity for developers and Council to consider the way in which parking can be managed with regard to the other elements of development. The CDP process does encourage negotiation rather than just adopting parking standards and places the onus on the consent planner to achieve the desired outcomes. It is

anticipated that the new policy parameters and the consenting process involving CDP will achieve a more efficient level of car parking.

It is within this context that the above submissions is given regard, with the submitter seeking a reduction or cap in the levels within high density centres. The submitter has not put forward recommended ratios for parking or a figure for a parking cap, and may wish to present such information or methodologies at the hearing. Of particular interest would be factual information on the correlation between parking ratios and the uptake of public transport.

There is merit to this request. Reduced levels of car parking could be of assistance with the uptake of public transport, however given that the areas that Plan Changes 13, and 15 cover are served primarily by buses, as opposed to New Lynn that has both train and buses, careful regard would have to be given to the actual levels of parking ratios, and /or a parking cap, such that they do not compromise development of the employment and commercial centres. The Auckland Regional Land Transport Strategy 2005, at Section 3.4 signals the use of the abovementioned method, and for the development of a parking strategy, as outlined below:

- *3.4 Ensure that the planning and management of parking resources in the region supports the region's land use and transport outcomes.* Sub policies include a request that parking ceilings be considered in regional centres; and that managing parking supply be considered.
- Policy 3.4.6 calls for the development of a Regional Parking Strategy *to provide regional policy direction on all parking issues ...*

To this end, and given timing constraints to produce plan change specific research to meet the submitters request, it is considered that the more restrictive part of the Community Environment Rule 14 could be used as a maximum figure for car parking supply in the plan Change areas of 13, and 15, therefore deleting the actual reference to Community Environment Rule 14. In addition it is proposed that a discretionary level activity is included in the Plan in the event that applicants seeks to exceed this maximum.

**Recommendation:**

Submission 258/225 is accepted, and amendments to the text are outlined in Appendix 1.

**5.17**

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
250/187 16	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the first paragraph of policy 0.3 by deleting the words " <i>regional traffic routes</i> " and replacing them with the words " <i>Regional Passenger Transport Routes</i> ".	<b>Supported By:</b> 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority

**Discussion:**

The submitter seeks that the term Regional Traffic Routes in Policy 0.3 be changed to Regional Passenger Transport Route. The term Regional Passenger Transport Route is not a defined term, although the submitter may wish to provide background at the hearing.

The policy refers to areas other than the plan changes areas under this LGAAA process where WCC expects growth to occur. The policies and rules of the plan allow intensive residential development to occur on regional traffic routes. The WCC District Plan shows

regional and strategic arterial routes. These regional traffic routes are characterised by transport services, predominantly bus services.

However it is possible that a person may undertake a journey of a regional nature and travel on a variety of areas of the network, and on different grades of the network- Rapid Transit network, Quality transit network and local connector network. These would obviously divert from the regional traffic route.

Accordingly it is not considered that Regional Passenger Transport Route is a useful replacement term for Regional Traffic Route when defining the actual suitable location of growth.

(NB: see discussion at section 5.32 of this report : Regional Traffic Route is recommended to be changed to High Density Corridor)

**Recommendation:**

Submission 250/187 is rejected.

**5.18**

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
258/231 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend Part 5 proposed policy 0.4 by including an additional bullet point to ensure that greenfield developments (residential and/or business developments) have a street layout that is public transport supportive.	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited
258/240 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Retain Policy 0.4	

**Discussion:**

The submitter seeks that policy 0.4 is retained (258/240) and that an additional bullet point is made for Policy 0.4 that ensures that Greenfield development have a street layout that is public transport supportive. The submitter may wish to elaborate at the hearing.

Policy 0.4 outlines the matters that should be given attention when designing a new urban development. The extensive list of matters recognises that complexity of detail required within the new urban form, of which a public transport supportive layout is only one of the matters. It is considered that the concern of the street layout being public transport supportive is covered in the following bullet points of the policy;

- *As far as it is possible, development forms part of the comprehensive area plan which incorporates access to open space, community services, transport networks, work places, and shops*
- *Emphasis is given to creating interconnected vehicle, walking and cycling routes, providing logical , attractive and safe linkages to activities within and beyond the site or areas*

It should be noted that other policy points, particularly Policy 0.6 relate to transport routes, being provided or developed to provide the best link between urban areas and workplaces and community facilities

**Recommendation:**

Submission 258/231 is accepted in part but no amendments to the text are required.

Submission 258/240 is accepted.

## 5.19

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
258/232 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend Policy 10.18 to require that subdivisions should be designed and laid out with a street layout that is public transport supportive.	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited

### **Discussion:**

The above mentioned policy is part of the Waitakere City Council Operative Plan. Policy 10:8 is not one of the existing policies that WCC sought to amend as part of the LGAAA Plan change process, and as such there is no scope for the submitter within this statutory process to seek amendments to this particular policy.

### **Recommendation:**

Submission 258/232 is rejected.

## 5.20

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
250/189 16	Auckland Regional Council	Amend policy 0.5 by adding a reference to planning public transport interchanges in cooperation with ARTA.	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority

### **Discussion:**

The submitter seeks that an amendment is made to Policy 0.5, to require the planning of Public Transport interchanges to be made in conjunction with ARTA. This policy relates to the locating and/or upgrading of public transport interchanges to be supportive of intensive housing and employment areas.

Public Transport interchanges are one of the key pieces of infrastructure for the integration of land use and transportation. Currently Waitakere City Council works in close partnership with ARTA, service providers and public transport user representatives in the planning, implementation and operation of public transport interchanges which fall within the city's area of responsibility – mainly new bus interchanges. The proposed plan changes have anticipated that the planning of such critical pieces of infrastructure will be undertaken with ARTA as outlined within the Transportation Criteria of each of the plan changes to which a comprehensive development plan will be subject. An example is

PC 15: Transportation criteria 27(R)

*The extent to which the development has been designed to integrate land uses with transport systems, including provision for public transport within the precinct and between the precincts (Note , it is expected that the development of the comprehensive development plans, there will be consultation with the Auckland Regional Council, the Auckland Regional Transport Authority and Transit New Zealand.*

As further plan changes are undertaken in accordance with schedule Y it is anticipated that a similar approach will be taken.

It is considered that an additional reference in Policy 0.5 is not required.

### **Recommendation:**

Submission 250/189 is accepted in part but no changes to the text are recommended.

## 5.21

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
250/190 16	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the first paragraph of policy 0.6 by adding those words underlined "...to achieve the form of development outlined in the above policies <u>and to meet the intent of the Local Government (Auckland) Amendment Act.</u> "; And; Amend to refer to the need to plan the networks in cooperation with ARTA (and where appropriate Transit NZ); and restrict new locations to those identified in Schedule Y.	<b>Supported By:</b> 259 Transit New Zealand

### **Discussion:**

The submitter seeks an amendment to the policy relating to improvements to the transport network being such that they support the form of development required by the proceeding policies.

The first amendment sought is that reference is made to the intent of the LGAAA within this policy. It is considered that the addition that is proposed to be made to this chapter through the addition proposed in the growth report, being the insertion of the matters to which regard should be given in the process of land and transport integration, is already clear and with sufficient reference to the LGAAA, and as such further additions are not required to this chapter.

The submitter also seeks an amendment such that reference is made to the need to plan networks in cooperation with ARTA and where appropriate Transit. Policy 0.6 relates to the transport network in very broad terms, with all forms of transport being referenced. It is not considered that additional reference to external bodies is required in this policy, as reference is made to these parties within the transportation assessment criteria of the individual plan changes.

A further amendment is sought seeking to restrict locations develop/redevelopment to those identified in schedule Y. The policy encourages transport improvements to achieve the form of development outlined in the above policies. These are policies that seek the form of development consistent with the LGAAA and growth centres generally and which will be the sites listed in schedule Y. It is therefore not considered necessary to make an additional statement to that effect.

### **Recommendation:**

Submission 250/190 is accepted in part but no amendments to the text are required.

## 5.22

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
218/5 16	AMP Capital Investors (NZ) Limited	Retain Policy 0.5 and Policy 0.6	<b>Supported By:</b> 106 Property Council of New Zealand
258/205 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Retain Policy 0.6	
258/214 16	Auckland Regional Transport	Retain Policy 0.6 (Managing City Growth)	

	Authority	
--	-----------	--

**Discussion:**

The submissions seek to support both policy 0.5 and 0.6 that recognise the ongoing requirements to provide for both new and improved transport interchanges, and roading, which will continue to support the integration of land use and transportation. The support of external agencies is important given the extensive planning process that is required for the provision of both types of infrastructure.

**Recommendation:**

Submission 218/5, 258/205, 258/214 are accepted.

**5.23**

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
257/319 16	Waitakere City Council	Amend Policy 0.6 by adding those words in italics and underlined: "Improvements to transport networks, including public transport, <i>cycle and pedestrian</i> routes and roads will be encouraged, with a particular emphasis on improvements required to achieve the form of development outlined in the above policies."	<b>Supported By:</b> 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 250 Auckland Regional Council

**Discussion:**

Policy 0.6 relates to the provision of roading infrastructure. The submitter seeks to make an addition to highlight the need for cycle and pedestrian routes. It is considered that it is appropriate to make this addition as these components of the network assist to reduce car journeys and provide recreation opportunities. It is important that they are recognised within the policies of the Plan to assist and encourage the uptake of such opportunities when development is planned.

**Recommendation:**

Submission 257/319 is accepted.

**5.24**

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
258/241 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Retain Policy 10.14	

**Discussion:**

This policy is within the Operative WCC plan. WCC did not propose changes to this policy as part of these plan changes, and as such any changes or discussion of this policy is not within the scope for which changes can be recommended.

**Recommendation:**

Submission 258/241 is rejected.

**5.25**

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
107/88	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	Amend the Plan Change so that references to roads and development around roads are	<b>Supported By:</b> 300 IMF Westland Ltd

16		internally consistent within the proposed Plan Change text and with regard to Policy Map X i.e. only references to "road"; "corridor"; "arterial" used within the text of the Plan Change so that it is clear which policies and objectives are applying to which type of road.	<b>Support and Opposed By:</b> 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
----	--	---	---

**Discussion:**

The submitter seeks that the Plan Change is amended to ensure consistency between the Plan Change text and the Policy Map X. The writer concurs that there is a range of terminology within the chapter that is confusing. To provide clarity for the reader the following key changes are recommended:

- References in the text to Transport Corridors/Nodes, will be changed to High Density Corridors, the location being consistent with the corridors on Policy Map X. The term High Density Corridors is consistent with the proposed definition from the Plan Change 6 of the ARPS
- Terminology relating to Roads will be altered to either Transport Network, where the roading reference is generic, or Arterial roads where the reference should be in line with Policy Map X.

**Recommendation:**

Submission 107/88 is accepted, and the recommended amendments are contained within Appendix 1 of this report.

**5.26**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
109/113 15	The Warehouse Ltd	Delete from Policy 11.45 paragraph 11 Explanation, the final sentence as many high traffic-generating activities are not multi-visit and are not suitable for access by public transport.	<b>Opposed By:</b> 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited

**Discussion:**

This submission seeks deletion of the last sentence of paragraph 11 of the Explanation for Policy 11.45 on the grounds that it is inaccurate. In response, it is recommended that it be deleted because it is peripheral to the subject matter of policy 11.45 and is partly inaccurate to the extent that:

- it implies no public transport will be available in the Massey North Special Employment Area, which is incorrect, and
- some trips to high traffic generating activities may be single-visit.

However, high traffic generating retail activities are often clustered together in compatible groups to facilitate multi-visit shopping. Also, in principle, there is no reason why the public should not have the option to access retail activities by public transport if they wish. Not all shopping involves bulky items that are difficult to move on buses. Consequentially, it is appropriate to provide for retail principally within Precincts B, A and E of the Massey North Town Centre Special Area which provides for a range of compatible activities with good access to the roading network and public transport.

**Recommendation:**

Submission 109/113 is accepted in part, although no amendments to the Plan Changes are required.

## 5.27

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
110/127 17	Warehouse Stationery Limited	Amend the explanation of Policy 11.47 to make changes consequent to those set out in submissions 110/123-110/126.	<b>Opposed By:</b> 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
109/127 17	The Warehouse Ltd	Amend the explanation of Policy 11.47 to make changes consequent to those set out in submissions 109/123 to 109/126.	<b>Opposed By:</b> 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited

### **Discussion:**

The submitters seek that an identical range of amendments are made to Policy 11.47, the policy relating to the street frontage controls. These controls require that a high level of street frontage amenity is achieved within town centres, where improvements in the pedestrian environment are essential to intensification, and land use and transport integration. The policy describes at length the detail that will contribute to achieving this outcome.

The submitter has sought a number of amendments, including changing terminology such as “in all cases” to “where practicable”, the removal of design comments specific to larger format retail, and seeks to limit the application of policy by altering terminology from “the main retail streets and high pedestrian routes” to routes used by a high number of pedestrians’. In addition the submitter is concerned that there is no definition for the term main retail streets.

The changes sought are specific to the submitter’s larger format style retail operation. The changes sought would serve to dilute the policy base of the District Plan. Should the submitter or indeed any other party wish to diverge from the intent of the policy in the course of their own development, it would be appropriate that this was undertaken within the resource consent process, so that their proposal could be assessed for suitability within the context of the town centre. With regard to the lack of definition for the term main retail street this term is to be viewed in an every day sense, as that of a shopping street, rather than being tied to a street typology. It is anticipated as the development occurs over time that retail/shopping activities will extend over numerous streets.

### **Recommendation:**

Submission 109/127, 110/127 is rejected.

## 5.28

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
250/203 17	Auckland Regional Council	Retain policy 11.48 as it gives effect to the location of indicative and proposed roads to increase connectivity.	

### **Discussion:**

The submitter seeks to support the proposed and indicative roads that are shown on New Lynn Urban Concept Plan Appendix XX1

The proposed roading network shows a series of roading links that are sought in New Lynn to create enhanced connectivity. The proposed road links will serve to assist to take traffic from the primary roading network that passes through New Lynn, and also provide greater pedestrian opportunities, particularly creating walking links between housing, transport and employment, and retail. It is anticipated that the street frontage and design rules will make for a more pleasant pedestrian environment. The exact location of these roads will be refined through the resource consent process.

### **Recommendation:**

Submission 250/203 is accepted.

- **Submissions seeking amendments to procedures**

**5.29**

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
258/220 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend to indicate by way of policy or method that implements or investigates feasible and appropriate means of achieving appropriate financial contributions for transport investment.	<b>Supported By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited <b>Opposed By:</b> 218 AMP Capital Investors (NZ) Limited

**Discussion:**

The submitter seeks that a policy or method that implements or investigates feasible and appropriate means of achieving appropriate financial contributions for transport investment.

Financial contributions (being land or money) are currently a well established tool within the resource consent process, and commonly used to contribute to the mitigation for adverse effects of the specific proposed activity (as outlined in s108(9) of the Resource Management Act). It is not envisaged that this would be a useful source of transport funding, due to the ad hoc nature of relevant circumstances arising in which a contribution for transport purposes could be obtained.

Development contributions, as established through the Annual, and Long Term Council Community Plan Processes, are a form of levy made with the establishment of all buildings, and contribute directly towards the development of the cities infrastructure, such as storm water and roading, community buildings, and in relation to transport, such items as bus shelters. The public transport levy of the development contribution within the City is currently in the vicinity of \$250,00. The levies are set for several years at a time to provide certainty within the development community. These documents have their own development and consultation processes and it is appropriate that the submitter engage in this process, should they seek that contributions are enhanced.

Accordingly it is considered that this submission is outside the scope of the submission process, and is rejected.

**Recommendation:**

Submission 258/220 is rejected.

**5.30**

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
258/213 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend to extend a Community Environment zone over all rail stations on the Western Rail line and any other bus interchanges where they do not currently have a commercial or community zone.	<b>Supported By:</b> 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd <b>Opposed By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited

**Discussion:**

The submitter seeks the extension of the Community Environment to include all rail stations in the city, where they do not currently have a commercial zoning.

Currently the rail stations are zoned Transport Environment. Within this zoning there is the ability through a resource consent process to establish an activity other than a transport activity. The provisions and assessment criteria assess the suitability and compatibility of such a proposal, with the primary transport activity for which the Transport Environment was established. It is considered that this is the most suitable method of allowing other activities into the environment and no change should be sought. Indeed it is anticipated that a public transport terminal would include such ancillary activities as newspaper vendors.

**Recommendation:**

Submission 258/213 is rejected.

**5.31**

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
258/211 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend to rename the zone Transport Environment to "Rail Zone" - and permit all rail based activities within this zone.	

**Discussion:**

The Transport Environment zone of the Waitakere City Plan includes both road and rail corridors. The rail corridors have an underlying Rail Designation, being the railway line from New Lynn to Waitakere township (Ref : NZR1) and is for designated Railway Purposes. The Requiring Authority submits an Outline Plan of Works in accordance with the s176A of the Resource Management Act to undertake works in accordance with its designation.

There appears to be little merit in this suggestion, although the submitter may wish to elaborate at the hearing.

**Recommendation:**

Submission 258/211 is rejected.

**5.32**

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
258/212 16	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend to review areas where this zone could be extended to provide for rail based infrastructure which might go outside the current zone boundary e.g. for rail pedestrian access facilities.	<b>Opposed By:</b> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited

**Discussion:**

The current railway line within the city is included within the Transport Environment under the Waitakere City Council Plan. The railway line and immediate area is also part of the Tranz Rail Limited/NZ Railways Corporation designation. The Transport Environment zoning over the railway area is reasonably consistent with this designation. In the event that the requiring authority wishes to extend its designation it will have to undertake this through a notified process as provided for under the RMA.

**Recommendation:**

Submission 258/212 is rejected.

### 5.33

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
250/197 16	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the plan change so that the use of transport terminology is consistent with the Auckland Regional Land Transport Strategy.	

#### **Discussion:**

The submitter seeks that the Plan Change is amended to reflect the terminology of the Regional Land Transport Strategy (ARLTS).

As outlined in the reply to submission point 250/187 (at section 5.21 of this report) consistency in terminology between the Plan Change 16, and the ARLTS, while desirable, does not necessarily achieve a benefit for the reader of either document, as the meanings are not interchangeable. As an example from submission 250/187 a “regional traffic route” within the WCC plan is a term consistent with the regional arterials shown within the maps of the WCC plan. This cannot be changed to a “regional passenger transport route”, as sought by the submitter, as they are not the same thing.

The primary purpose of a district planning document is to describe the land use policies and rules applicable to the district, and that a district document give effect to key regional documents. While some of the terminology uses may be consistent between documents this is not regarded as critical.

#### **Recommendation:**

Submission 250/197 is rejected.

### 5.34

<b>N0.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Sought</b>	<b>Further Submitter/s</b>
107/73 16	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	Amend the plan change to reflect any amendments made to the Regional Policy Statement in response to Westfield’s submission to ARC Plan Change 6 (Submission 107/1 - 107/22).	<b>Supported By:</b> 300 IMF Westland Ltd <b>Support and Opposed By:</b> 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
108/106 16	Progressive Enterprises Limited	Amend the plan change to reflect any amendments made to the Regional Policy Statement in response to Progressive Enterprises’ submission to ARC Plan Change 6 (Submission 108/1 - 108/23).	<b>Supported By:</b> 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd

#### **Discussion:**

The submitter seeks that changes be made to Plan Change 16 to reflect changes sought in their submissions to ARC Plan Change 6. The changes sought in the nearly identical submissions, cover wide area of the plan, including terminology, definitions, schedules of the plan, identification of major development areas, reverse sensitivity, transport objectives, and transport policies.

Regardless of the merit or otherwise of these points of submission to another plan change within the LGAAA process, it is not within the scope of this report to anticipate decisions that may be made and agree that they should be included with Plan Change 16.

#### **Recommendation:**

Submission 107/73, and 108/106 are rejected.

# APPENDIX 1

## RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS TO PLAN CHANGES 13-18

Additions are shown underlined, and deletions are shown in ~~strikethrough~~.

Numbers in [ ] indicate the submissions/s that proposed amendment arises from

Note that underlined sections with no reference [ ] indicate proposed recommendations from the earlier LGAAA reports.

### PLAN CHANGE 13

Rule 21.1 Permitted Activities, amend to include

(f) Parking for non residential activities is not to exceed the following performance standards :

- (i) one car park for every 25m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area at ground floor or mezzanine level;
- (ii) one car park for every 35m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area for floorspace not covered in (i) above;
- (iii) the following shall be the minimum number of loading spaces to be provided in respect of:

- General Goods Handling (retail, wholesale, manufacturing, etc):

<u>0. - 5,000m<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>1 space required</u>
<u>5,001-10,000m<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>2 spaces</u>
<u>Greater than 10,000m<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>3 spaces plus 1 space per 7.5000m<sup>2</sup> above 10,000m<sup>2</sup></u>

- Non Goods handling (offices etc):

<u>0-20,000m<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>1 space required</u>
<u>20,001-50,000m<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>2 spaces</u>
<u>Greater than 50,000m<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>3 spaces plus 1 space</u>

	per 40,000m <sup>2</sup> above 50,000m <sup>2</sup>
--	--

- (iv)  dwellings with one car park for every dwelling. :
- (v)  disabled car parks are to be provided in accordance with NZS 4121 (1985) 'Design for Access and Use of Buildings and Facilities by Disabled persons'. (Note: these car parks shall comprise part of the parking numbers requirement) [258/225]

Rule 21.4 amended to read

(f) Activities which exceed the standard of Rule 21.1 (f) [258/225]

Rule 21 .5 Other Rules Applying, be amended to read :

..... In areas detailed in Comprehensive Development Plans as neighbourhood centres

- ~~Community Environment Rules 2-4, 8-15~~
- Community Environment Rules 2-4, 8-13, and 15 [258/225]

Rule 21: Assessment criteria: Transportation criteria: be amended to read :

21(x)The extent to which a travel plan can be developed for the proposed activity, so as to reduce the number or car journeys generated by the activity and provide those on site with greater transport choices.[258/226, 258/227]

## PLAN CHANGE 14

Rule 25: Assessment criteria: Transportation criteria: be amended to read:

25(at)The extent to which a travel plan can be developed for the proposed activity, so as to reduce the number or car journeys generated by the activity and provide those on site with greater transport choices [258/226, 258/227]

## PLAN CHANGE 15

Amend 26.3 Performance standards relating to permitted activities, controlled activities and limited discretionary activities, to read as follows

(f) Parking Loading and Driveway access

Maximum Parking:

Non-residential Activities

- (i) one car park for every 25m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area at ground or mezzanine level;
- (ii) one carpark for every 35m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area for floor space not covered in (i) above.

Residential Activities

- (i) one car park for every dwelling.

- General Goods Handling (retail, wholesale, manufacturing, etc):

<u>0. - 5,000m<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>1 space required</u>
<u>5,001-10,000m<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>2 spaces</u>
<u>Greater than 10,000m<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>3 spaces plus 1 space per 7.5000m<sup>2</sup> above 10,000m<sup>2</sup></u>

- non goods handling (offices etc)

<u>0-20,000m<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>1 space required</u>
<u>20,001-50,000m<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>2 spaces</u>
<u>Greater than 50,000m<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>3 spaces plus 1 space per 40,000m<sup>2</sup> above 50,000m<sup>2</sup></u>

- (vi) disabled car parks are to be provided in accordance with NZS 4121 (1985) 'Design for Access and Use of Buildings and Facilities by Disabled persons'. (Note: these car parks shall comprise part of the parking numbers requirement)

Provided that:

- Town Centre Core Precinct Area A
- No *driveway* access shall be located along the Mainstreet as shown on the *Massey North Urban Concept Plan*. **[258/225]**

Amend Transportation Criteria, to read as follows:

Rule 26 : Assessment Criteria : Transportation Criteria: be amended to read :

26(ac)The extent to which a travel plan can be developed for the proposed activity, so as to reduce the number or car journeys generated by the activity and provide those on site with greater transport choices [258/226, 258/227]

# PLAN CHANGE 16

## 5.0 ISSUE – MANAGING CITY GROWTH

.....

The issues which can arise from such development are outlined in the following Objectives of this Chapter and include adverse effects of development on:-

- Water – Quality and Quantity
- Native Vegetation and Fauna Habitat
- Land (including soils)
- Air Quality/ Atmospheric Quality
- Ecosystem Stability
- Outstanding Natural Features
- The Natural Character of the Coast and Margins of Lakes, Rivers and Wetlands
- Mauri
- Outstanding Landscapes
- Amenity Values –Health and Safety
- Amenity Values – Landscapes, Local Areas and Neighbourhood Character
- Heritage

These issues are also documented and influenced by the Auckland Regional Policy Statement (ARPS) - updated 2005, the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy (ARGS 1999), the Northern and Western Sectors Agreement (NAWSA 2001) and the Local Government Auckland Amendment Act 2004 (LG(A)AA).

All of these documents highlight the need to manage growth in an integrated manner with the aim of consolidating development to a sustainable compact urban form, with well-integrated land uses and transport network. This not only necessitates managing urban growth but also integrating peripheral urban growth and rural growth. In particular growth is not anticipated within areas of high environmental and landscape values (such as the Waitakere Ranges) and only limited provision for growth is anticipated in other rural areas.

In particular, the LG(A)AA requires the integration of land use and transport to contribute in an integrated manner to the following matters:

- providing increased certainty in the assessment of resource consents, designations, and plan changes related to transport and urban form, and ensuring that transport and land use patterns are aligned to achieve sustainability, efficiency, and liveability in the Auckland Region; and
- managing transport and transport infrastructure, facilitating a multimodal transport network, and facilitating integrated transport management; and
- reducing adverse effects of transport on the environment (including improving air and water quality, reducing noise and stormwater, improving heritage protection and reducing community disruption and transport land use), and reducing the adverse effects and increasing the positive interactions of transport and land use; and
- supporting compact sustainable urban form and sustainable urban land use intensification (including location, timing and sequencing issues, and associated quality, character, and values of urban form and design); and
- integrating transport and land use policies to reinforce metropolitan urban and rural objectives of the Auckland Regional Policy Statement, the development of a competitive and efficient economy and a high quality of life, underpinned by a quality environment and amenity.[258/206]

.....  
These strategies are not new. They have existed in this District Plan since it was notified in 1995. However, the following issues have become evident:

1. The means by which urban consolidation is intended to be achieved needs to be very clearly explained, so that there is no doubt about the outcomes expected;
2. Development within rural areas needs to be managed in an integrated manner with urban growth;
3. The expected outcomes need to be supported by district plan provisions which provide, in an appropriate and realistic way, for residential intensification;
4. These opportunities need to be focused in locations which will support linkages to transport ~~systems networks~~ **[107/88]** community services and employment – town centres, ~~public transport nodes and main routes;~~ high density corridors and arterial roads **[107/88]**
5. New areas for employment need to be introduced within the City to keep pace with population growth and stem the flow of existing residents leaving the City to work each day;
6. The issue of design at building, site, neighbourhood and community levels needs to be recognised so that attractive, workable and liveable places are created (particularly in relation to residential, mixed use, business and industrial development);
7. In providing for the scope, location and form of housing development, recognition needs to be given to social, economic and cultural well being.

.....  
Public transport needs to be well planned, well located, efficient, attractive and affordable. This District Plan supports all of those aims.

In addition, it is important that as many people as possible live and work within accessible distance of a public transport node. This involves the need to not only locate new development around ~~key transport nodes~~ town centres and along high density **[107/88]** corridors but to also improve existing and new transport connections (including cycling and walking) within areas of existing development. This is a form of integration which is provided for and supported by this District Plan.

The District Plan also supports the Auckland Regional Land Transport Strategies in the promotion of increasing residential and employment densities in town centres and along ~~transport~~ high density **[107/88]** corridors. The provision of growth nodes at Massey North, Hobsonville Village and Hobsonville Peninsula along State Highway 16 and 18 **[107/88]** is critical to transport and land use integration.

.....  
In summary, the following are the issues which need to be addressed when managing city growth:

### **General:**

- Accommodating significant population growth, which will continue throughout the planning period;
- Increasing the percentage of resident workforce employed locally;
- Ensuring the provision of a balanced range of urban activities, easily accessed by new populations;
- The integration of land use activity and transport networks, and in particular providing linkages between higher intensity residential areas and employment areas, and public transport nodes;
- Managing development so that it achieves the efficient use of resources;
- Managing development so that it is efficient and sustainable.

### **Specific:**

.....

- Opportunities for intensive residential and mixed use development focused in town centres (particularly, New Lynn, Henderson and Massey North), around ~~public transport nodes~~ high density corridors and ~~main arterial routes~~ roads [107/88] as identified in Policy Map X and Schedule Y of the District Plan;
- Certainty that the opportunities provided for intensive residential and mixed use activities will be established when land is developed/redeveloped;
- Providing adequately for housing which is affordable, and suitable for a range of social and cultural needs;

.....

## Objective 0

**To manage growth in such a way that will ensure the City develops and redevelops to achieve a sustainable compact urban form in a manner that appropriately manages adverse cumulative effects and reverse sensitivity issues. Growth should be focused in and around town centres and ~~transport~~ high density [107/88] corridors, well integrated, with high amenity values and providing appropriately for additional population, employment, community and business services, by managing the location, density, scale, form, character, timing and sequencing of urban and rural growth. In order to achieve sustainable urban consolidation, urban growth and development should be directed to areas inside the Metropolitan Urban Limit and managed in a manner that protects significant environmental values.**

### *Explanation*

It is a major theme of this District Plan, within the wider regional framework, to ensure the consolidation of urban development. In order to ensure urban consolidation can be achieved an integrated approach needs to be taken to growth within the urban area and its periphery as well as rural growth. Particular consideration also needs to be given to the mix of residential and employment growth within existing and future urban areas. The aim by 2021 is to ensure that 78% of the City's growth is to occur inside the 2001 MUL, 17% is to be accommodated in peripheral urban growth areas (the Northern Strategic Growth Area ,Penihana and Babich land), and 5% of the City's growth will be provided within the rural part of the City. A significant increase in the number of people that work locally is also necessary to achieve sustainable urban consolidation, although it is acknowledged that the relationship between where people live and work is not merely a sub-regional issue.

Significant urban intensification has been occurring in town centres and neighbourhood centres and along ~~transport~~ high density [107/88] corridors. Additional intensification has however been occurring outside these areas which is not supportive of promoting sustainable urban development or integrating transport and land use planning. The aim of this objective is to re-direct urban growth to areas that support sustainable compact urban form.

## Policy 0.1.

.....

### *Explanation*

This policy is important to achieve a compact urban form. Emphasis is given to achieving higher densities in critical locations such as around town centres and high density corridors ~~transport nodes~~ [107/88] as stipulated in Policy Map X and Schedule Y of the District Plan. In such areas it is expected that the existing environment will alter over time to a new form. New growth areas are also expected to be developed at higher densities, so as to enable the efficient use of newly developing areas. Lower density development is still provided for in other areas, and particularly existing suburbs which have been historically developed to lower densities and have a clearly defined valued character. In some cases it is necessary to restrain higher density development where this can have adverse effects on existing residential character. It is noted that density targets identified in the Policy will need to be reviewed and determined at the time of detailed concept planning that is required prior to urban areas being significantly developed or redeveloped.

.....  
**Methods**

.....

**Policy 0.2.**

The priority areas for urban intensification should be within and around the Henderson and New Lynn Community Environments and the Massey North/Westgate Special Areas. Urban intensification is required to ensure efficient use of that land resource including provision for business (including retail), high density residential and mixed use development, and other employment activity which is appropriate to town centre character and the ability to be serviced by ~~reading~~ transport networks [107/88] and other infrastructure.

*Explanation*

.....  
**Methods**

.....

**Policy 0.3.**

Opportunities for intensive residential and mixed use development in town centres other than New Lynn, Henderson and Massey North/Westgate, and also around town centres and on high density corridors ~~regional traffic routes~~ [107/88] should be provided for and encouraged.

*Explanation*

To achieve consolidation strategies, it will also be important that development and redevelopment occurs in other locations close to services, shops and transport nodes/ routes. The District Plan makes provision for medium density and apartment development in and around the City's neighbourhood centres, and on the arterial roads ~~major road routes~~ [107/88] (refer Policy Map X and Schedule Y). In most cases this will be an opportunity to be encouraged rather than a requirement, but it is expected that significant development will occur in these areas.

**Methods**

.....

**Policy 0.4.**

When designing new urban development at the site, neighbourhood or community levels, attention should be given to the following:

*Explanation*

.....

**Methods**

.....

**Policy 0.5.**

Public transport interchanges and other nodes should be provided for and/or upgraded in locations which will support existing or new land use activities such as intensive housing developments and employment/business areas.

*Explanation*

.....

**Methods**

.....

**Policy 0.6.**

Improvements to transport networks, including public transport routes and roads will be encouraged, with a particular emphasis on improvements required to achieve the form of development outlined in the above policies.

*Explanation*

.....

**Methods**

.....

**Policy 0.7.**

In all new developments, infrastructure should be able to be provided which:

- Minimises the need for water;
- Minimises the generation of and/or the disposal off-site of stormwater and wastewater;
- Provides adequately for an interconnected road network and private access and carparking;
- Provides public open space which is:-
  - ◆ readily visible and accessible, such as with a generous street frontage or bordering the front yards of sites or front faces of buildings
  - ◆ located to provide visual relief, particularly in intensively developed areas
  - ◆ integrated with surrounding development
  - ◆ sized according to community and neighbourhood needs
  - ◆ developed so that it is practicable, relevant to local needs and usable
  - ◆ easily maintained.

*Explanation*

Many areas in which intensification is to occur already have infrastructure networks. However in some cases those networks will need upgrading, to provide greater capacity or life or to meet new environmental standards. Wherever possible, the demands on public infrastructure should be minimised by using sustainable on-site techniques such as water tanks, permeable surfaces and waste reduction devices. Where public infrastructure is to be used, it will be upgraded as necessary to meet demands and standards.

In greenfields areas new infrastructure will be provided, but the same principles will apply.

Traffic access to and around new developments and areas of development needs to be carefully planned so that it is efficient, safe and has high amenity value.

Provision made for carparking is a particular concern in higher intensity developments, because it potentially utilises much space that could otherwise be open space or a larger building footprint. In such developments provision for carparking may need to be made, but will not be regarded as a

priority where that development has alternative access to other transport modes. In such cases it may need to be shown how residents' ownership or use of cars will be minimised.

The provision of adequate areas of open space is important to provide for passive and active recreational needs, to preserve and enhance natural features, and to provide visual relief as an integrated part of the overall urban form. The location of such areas, and the way they are developed, can be as or more important than their size. Comprehensive planning will be encouraged to ensure high quality public places are provided.

## **Methods**

### ***District Plan Rules:***

- Medium Density Housing, Apartment Housing and Mixed Use Rules

### ***Other Methods:***

- comprehensive area plans
- provision of design guidelines
- provision of design advice
- Catchment Management Plans
- Waitakere City Parks Strategy
- Monitoring
- Travel Plans [258/226, 258/227]

# PLAN CHANGE 17

Policy 10.8, amended to read

Land use development and subdivision must recognise the need for a transportation strategy which provides for the safe and efficient movement of people through private and public transport in a way that avoids, remedies or mitigates potential adverse effects on the environment and which does not compromise the needs of future generations, through ensuring the:

- safe movement of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles around the City;
- recognising and providing for the interdependence between transportation and other activities;
- supporting the creation of an efficient public transport network which provides an integrated system with appropriate levels of convenience and services;
- protection of the transport corridor for public transport purposes, conveyance of goods and communications;
- ensuring that the impact of activities on the capacity and safety of the road system is adequately catered for;
- maintaining amenity values that contribute to the well-being of residents and workers;
- integrating roads with safe and efficient pedestrian cycle routes;
- minimising impacts of noise and traffic movement on the amenity of surrounding sites;
- contributing where required to an upgrading of the transport system, proportionate to the pressures on that system created by the development proposed.
- encouraging the communal use of parking areas to encourage multi modal visits to town centres and to encourage efficient use of parking areas.
- to encourage visits to town centres by a range of transport modes;
- to encourage efficient use of parking areas;
- providing flexibility to parking standards within town centres, particularly for residential activities to recognise the mixed use nature and increased range of activities within walking distance of town centres and to encourage use of public transport. [257/220]

### Explanation

.....

### Methods:

.....

## POLICY 10.11

Activities should provide for:

- the on-site parking and loading of motor vehicles; and
- the location and design of access to car parking and loading areas, including areas for reverse manoeuvring to ensure that the safe and efficient functioning of adjacent roads, according to the positioning of that road in the Rooding Hierarchy, is not adversely affected

provided that residential activities in the Community Environment (New Lynn) do not have to provide any on-site car parking.

Provided that within Major Town Centres or identified Special Areas the Council will encourage the communal use of parking to encourage the efficient use of parking areas. In addition, consideration will be given to flexible parking standards within town centres to recognise the mixed use nature of town centres and to encourage use of public transport, provided that such flexibility does not compromise the rooding hierarchy [257/266,257/221]

***Explanation***

.....

**Methods**

.....

**Definitions (over all Plan Changes )**

Definition section of the WCC Plan to be amended to include :

Travel Plans : A package of measures that aim to reduce the number of car journeys and provide people with greater transport choices [258/226, 258/227]