

REPORT TO THE JOINT HEARINGS PANEL

WAITAKERE CITY DISTRICT PLAN

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 13 (HOBSONVILLE AIRBASE)

File Reference : Report WCC 8A
Date : 31 January 2006

1 OUTLINE

This report considers submissions and further submissions which were received in response to proposed Plan Change 13 to the Waitakere City District Plan (referred to in this report as “the Plan Change”). Additional submissions to the Plan Change are considered in submission hearing reports under other topic headings.

This report has been prepared in accordance with section 42(a) of the Resource Management Act to assist the Joint ARPS 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 that has been made by staff preparing the report, **but it is not the decision of the Waitakere City Council (“the Council”)**. Recommendations are made following the summary of original submissions. However, in keeping with standard practice, recommendations are not directly made with respect to further submissions in support of or in opposition to the original submissions.

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 Waitakere City 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 (“the Plan Change”) was 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.

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 LGAAA, Waitakere City 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 are specific to Plan Change 13. However, some submissions made on Plan Change 13 which concern general issues are addressed in other 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 Auckland Regional Growth Strategy (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.

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.*

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.

Section 32(2) of the RMA 1991 requires a further "s.32" evaluation by the local authority before making any decision on submissions under clause 10 or clause 29(4) of Schedule 1 of the RMA 1991. As the preparation of recommendations is part of the process leading to decision by the Council, it is appropriate that the further evaluation be undertaken when preparing recommendations.

The evaluation must examine:

- (a) *the extent to which each objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of this Act; and*
- (b) *whether, having regard to their efficiency and effectiveness, the policies, rules, or other methods are the most appropriate for achieving the objectives.*

Where the report recommends changes in response to submissions, the author has evaluated the recommended changes in accordance with (a) and (b) above and is satisfied that s.32 has been complied with. Where no changes are recommended, the original s.32 evaluation carried out in preparation of the notified Plan Change continues in effect.

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 Auckland Regional Growth Strategy (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 Auckland Regional Growth Strategy (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 AND STRATEGIES

4.1 THE AUCKLAND REGIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY: 2050

4.1.1 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 Auckland Regional Policy Statement (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 Auckland Regional Growth Strategy (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, 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.

4.1.2 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) to 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 Auckland Regional Growth Strategy (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. Consequently, reviews are important and implementation needs to reflect emerging issues.

4.1.3 The Northern and Western Sectors Agreement

The Memorandum of Understanding signed by the Regional Growth Forum members committed the members to sector-based agreements as a method of implementing the ARPS. Four geographic sectors were identified in the ARGS. Issues for the northern and western sectors are combined in the Northern and Western Sectors Agreement, October 2001. This was prepared by North Shore City Council, Rodney District Council, Waitakere City Council and Auckland Regional Council who are signatories to the agreement.

The sector agreements are an important tool for implementation of the ARGS. However, they are not a statutory document, nor are they incorporated by reference into the LGAAA, and were not expressly prepared under other legislation. Therefore there is no requirement to "have regard to" or "give effect to" sector agreements. Nevertheless where a submission refers to the Northern and Western Sectors Agreement, then regard may be had to the sector agreement within the context of

that submission. Also the implementation of the sector agreement may be given as a reason for a particular recommendation on a submission.

4.3 THE NEW ZEALAND COASTAL POLICY STATEMENT

The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) is a national policy statement containing policies on the coastal environment. The Waitakere City District Plan must give effect to the NZCPS.

The land area subject to the Plan Change is some distance from the coastline and is not part of the coastal environment. Therefore many of the policies in the NZCPS are not directly applicable to the Plan Change. However, changes to land use in the catchment subject to the Plan Change have a theoretical potential to affect the adjacent Waitemata Harbour through stormwater runoff or other discharges. Therefore those NZCPS policies concerned with coastal water quality and the effects of land use on coastal water and ecology are relevant. No submissions expressly refer to the NZCPS, but Section 5.11 of this report addresses relevant submissions concerned with storm water and its potential effects on the coastal environment.

4.4 THE AUCKLAND REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT

The Auckland Regional Policy Statement (ARPS) sets regional policy. The ARPS contains a variety of policy relating to management of urban growth. This includes relatively detailed new policy introduced by Proposed Change 6 to the ARPS under the LGAAA.

The Waitakere City District Plan must give effect to the ARPS and the new policy introduced by Proposed Change 6 is relevant to Proposed Plan Change 15. However, Proposed Change 6 is not operative yet and the Regional Council has not made decisions on submissions to Proposed Change 6. At the time of writing of this report, it was not clear what sequence is to be followed in the release of decisions on Proposed Change 6, relative to release of decisions on the proposed changes to the district plans. Some submissions have raised consistency with the ARPS as an issue.

4.5 THE AUCKLAND REGIONAL PLAN: COASTAL

The Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal (ARPC) contains policy and rules relating to the coastal marine area. While the area of land subject to the Plan Change is not in the coastal marine area, the ARPC does contain policy relating to effects on the coastal marine area of the discharges from land-based activities. No submissions have expressly raised consistency with the ARPC as an issue.

4.6 THE AUCKLAND REGIONAL PLAN: AIR, LAND AND WATER

The Auckland Regional Plan: Air, Land and Water (ARPALW) contains policy and rules relating to air quality, water quality, water quantity, alteration of water bodies and other related matters. Some of this policy is relevant to the Plan Change. No submissions have expressly raised consistency with the ARPALW as an issue.

4.7 THE AUCKLAND REGIONAL PLAN: SEDIMENT CONTROL

The Auckland Regional Plan: Air, Land and Water (ARPSC) contains policy and rules relating to land disturbance. Some of this policy is relevant to the Plan Change. No submissions have expressly raised consistency with the ARPSC as an issue.

4.8 THE HOBSONVILLE PENINSULA INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Hobsonville Peninsula Integrated Catchment Management Plan is a storm water network discharge consent application which has been lodged with the Auckland Regional Council. This consent application is referenced as application 270161. The application is for storm water discharge for the entire Hobsonville Peninsula Catchment, which includes the entire land area subject to the Plan Change. The application was notified for public submissions in 2006, but the

Auckland Regional Council has made an administrative decision to delay further processing of the application until after the relevant LGAAA decisions are released.

Submissions concerned with consistency between the Hobsonville Peninsula Integrated Catchment Management Plan and Proposed Plan Change 13, or with storm water generally are addressed in section 5.11 of this report.

5.0 DISCUSSION OF SUBMISSIONS

5.0.1 Section Outline and Summary of Issues

The original submissions and further submissions have been summarized by the Auckland Regional Council. In this report the summaries of submissions are grouped into general topics presented in order ranging from general issues at the front, to more specific or detailed matters towards the end.

Amendments to the Plan Change text arising from submissions are attached as Appendix 1

Amendments to the Plan Change Maps arising from submissions are attached as Appendix 2. A table of changes has been prepared to assist the Panel with their consideration of the changes to the various Maps. The grouping of the submissions (and the relevant Report Section Number) is as follows.

5.1	Retain Plan Change
5.2	Reject Plan Change
5.3	General District Plan Objectives
5.4	Precinct Location / Layout
5.5.1	Marine Industry Special Area Policies
5.5.2	Marine Industry Special Area Rules
5.5.3	Marine Industry Special Area Assessment Criteria
5.5.4	Marine Industry Special Area Definitions
5.5.5	Marine Industry Special Area Map Issues
5.5.6	Marine Industry Special Area Wording Errors
5.6.1	Future Development Special Area Policies
5.6.2	Future Development Special Area Rules
5.7.1.1	Base Village Special Area Policies: General
5.7.1.2	Base Village Special Area Policies: Specific
5.7.2	Base Village Special Area Rules
5.7.3	Base Village Special Area Assessment Criteria
5.7.4	Base Village Special Area Maps
5.8.1	Hobsonville Landing Special Area Policies
5.8.2	Hobsonville Landing Special Area Rules
5.8.3	Hobsonville Landing Special Area Assessment Criteria
5.8.4	Hobsonville Landing Special Area Definitions
5.9	Residential Intensity
5.10	Transport Issues
5.11	Storm Water
5.12	Water Quality / Coast
5.13	Reverse Sensitivity
5.14	Heritage
5.15	Comprehensive Development Plan / Consenting Issues
5.16	General Matters
5.17	Errors
5.18	Process Issues
5.19	Plan Change 18

5.1 Retain Plan Change

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
4/2	Rexford Family Trust	Retain in Plan Change 13 the provision for job opportunities embedded in these plan changes.	
85/6	Enterprise Waitakere	Retain the Plan Change as notified as it is consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy and the Northern and Western Sector Agreements and other reasons set out in the submission.	Supported By: 300 IMF Westland Ltd
95/1	Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)	Retain the Plan Change as notified.	
160/1	Lloyd Morris	Support concept of extending the Metropolitan Urban Limit; being timely and now appropriate.	Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited
253/50	Manukau City Council	Retain the provisions notified in Plan Change 13.	
299/3	Unitec New Zealand	Retain the Plan Change. Unitec supports Waitakere City in the establishment of logical growth-attracting centres that will drive the development of a viable integrated public/private transport system, reduce loading-growth on the present motorway corridors, and provide increased access to and available opportunities, for education in the city.	
299/8	Unitec New Zealand	Retain the Plan Change. Unitec supports the Waitakere City strategy to attract more of its citizens to work and be educated within their City.	
299/13	Unitec New Zealand	Retain the Plan Change. Unitec supports the City in their logical expansion of the already light industrial/commercial concentrations of the northwest areas, to provide for managed future urban/rural growth.	

Discussion:

These submissions support Plan Change 13 (and/or the related application to shift the Auckland Regional Council Metropolitan Urban Limit) in general, for the reasons given in each of the submissions. The support of these submitters is acknowledged and is taken into account in consideration of other submissions requesting changes to the Plan Change. Some changes are recommended to the Plan Change in response to other submissions by these and other submitters. However, these recommended changes should not adversely affect the favourable attributes identified in the Plan Change by these submitters.

Recommendation:

Submissions 4/2, 85/6, 95/1, 160/1, 253/50, 299/3, 299/8, 299/13 are accepted, with no changes being made in response to these submissions.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
256/40	Rodney District Council	Retain the Plan Change 13 subject to the outcome of Rodney District Council's further business research being undertaken in Western Rodney in consultation with Waitakere City Council.	108 Progressive Enterprises Limited

Discussion:

The research project referred to in the submission is entitled "*Economic Development Trends in the Rodney District Western Sector*", and is dated April 2006. The report is supportive of possible growth of industrial/business estates in the Massey North / Hobsonville Corridor. This is considered to offer the potential for closer employment opportunities for the growing population of residential commuters in the west of Rodney, which would support objectives in Vision Rodney for local employment and reduced commuting. This is particularly the case if (as is expected) sufficient industrial/business growth in Kumeu/Huapai and Helensville keep pace with expected residential population growth in the west.

For that reason, the submission is accepted, and no amendments to the Plan Change are required to occur as a result of the submission.

Recommendation:

Submission 256/40 is accepted.

5.2 Reject Plan Change

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
170/1	Patricia I Hawkins	Amend to delete proposed urban expansion into Hobsonville	Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)
298/44	Landco Limited	Reject the Plan Change, OR amend to allow a much larger area of land to be included within the extensions to the Metropolitan Urban Limit.	Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 259 Transit New Zealand

Discussion:

Submission **170/1** expresses concerns about the effect of additional traffic on Upper Harbour Drive and Hobsonville Road arising from residential development on Hobsonville Airbase causing traffic congestion. The Council has undertaken traffic modelling that shows the expected traffic from the residential development will be able to be accommodated on the existing transport network, and has, via other submissions, identified public transport routes to and within the Hobsonville Airbase to ensure that the land use and transport components of this area of the City are integrated.

Submission **298/44** seeks that either the Plan Change be declined or that a much larger area of land be included within the Metropolitan Urban Limit. The reasons given by the submitter are summarised as:

- contrary to the Resource Management Act 1991,
- the Hobsonville Base Village extension could compromise wider development and integrated planning of opportunities particularly in association with the Whenuapai airfield,
- the Redhills area should not be excluded.

No evidence is presented in the submission that the proposed Hobsonville Airbase extension of the Metropolitan Urban Limit compromises development of other areas in the vicinity. In this context the Hobsonville Base Village Concept Plan shows the development confined in an integrated manner between the forthcoming motorway, the Proposed Future Urban Development Special

Area and Countryside Environment south of Clark Road. Therefore it will not functionally compromise adjacent areas.

The Royal New Zealand Airforce has indicated that it will occupy and use the Whenuapai Airbase until at least 2014. Consequently, future commercial airfield use should not be adversely affected by the Hobsonville Base Village Special Area.

In the interim it is inappropriate to disallow any development based on speculation as to future use of the airfield, as Waitakere City has a predicted shortfall of suitable employment land that needs to be addressed proactively (as proposed in the Marine Industry Special Area). The opportunity also exists to utilise existing residential stock and green fields land to provide a residential area on the Hobsonville Airbase that will assist in addressing the shortage of urban land available for residential purposes. It is unlikely that the whole remaining Whenuapai/Hobsonville area could or would be developed as one single shift of the Metropolitan Urban Limit because of the difficulties of integrating transport and infrastructure over such a large area in one go. Therefore any future shifts of the Metropolitan Urban Limit will of necessity be discrete. The current proposed extensions to the Metropolitan Urban Limit at Hobsonville Airbase are a suitably discrete shift in the context of surrounding land use and the construction of new State Highway 18.

Future development of Redhills is anticipated within the Northern and Western Sectors Agreement 2001. That Agreement delays urban development of the Redhills area until after 2021 in order to provide an integrated approach to urban development within the Northern Strategic Growth Area. It would be inappropriate to zone the Redhills area for urban development at this point in time. No change is recommended.

Recommendation:

Submissions 170/1 and 298/44 are rejected.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
198/9	PARANZ Limited	Delete Plan Change 13 in its entirety.	<p>Supported By: 264 Centre for Urban and Transport Studies</p> <p>Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 204 The Waitakere Ranges Protection Society Incorporated</p>

Discussion:

The submitter seeks that the Plan Change be deleted, along with all other plan changes proposed under the LGAAA. The LGAAA requires, amongst other things, that Auckland local authorities are to prepare and notify changes to the District Plans in order to provide for integrated land transport and land use provisions that are consistent with the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy. This submission asserts that “The proposal does not prevent or correct ‘urban sprawl’ or ensure high standards of urban (or rural design) design. It encourages higher urban densities without addressing the social problems that occur.”

Waitakere City has proposed the development of Hobsonville Airbase, and while it is development of a greenfield site, it is not uncontrolled sprawl. Careful consideration has been given to integration with transport systems, and the urban design of the various Special Areas and Precincts within those Special Areas. The provisions of Plan Change 13 and the associated Plan Change 18 will ensure a high quality of urban design. It is recommended that the Plan Change is not rejected. Subject to proposed amendments suggested elsewhere in this report, it is considered that the Plan Change achieves the purpose of the Resource Management Act and the LGAAA and should be retained.

Recommendation:

Submission 198/9 is rejected.

5.3 General District Plan Objectives

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
107/52	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).	Supported By: 300 IMF Westland Ltd Support and Opposed By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
108/62	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).	Supported By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd

Discussion:

These submitters support Plan Change 13 provided it is in accordance with a centres-based policy for retail and business development. The submitters also seek consistency with the Regional Policy Statement and various other relief that is sought in the numbered submissions referred to.

A centres-based policy is an important component of the Council's overall strategy for urban consolidation and its obligations to provide integrated land transport and land use provisions consistent with the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy and the LGAAA. A key component to the centres-based policy is the management of retail and business development and centres. The Plan promotes a hierarchy of business development sequencing with the centralisation of retail and business activities, particularly within existing and proposed town centres at the top of this hierarchy. A secondary hierarchy applies to the periphery of town centres for activities that are not well accommodated within them. The policy also enables a third hierarchy for certain business development along specifically identified major roads. This is the case with the proposed neighbourhood centres in Plan Change 13.

A focus of the Council's centres-based policy is the concentration of retail activities in town centres and on existing and/or proposed passenger transport routes. This will promote the improved viability of passenger transport, reduce vehicle trip frequency and length and relieve the wider pressures on the City's water and land resources and infrastructural systems that arise from the outward expansion of the urban area.

Equally as important, the policy also recognises a need to respond to the important economic and social needs of the community, represented by the physical environment within town centres. That physical environment has a heavy reliance on the retail sector and amenity values and could suffer through the unmanaged establishment of retail development elsewhere. It is important to ensure the positive effects on amenity values that are derived from the concentration of retail and community facilities are recognised, provided for and maintained. It is also noted that the above strategies have been fully tested by the planning process (including appeals to the Environment Court) and is now operative.

Plan Changes 13-18 have been prepared in accordance with this policy and provide for new neighbourhood centres in the Hobsonville Airbase. It is considered that Plan Change 13 is consistent with a centres-based policy, and the regional instruments referred to in the submission. Furthermore, it is considered that Plan Change 13 is consistent with the provisions of the LGAAA as it promotes town centres and associated urban form that are favourable to establishing efficient public and land transport systems.

On this basis it is recommended that the submissions be accepted in part insofar as they support Plan Change 13, on the basis that it is consistent with a centres-based policy and is consistent with the Regional Policy Statement. This is expanded upon in the specific policies (and amendments recommended arising from other submissions) within the Plan Change. These specific policies are commensurate with the needs of the community, in particular the need to maintain and enhance the growth and development of existing and proposed business centres in the City.

Recommendation:

Submissions 107/52 and 108/62 are accepted in part, subject to amendments arising from other submissions.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
177/2	John Ingram	Amend to introduce policy about affordable housing and remove requirements that make housing less affordable	

Discussion:

The land that will become available for residential use at the Hobsonville Airbase is being taken up by Housing New Zealand. This central government agency has various roles in providing housing to all sectors of society, and a proportion of this will be for lower income families. The submitter's concern about the provision of affordable housing will be met through Housing New Zealand's corporate goals, and as a result the District Plan does not require amendment to make provision for affordable housing.

The submitter also raises the issue of the cost of housing. Many of the requirements within the District Plan are there to ensure that adverse effects on the environment are avoided or mitigated, while an appropriate level of amenity value is provided for occupants of dwellings. The extent of the requirements necessary to address adverse effects often has little discretion available – for a proposed development to go ahead, an identified effect on the environment must often be avoided or mitigated. To not do so may impose costs on the public and/or individuals adjacent to the proposed development. It is also important that the requirements needed to address adverse effects are not unreasonable or unnecessarily costly, however this is not considered to be the case in the Hobsonville Airbase Special Area.

Recommendation:

Submission 177/2 is rejected.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/115	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the plan change by adding objectives for the entire Hobsonville Airbase and for each of the Special Areas, which reflect the intention of the LG(A)AA, the principles of the Growth Concept, the strategic direction of the Auckland Regional Policy Statement (including Plan Change 6) and the specific vision for, and history and features of, the area/s.	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

Plan Change 13 is an important component of the Council's LGAAA response, and Objective 0 seeks to provide the outcomes for Waitakere City's development and re-development. The Objective includes an Explanation relating to the land contained within Plan Change 13, and this is expanded upon in Policy 0.9 in Plan Change 16 and Policies 11.34, 11.35, 11.36, and 11.37 in Plan Change 13. This Objective and these policies articulate the Council's vision for the area, and seek to achieve the objectives of the LGAAA, the Growth Concept, and the Regional Policy Statement. The explanatory text introduced into Section 6.12.15 refers to the Hobsonville Concept Plan 1 – Features, which identifies areas and items of high amenity value and of heritage significance on the Airbase.

Consequently the addition of a specific objective for the Hobsonville Airbase is not required. The clarity and certainty of the planning framework for the Airbase can, however, be enhanced by the inclusion of an over-arching policy for the whole Airbase (i.e. the land contained within the Council's application to move the Metropolitan Urban Limit). This will provide a finer grain of policy guidance for the Airbase as a whole.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/115 is accepted in part, to the extent that the policy framework will be amended to insert a new Policy (numbered 11.34) that applies to the whole of the Hobsonville Airbase.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/103	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to add a further policy statement emphasising the importance of providing for a high standard of pedestrian amenity. State that main pedestrian routes are to be identified at Comprehensive Development Plan stage and are to adequately provide for circulation around a precinct, between precincts, to schools, parks and community services, and integrated with public transport nodes and bus stops.	Supported By: 250 Auckland Regional Council

Discussion:

Pedestrian amenity is a key component of any functioning residential area. The Council has, in this submission recognised that pedestrian amenity was not adequately addressed in the notified version of the Plan Change. The Council requests that the Comprehensive Development Plan tool be utilised to identify the main pedestrian routes. It is appropriate that this matter be addressed via amendments to the Policy section of the Plan Change, both in a new generic Hobsonville Airbase (inserted in response to submission 250/115) and specifically in the Hobsonville Base Village and Marine Industry Special Areas.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/103 is accepted.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/104	Waitakere City Council	Amend Policy 6.2.15 to provide an explanation relating to how "City-Wide Rules" are to be applied when implementing the Hobsonville Base Village Special Area Rules.	Opposed By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

The Council's approach to Special Areas within the District Plan includes the utilisation of existing Rules both within the City Wide Section of the Plan and within other specific Human Environments. On occasion there is uncertainty about how Rules from other parts of the District Plan are to be applied in a Special Area. It is appropriate that text be inserted into the Explanatory text contained in section 6.2.15.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/104 is accepted.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/105	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to, where necessary, reword the policies to eliminate ambiguity. (Further particulars of proposed amendments will be provided at any hearing of this Plan Change).	Opposed By: 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

257/162	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change, as necessary, to reword the policies to eliminate ambiguity. (Further particulars of proposed amendments will be provided at any hearing of this Plan Change).	Opposed By: 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)
---------	------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discussion:

Submission **257/105** relates to the Base Village Special Area and submission **257/162** relates to the Marine Industry Special Area.

These general submissions acknowledge that there is a large amount of text entering the District Plan as part of Plan Change 13. Following further consideration of that text by the Council, ambiguities have been identified, and the Council has sought to correct these matters through these submissions.

Recommendation:

Submissions 257/105 and 257/162 are accepted, subject to detailed amendments to the Plan change text being identified as a result of other submissions in this report.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
258/195	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend so that the words "should" and "may" be replaced with the word "shall" in all policies included in Plan Change 13.	

Discussion:

The word "should" occurs 14 times and the word "may" occurs 11 times in the new policies and existing policies that are amended via Plan Change 13. It is important that policies provide clear and certain guidance on what the District Plan is seeking from Plan Change 13. To this end the use of the words "shall" and "will" are more directive than the words "should" or "may", and is appropriately used in some instances in the Policies that apply to Plan Change 13. This terminology amendment will be incorporated into any other amendments to these Policies arising from other submissions.

Recommendation:

Submission 258/195 is accepted in part.

5.4 Precinct Location / Layout

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
160/2	Lloyd Morris	Support the concept of Precincts	

Discussion:

This submitter's support of the use of Precincts as a planning tool within the Base Village and Marine Industry Special Area is noted.

Recommendation:

Submission 160/2 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
160/3	Lloyd Morris	Amend to extend Metropolitan Urban Limit to include properties fronting Clark Road (plan attached to submission)	Opposed By: 259 Transit New Zealand
160/5	Lloyd Morris	Amend to expand Metropolitan Urban Limit to include the property wrapping around the Chapel and Cemetery	
160/7	Lloyd Morris	Amend to extend Metropolitan Urban Limit to include corner property (in vicinity of Historic Chapel and Cemetery, Scott Road) and the	Opposed By: 259 Transit New Zealand

		unformed portion of Clark Road abutting Precinct G, as medium density residential	
582/1	Hazen & Jeanette Rota	Seeks that the southern Clark Rd/Scott Rd area be included in the Plan Change because with the closure of the airbase there is now no reason for the developemnt restrictions to remain. Most blocks are uneconomical for horticultural use. A relaxation/change is sought to allow subdivision into half acre lifestyle blocks.	Supported By: 160 Lloyd Morris Opposed By: 259 Transit New Zealand

Discussion:

These four submissions relate to requests that the Council's application to the Auckland Regional Council to shift the Metropolitan Urban Limit be amended to include additional sites along Clark Road and Scott Road. The Council has considered the possibility of urbanisation of the area known as Scott Point (or the remainder of the Hobsonville Peninsula). It has determined that it is appropriate that this area be sequenced for consideration for urban development after 2021. The inclusion of the areas requested by the submitters, while being small in area, are nevertheless not required for growth purposes. Their inclusion may have the effect of destabilising the clear and defensible line that the Council has sought for the Metropolitan Urban Limit on the Hobsonville Peninsula.

Recommendation:

Submissions 160/3, 160/5, 160/7 and 582/1 are rejected.

5.5 Marine Industry Special Area

5.5.1: Marine Industry Special Area Policies

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
87/4	Waitakere Properties Limited	Amend to refer to Area "aa" being used primarily for large boats, but also subsidiary activities such as the associated building of smaller boats, where this does not compromise the primary purpose of this area being for activities requiring close access to deep water.	Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 250 Auckland Regional Council

Discussion:

Area "aa" is the core part of the Marine Industry Special Area. The Council is seeking to ensure that only marine industry activities choose to locate in this area. This is to ensure that the industry has the opportunity to locate near to the deep water access provided by the Waitemata Harbour, and to ensure that non-marine industry activities do not locate there. The Council has established industrial areas in both the Massey North and Hobsonville Village Centre areas to accommodate other non marine industry. While the Council has defined what a "marine industry activity" is as part of Plan Change 13, the submitter is seeking that this approach include smaller boat building in the Policy Section of the Plan Change. This is not an appropriate amendment, as the council is seeking to ensure that the outcomes being sought from the Plan Change are achieved. Consequently only new text reinforcing the role of Area "aa" is introduced into the re-numbered Policy 11.45.

Recommendation:

Submission 87/4 is accepted in part.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
63/3	Marine Industry Association NZ	Amend policy 11.34 by including the word " <i>generally</i> " between "The" and "limitation" (3 rd line), and the word " <i>general</i> " between "this" and "limitation" (5 th line).	

87/6	Waitakere Properties Limited	Amend policy 11.34 by including the word “ <i>generally</i> ” between “The” and “limitation” (3 rd line), and word “general” between “this” and “limitation” (5 th line).	Opposed By: 250 Auckland Regional Council
------	------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------

Discussion:

These two submissions seek greater flexibility in terms of Policy 11.34, so that marine activities that are not specifically linked to the adjacent deep water access are able to occur. The Policy sets out the policy approach to the Hobsonville Marine Industry Special Area, and then proceeds to itemise specific requirements if activities wish to establish in the Special Area. Given this format of Policy 11.34, the first inclusion of “general” is not appropriate, however the inclusion of the word “primarily” in a revised Policy that more clearly states the intention of the Marine Industry Special Area is appropriate.

Recommendation:

Submissions 63/3 and 87/6 are accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
63/4	Marine Industry Association NZ	Amend Policy 11.34 to make specific reference to the need to develop buildings of substantial scale within area “aa” of the Hobsonville Marine Industry Special Area, such as a rewording of the third bullet as follows: <i>“Landscape character will change through the establishment of buildings of a potentially large height and bulk, necessary to accommodate the construction of large boats. The adverse effects of that change, as viewed from the surrounding Special Areas, and from outside the peninsular, need to be mitigated by sleeving lower scale development around the edges of the Hobsonville Marine Industry Special Area, by appropriate landscape treatment to break up the outline of buildings, and by good design and colouring of the buildings themselves.”</i>	
87/7	Waitakere Properties Limited	Amend policy 11.34 by specifically including reference to the need to develop buildings of substantial scale within area “aa” of the Hobsonville Marine Industry Special Area, such as a rewording of the third bullet point as follows: <i>“Landscaping character will change through the establishment of buildings of a potentially large height and bulk, necessary to accommodate the construction of large boats. The adverse effects of that change, as viewed from the surrounding Special Areas, and from outside the peninsula, need to be mitigated by sleeving lower scale development around the edges of the Hobsonville Marine Industry Special Area, by appropriate landscape treatment to break up the outline of buildings, and by good design and colouring of the buildings themselves”.</i>	

Discussion:

Area “aa” is the core part of the Marine Industry Special Area. The Council is seeking to ensure that only marine industry activities choose to locate in this area. This is to ensure that the industry has the opportunity to locate near to the deep water access provided by the Waitemata Harbour, and to ensure that non-marine industry activities do not locate there. The council has established industrial areas in both the Massey north and Hobsonville Village Centre areas to accommodate other industry. While the Council has defined what a “marine industry activity” is as part of Plan Change 13, the submitter is seeking that this approach be reinforced in the Policy Section of the Plan Change. This is an appropriate amendment, to ensure that the outcomes being sought from the Plan Change are achieved. Consequently new text is introduced into the re-numbered Policy 11.45, describing what activities are appropriate in Area “aa”.

Recommendation:

Submissions 63/4 and 87/7 are accepted in part

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/139	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the plan change to provide detail on the scale of industrial activities to be provided for in the Marine Industry Special Area, and ensure through amendments to Plan Change 13 that ‘heavy’ industry is not provided for.	

Discussion:

This Special Area is not within an industrial air quality area, but is within a rural air quality area, as identified in the Auckland Regional Air, Land and Water Plan Maps. This area is also located in close proximity to a large area of residential development, and the Upper Waitemata Harbour. The proximity to the deep water access that is available in the Upper Waitemata Harbour is one of the key factors driving the Council’s proposal to develop a marine industry cluster.

While it is difficult to predict the nature of the industries that will locate in the Marine Industry Special Area, it is appropriate to place limitations in the District Plan to ensure that “heavy” industry do not locate there, because of the potential for adverse environmental effects given the proximity of sensitive land uses. Consequently it is appropriate to insert text into the re-numbered Policy 11.35 for areas “bb”, “cc” and “dd” and make consequential changes to Marine Industry Special Area Rules 24.2 (g) and (h).

Recommendation:

Submission 250/139 is accepted in part.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/156	Waitakere City Council	Amend the third bullet point in Policy 11.34 by making reference to the likely height and bulk of buildings (expected to be large for boat building purposes).	

Discussion:

The Marine Industry Special Area is expected to have large buildings located within it, to enable the industry to operate effectively. This submission seeks that the height of buildings be more explicitly addressed in the Policy, thereby ensuring that all Plan users understand the nature and extent of development and change to the landscape character in this Special Area.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/156 is accepted.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/157	Waitakere City Council	Amend Policy 11.34 to add a policy statement referring to the importance of ensuring the scale of buildings in Area “bb” appropriately relates to the scale of existing or possible	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) Support and Opposed By: 250 Auckland Regional

		future buildings in surrounding Special Areas (ie are of a lower or “sleeved” scale) to ensure that built form, streetscape relation, basic bulk and location and façade detailing are appropriately addressed to ensure suitable interface is achieved to adjoining roads and/or Special Areas.	Council
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Discussion:

This submission aligns with the Council’s submission 257.156, which sought an amendment to the re-numbered Policy 11.35 to reflect the nature and scale of the built form within the Marine Industry Special Area. The Council is, however, seeking to ensure that the interface between Area “aa” and its neighbouring areas is treated appropriately and that the scale of development along the edges of Area “aa” is appropriate. It is appropriate that text be inserted into the re-numbered policy 11.35 to address this matter.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/157 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/159	Waitakere City Council	Amend Policy 11.34 to better explain the need to provide adequately for carparking - normal district plan parking requirements to be met unless it can be shown, at CDP and individual development stages, that a lesser requirement can be justified, through such means as indicating likely employee numbers and provision to be made for access by public transport.	Support and Opposed By: 250 Auckland Regional Council

Discussion:

The Marine Industry Special Area will be a significant employer in the area of the Hobsonville Airbase. Plan Change 13 lacked sufficient consideration of this matter, and this submission seeks to rectify that matter. It is important that car parking be addressed in a manner that ensures that any adverse effects on the transport network from car parking are avoided or mitigated, and where possible car parking is minimised. The submission gives scope for the District Plan requirements to be assessed at a lower standard in certain circumstances, which is appropriate given the large buildings having potential under the current district plan standards to be required to provide parking in excess of that needed for the employees and visitors to the building. A consequential change to the Rule24.2(a)(ix) is also appropriate.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/159 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/161	Waitakere City Council	Amend the third paragraph under the heading ‘Hobsonville Marine Industry Special Area’ in Section 6.2.15 by replacing “A” with “aa”, “B” with “cc” and “C” with “bb”.	

Discussion:

This typographical error is acknowledged, and it is appropriate to amend this to provide certainty for District Plan users.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/161 is accepted

5.5.2 Marine Industry Special Area Rules

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/172	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to, as necessary, reword the rules and assessment criteria to eliminate ambiguity and promote greater word economy. (Further particulars of proposed amendments will be provided at any hearing of this Plan Change).	Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

This submission relates to the Marine Industry Special Area and acknowledges that there is a large amount of text entering the District Plan in this part of Plan Change 13. Following further consideration of that text, ambiguities have been identified, and require correction.

Recommendation:

Submissions 257/172 is accepted, subject to detailed amendments to the Marine Industry Special Area identified in relation to specific submissions on the Rules and Assessment Criteria identified in this report.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/124	Auckland Regional Council	Amend: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24.2(a)(ix) to read: "A transport management <u>plan in accordance with assessment criteria 24(t)-(ad).</u> • 24.2(a)(x) by adding those words underlined: "<u>An infrastructure management plan in accordance with assessment criteria 24(ae)-(an)</u>" • 24.2(b) to read: "<u>the creation subdivision</u> of any site which." <p>And;</p> <p>Delete 24.3 because non-residential activities are not provided for within the definition of "Hobsonville Marine Industry Activity" and so should be non-complying.</p>	

Discussion:

The submitter has sought in the first part of this submission the clarification of matters associated with transport, infrastructure and subdivision, and the connection of management plans to the relevant assessment criteria. These amendments assist in clarifying the requirements associated with both transport matters and infrastructure, and correct poor phraseology in terms of the use of "creation" rather than subdivision.

The inclusion of Rule 24.3, for Discretionary Activities, and its application to non-residential activities is appropriate, as it only applies to Areas "bb", "cc", and "dd", and not to the core Marine Industry Area "aa". This provision enables additional non-residential activities to occur in these buffer Areas, while distinguishing these from residential activities that would be assessed as a non-complying activity in Areas "bb" and "cc". Residential activities are able to occur in Area "dd" of the Marine Industry Special Area as a limited discretionary activity, inserted in response to submissions WPL 87/1 87/2, ARC 250/118, and WCC 257/160. Consequently this part of the submission is not accepted.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/124 is accepted in part

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/163	Waitakere City Council	<p>Delete the last two lines in Rule 24.2 and replace with:</p> <p><i>“and, in respect of Rule 24.2(a), Assessment Criteria 24(a), (b)-(as);</i></p> <p><i>in respect of Rule 24.2(b), Assessment Criteria 21(b)-(d),(i)-(p),(t)-(y), (ae)-(as);</i></p> <p><i>in respect of Rule 24.2(c), Assessment Criteria 21(b)-(r),(t), (p),(t), (v), (y)-(ae), (aj)-(an), (ap)-(as);</i></p> <p><i>in respect of Rule 24.2 (d), Assessment Criteria 24(h) and (i);</i></p> <p><i>in respect of Rule 24.2(e) Assessment Criterion 24(s);</i></p> <p><i>and in respect of Rule 24.2(f) Assessment Criteria 24(t)-(as).”</i> (Note: amend as necessary to align with Submission 257/172 below).</p>	

Discussion:

This submission seeks to clarify the application of assessment criteria in Rule 24.2. It reduces the number of assessment criteria that are to be applied, without any valid basis for doing so. It may be that the assessment criteria that have not been selected for particular performance standards could be relevant to a particular consent application, and so it is appropriate to be inclusive in this instance. Consequently the requested amendment is not supported.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/163 is rejected.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
63/1	Marine Industry Association NZ	Amend Rule 24.2 to provide for subsidiary activities to the marine industry that do not compromise the primary purpose of the area, as permitted activities.	Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)
87/3	Waitakere Properties Limited	Amend Rule 24.2 to provide as a permitted activity, marine activities subsidiary to those activities involving the manufacture, finishing or refitting of boats of a dimension which will require launching from the Hobsonville hardstand area.	Opposed By: 250 Auckland Regional Council Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

“Hobsonville Marine Industry Activity” are defined as

Ships chandlery, the manufacturing, servicing, maintenance, repair, transportation, storage, distribution, display and sale of any boat and ancillary boat part, offices ancillary to the foregoing, training and educational facilities associated with the marine industry and no more than one dairy/ lunch bar not exceeding 200m² in gross floor area.

Activities that are subsidiary to the defined Hobsonville Marine Industry Activity are an important component of the Marine Industry Special Area, but need to be considered in terms of the outcomes being sought by the Council in terms of the potential urban design and reverse sensitivity effects associated with development in the Special Area. It is important that these subsidiary

activities be enabled, but not as permitted activities. It is therefore appropriate that an additional performance standard be included in Rule 24.2 to provide for these activities.

Recommendation:

Submissions 63/1 and 87/3 are accepted in part

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/171	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 24 to add a further bullet point under "Resource Consent Conditions" as follows: <i>"Such other matters provided for in the assessment criteria."</i>	Supported By: 250 Auckland Regional Council

Discussion:

Assessment criteria are used to identify matters that require assessment when a resource consent is processed.

Rule 24 includes a list of matters that can be addressed via a condition when granting a resource consent. This includes a reference to section 108 of the Resource Management Act 1991, which specifies the matters that can be addressed via a condition on a resource consent.

The submitter is seeking that any matter included in the Assessment Criteria should be able to have a condition related to it placed on a resource consent. This would include assessment criteria 24(a) to 24(as), and any relevant assessment criteria included in the other Rules that apply to the Hobsonville Landing Special Area. This ability already exists via section 108 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Unless the submitter can identify a specific matter contained within Special Area's Rule 24 Assessment Criteria that requires a specific reference in the "Resource Consent Conditions" part of the Rule, this submission is vague and is rejected. Without such specificity, this submission is rejected.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/171 is rejected

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/166	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 24 to Insert a further bullet point under "Resource Consent Conditions" allowing a 10 year consent period in respect of Comprehensive Development Plans.	

Discussion:

The standard term of resource consent is five years. It is likely that resource consent for a Comprehensive Development Plan will be complex and may require more than five years to be given effect to. A ten year timeframe is therefore appropriate, but no longer given the ten year life of the District Plan before it requires review.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/166 is accepted.

5.5.3 Marine Industry Special Area Assessment Criteria

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/167	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of Assessment Criteria 24(h) and (i) to state the importance of existing heritage features. State the requirement for a heritage inventory as part of the CDP process, and the need to make heritage protection and enhancement an integral component of CDP preparation. State the requirement for a heritage design statement to accompany any building or other development proposal, covering the design philosophy in respect of the heritage features of the relevant precinct.	

Discussion:

The requirement for a Heritage Management Plan has been included into the performance standards associated with Rule 24.2(a), in response to other submissions. It is therefore appropriate that the assessment criteria be amended to reflect the heritage values of the Special Area. Some of the matters requested in this submission have been dealt with in the policies and rules, and so the amendments to the assessment criteria amount to an acceptance in part of this submission.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/167 is accepted in part

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/175	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of Assessment Criteria 24(j) by deleting those words struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: "The extent to which design themes established through design guidelines and other appropriate means <i>building design</i> will achieve a character and appearance that will ensure a high standard of amenity values and avoid conflicts <i>adverse effects</i> from between activities <i>located</i> in the <i>Hobsonville Marine Industry Special Area</i> on Precincts in the Hobsonville Base Village Special Area and on land identified as Open Space Environment and surrounding areas. "	

Discussion:

This text is able to be improved by the use of a different phraseology and terms that are appropriate in resource management documents, and it is appropriate that these amendments be made.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/175 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/164	Waitakere City Council	Amend Assessment criteria 24(j) and 24(k) to recognise that there will be large boat buildings and the consequent need for buildings to be designed and mitigated (for instance by landscape treatment) to ensure there are no more than minor adverse effects	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

		when those buildings are viewed from around and outside the Special Area.	
257/165	Waitakere City Council	Amend Assessment Criteria 24(j) and 24(k) to refer to the importance of ensuring the scale of buildings in Area "bb" appropriately relates to the scale of existing or possible future buildings in surrounding Special Areas (ie are of a lower or "sleeved" scale) to ensure that built form, streetscape relation, basic bulk and location and façade detailing are appropriately addressed to ensure suitable interface is achieved to adjoining roads and/or Special Areas.	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

Assessment criterion 24k is the main matter raised in these two submissions, which seeks to clarify and confirm the amenity value matters that will be assessed as part of resource consents for the Marine Industry Special Area. It is appropriate that these matters be made more explicit, and that will provide certainty for plan users.

Recommendation:

Submissions 257/164 and 257/165 are accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/168	Waitakere City Council	Amend Assessment Criterion 24(q) to refer to wider (than aural and visual) effects, including odour, dust, vehicle movement, hours of activity, traffic and security.	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

This amendment seeks to expand the possible effects on amenity values that shall be assessed as part of assessing resource consents for activities in the Marine Industry Special Area. As such it provides greater certainty for plan users, and is accepted. Security is an operational matter that will be dealt with separately from resource consents, and consequently it is not included.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/168 is accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/176	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to amalgamate Assessment Criteria 24(w) and 24 (ag). Redraft 24(w), delete 24(ag), and re-number the remaining assessment criteria accordingly.	

Discussion:

These two assessment criteria provide guidance on streets and public spaces, and the design of those areas. The two criteria are easily combined without creating any confusion, and the submission is accepted.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/176 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/169	Waitakere City Council	Amend Assessment Criterion 24(z) to refer to the Waitakere City Council Parking and Driveway Guideline, as a guideline for "standard" carparking requirements, and a	

		statement making it clear that reductions will only be given where it can be confirmed that a lesser number of car parking spaces will satisfy likely demand.	
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Discussion:

The inclusion of a reference to the council's Car Parking and Driveway Guideline (which is contained within the Council's Code of Practice for City Infrastructure and Land Development) is a useful addition to making this assessment criterion clear and certain. The application of the Parking Guideline in the assessment of a resource consent will determine whether the applicant has demonstrated that the parking demand requires fewer parking spaces. Consequently this requested amendment is accepted to the extent that a reference to the parking guidelines is included in the assessment criterion.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/169 is accepted in part

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/170	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to add, after the end of the Assessment Criteria, in "See also Policies" reference to Policy Section 6.2.15.	

Discussion:

This submission seeks to include a cross reference to the relevant part of Section 6 of the District Plan Policy Section. This cross reference will assist Plan users to understand the policy direction being sought through the District Plan provisions, and is appropriate.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/170 is accepted.

5.5.4 Marine Industry Special Area Definitions

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
63/2	Marine Industry Association NZ	Amend the proposed definition of 'Hobsonville Marine Industry Activity' to include reference to training/educational facilities associated with the marine industry, which may well be required to locate in this area, and which are complementary to the other activities already provided for.	Support and Opposed By: 250 Auckland Regional Council
87/5	Waitakere Properties Limited	Amend the definition of Hobsonville Marine Industry Activity to mean the use of land and <i>buildings</i> for the following: "Ships chandlery, the manufacturing, servicing, maintenance, repair, transportation, storage, distribution, display and sale of any boat and ancillary boat part, offices ancillary to the foregoing, training/educational facilities associated with the marine industry and no more than one dairy/lunchbar not exceeding 200m ² in <i>gross floor area</i> ".	

Discussion:

These two submissions seek the inclusion of "training and education facility" within the definition of Hobsonville Marine Industry Activity. The marine industry is a growing industry that has the potential for educational institutions to share knowledge about the industry and its operation. It is appropriate that this type of facility locate in proximity to the area where the industry is located.

Recommendation

Submissions 63/2 and 87/5 are accepted.

5.5.5 Marine Industry Special Area Map Issues

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
87/1	Waitakere Properties Limited	Amend the map titled: Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan - Features, to extend area "bb" for a depth of up to 80 metres west of the proposed open space and/or the open space area to be amended to provide for a more logical boundary such as that shown on the concept plan attached to this submission.	Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)
87/2	Waitakere Properties Limited	Amend Rule 24.3 to provide for "Any Activity" as a discretionary activity in Area "bb".	Opposed By: 250 Auckland Regional Council

Discussion:

The purpose of the Area "bb" is to act as an area that has marine industry activities, but at a reduced scale to address any adverse effects that may arise from such large scale buildings adjacent to (as yet unknown) activities in the Hobsonville Future Development Special Areas. The submitter is seeking an extension of the buffer on the eastern (coastal) side of the Marine Industry Area, to the west of the identified open space areas. A subsequent submission by the same submitter is 87/2, in which the submitter seeks that the limitation within Area "bb" that enables only marine industry activities be changed to enable any activity. .

This expansion of activities that can occur in Area "bb" is not appropriate, as Area "bb" is seen as a core part of the Marine Industry Special Area, albeit at a lower scale. This is especially important on the southern and western boundaries, where the boundary abuts the Future Development Special Area (which may become part of the Marine Industry Special Area via a future plan change process).

However when submissions 87/1 and 87/2 are combined, it is appropriate that a new eastern side to Area "dd" be created, given the proximity of the coastal environment. Further to this the activities that could occur in this eastern buffer could be expanded to include non-marine industry activities, given that other non-residential or residential activities on that eastern edge may also act to buffer the large scale marine industry buildings to the west. This could occur provided that appropriate policies and rules address the development of this part of the Marine Industry Special Area.

This area should be given a new title (to distinguish it from Areas "aa" and "bb". Consequently this area is entitled Area "dd".

Recommendation:

Submissions 87/1 and 87/2 are accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/132	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the Hobsonville Urban Concept Plan by creating direct access between the Landing and Marine Industry Special Areas suitable for boats and heavy vehicles.	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

There is an existing access between the Marine Industry Special Area and the Landing Special Area. The Marine Industry Special Area requires access to enable large boats to be launched into the deep water adjacent to the Landing Special Area. The Council has discussed the location of the access way with the Marine Industry Association, but has not reached a final view on where the access way is best placed. Consequently the performance standards for the Comprehensive Development Plan resource consent for the Marine Industry Special Area require that the location

of all roads be part of the resource consent, which includes the access road for the launching of large boats. The final location of the road may be included in the forthcoming plan change required for the further development of the Landing Special Area. In the interim, the location of all roads in the Marine Industry Special Area are required as part of the comprehensive development plan resource consent application. Consequently it is appropriate that the indicative roading arrow within the Marine Industry Special Area be removed.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/132 is accepted in part

5.5.6 Marine Industry Special Area Wording Errors

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/173	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of Rule 24.2(c) by adding the word underlined: "Any <i>Hobsonville Marine Industry Activity...</i> "	

Discussion:

This word was omitted from the notified version of the Plan Change in error. It is appropriate that it be inserted into the Rule, to provide certainty and clarity for Plan users.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/173 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/174	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of Rule 24.2(c)b to italicise the word "connections".	

Discussion:

The District Plan uses a system of italicising words that have been defined in the District Plan. The word "connections" has a specific meaning relating to infrastructure, and the definition is already operative within the District Plan. The italicisation of this word was omitted from the notified version of the Plan Change in error. It is appropriate that it be italicised in the Rule, to provide certainty and clarity for Plan users.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/174 is accepted.

5.6 Hobsonville Future Development Special Area

5.6. 1 Hobsonville Future Development Special Area Policies

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/127	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the plan change by including policies and rules to prohibit subdivision and development that would compromise future urban development options for the area, or have adverse effects on the natural character of the coast or the heritage features of the area in order to manage the identified Future Development Special Areas in a comprehensive, integrated manner, cognisant of constraints to future development.	Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)
257/185	Waitakere City Council	Amend Policy 11.36 so that it refers to the Hobsonville Future Development Special Area not being considered for development	Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand

		until at least 80% of the expected household numbers in the rules are completed within each of the Parade Ground, Campus/Runway Park, Buckley and Hudson Bay Precincts.	Corporation (1)
257/183	Waitakere City Council	Amend Policy 11.36 by adding a policy statement to the effect that opening up too much land at one time can actively undermine the establishment of a compact, efficient settlement in a manner that future retrofitting cannot reliably infill. Limiting the land available at any one time forces a more compact neighbourhood to develop with proper management of privacy, mixed use, reverse sensitivity etc. Without this, development sprawls if for nothing less than it is easier to obtain consents when distance between activities mitigates effects and makes the need for careful and deliberate design solutions unnecessary.	Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)
257/184	Waitakere City Council	Amend Policy Section 6.2.15 by adding a policy statement to the effect that opening up too much land at one time can actively undermine the establishment of a compact, efficient settlement in a manner that future retrofitting cannot reliably infill. Limiting the land available at any one time forces a more compact neighbourhood to develop with proper management of privacy, mixed use, reverse sensitivity etc. Without this, development sprawls if for nothing less than it is easier to obtain consents when distance between activities mitigates effects and makes the need for careful and deliberate design solutions unnecessary.	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited Opposed By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd

Discussion:

Policy 11.36 and its Explanation in Section 6.2.15 establish that the Future Urban Special Area is to be included within the Metropolitan Urban Limit, but is not available for urban development until after a future District Plan change establishes the land use controls that will apply to this area of land. The Policy and Explanation establishes that this future plan change cannot occur until certain development thresholds in the Sunderland Head, Campus/Runway Park, Buckley Avenue and Hudson Bay Road Precincts is completed. District Plan Rule 21 establishes expected household numbers required in each Precinct (Parade Ground 198(now included in Sunderland Head Precinct), Campus/Runway Park 637, Buckley 283 and Hudson Bay 215) This amounts to 1333 household units (or 1463 including Sunderland Head Precinct).

There is a lack of certainty in Policy 11.36 about what development threshold must be passed within each Precinct in the Base Village Special Area before the future plan change can be notified.

The submission **257/185** seeks to clarify what that threshold is. The submitter seeks that 80 percent of the household development in each of the Precincts is completed before the future plan change is notified. This percentage is stated in the notified version of Section 6.2.15, but not in the Policy itself. This amounts to the following:

Precinct Name	Notified Household Number	80 % Threshold
Sunderland Head (Total including amalgamated Parade Ground Precinct)	198 (328)	158 (262)
Campus/Runway Park	637	510
Buckley	283	226
Hudson Bay	215	172
TOTAL	1333 (1463)	1066 (1170)

The suggested amendment to Policy 11.36 provides certainty, as the number of household units in each Precinct is quantifiable. The reasoning behind the submission on Policy 11.36 appears to be provided in submissions 257/183 and 257/184. It is appropriate that this reasoning be inserted into Section 6.2.15.

Submission **250/127** seeks to ensure that the Future Development Special Area is retained for its specified purpose, and is not subject to premature development or development that may adversely affect the natural values associated with the Area. The Council relies on the Countryside Environment to address this submission, rather than introducing further rules to prohibit subdivision and development. Clarification of the matters raised in the submission is appropriate.

A further submission from Housing Corporation seeks clarification that the future plan change referred to can be prepared, but can only be publicly notified once the threshold has been achieved. This recognises that the planning work may commence prior to, but in anticipation of, the threshold being reached. This aspect of the Housing Corporation's larger further submission is accepted.

Recommendation:

Submissions 257/183, 257/184 and 257/185 are accepted.

Submission 250/127 is accepted in part

Further submission 95 (1) is accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
175/1	Department of Conservation	Amend 6.2.15 by altering the description of 'Hobsonville Future Development Special Area' to identify the important wading habitat adjacent to the peninsula	Opposed By: 264 Centre for Urban and Transport Studies
175/2	Department of Conservation	Amend 6.2.15 to highlight that the protection of this habitat will be a priority for any future development of the 'Hobsonville Future Development Special Area'	Opposed By: 264 Centre for Urban and Transport Studies

Discussion:

The Future Urban Special Area is clearly identified as requiring a further Plan Change to insert land use controls for this land before development is able to occur there. This requirement for a Plan Change is included in Policy 11.36 and Section 6.2.15.

The submitter raises the matter of bird wading and roosting areas on shell banks and habitat at the mouth of Bomb Bay, and inter-tidal feeding areas adjacent to the Peninsula. Bomb Bay is located to the south of the existing peninsula (known as "Bomb Point") where the old armoury buildings are located.

Policy 11.36 and the explanation in 6.2.15 states certain matters that must be fulfilled before the Plan change process may commence. It does not mention the matters raised by the submitter. This matter can, however be included in Section 6.2.15, to ensure that the future Plan Change takes this matter into account and appropriate land use controls are incorporated into the District Plan to ensure that these important areas are not adversely affected by adjacent development.

Recommendation:

Submissions 175/1 and 175/2 are accepted.

5.6.2 Hobsonville Future Development Special Area Rules

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/186	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 22 to add, after the 'Note' referring to Policy 11.34, reference to Policy Section 6.2.15.	

Discussion:

This submission seeks to include a cross reference to the relevant part of Section 6 of the District Plan Policy Section. This cross reference will assist Plan users to understand the policy direction being sought through the District Plan provisions, and is appropriate.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/186 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/187	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 22.1(i) to replace the existing wording with the following: <i>"Parks and Reserves."</i>	

Discussion:

The existing Permitted Activity in Rule 22.1 states:

- i. Any land to be vested as a reserve pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977 or the Local Government Act 1974.*

It is appropriate to remove the reference to the Local Government Act 1974, as this has been repealed and replaced by the Local Government Act 2002. However the Reserves Act 1977 is still relevant and should remain. It is appropriate to insert a reference to "parks". Consequently the submission is accepted in part.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/187 is accepted in part

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/188	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Rule 22 by re-numbering the clauses so that '22.3' becomes '22.2.'	

Discussion:

This submission seeks that Rules 22.2 and 22.3 be re-ordered. This re-ordering will provide a format for the Rule that is consistent with the other Special Area Rules in the District Plan, which generally list "Other Rules Applying" after any Rules allocating Non-complying status to any proposed activities. This formatting change is appropriate, and will assist in providing certainty and clarity for Plan users.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/188 is accepted.

5.7 Hobsonville Base Village Special Area

5.7.1 Hobsonville Base Village Special Area Policies

5.7.1.1 General Policy Amendments

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/102	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to add a further policy statement relating to the two retail centres provided for. Explain the role of these centres as local service centres only (the main town centre in this area being at Hobsonville Village). In respect of the retail centre in the Parade Ground Precinct, state the importance of achieving development which avoids large individual tenancies (policy to mention maximum individual tenancy size of 500m ² and maximum average size of 200m ²), with externally-focussed active street edges and the ability to be integrated with other commercial and residential development (for instance, apartments above shops). In respect of the retail centre in the Motorway Precinct, state the expectation that this centre will be oriented primarily towards customers arriving by car, but must be designed as an important gateway to the community and to present an attractive façade to surrounding streets, and make provision for customers arriving on foot.	<p>Supported By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd 300 IMF Westland Ltd</p> <p>Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 250 Auckland Regional Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited</p>

Discussion:

The Council is seeking to ensure that the Centres based approach to retail in the City is correctly referenced in the Plan Change. It is important that the size and nature of the retail activity that is being enabled to occur is correctly specified in the District Plan to enable appropriate development to establish.

It is also important to make it clear to Plan users that the retail activity enabled at the Hobsonville Village Centre (via Plan Change 14) is the primary service centre meeting retail needs that go beyond convenience retail. Consequently the Council has identified the need to specify gross floor area standards in those Precincts where retail is enabled (the re-named Sunderland Head Precinct, the Buckley Interchange Precinct and the Hobsonville Village Precinct (this Precinct abuts the Hobsonville Village Centre discussed previously in this submission)).

The notified amount of gross floor area for retail activities for the Sunderland Head Village have been amended in response to submissions by Westfield (107/57) and Progressive (108/71). It may be appropriate to review the nature and scale of retailing in the Sunderland Head Precinct as part of the development of the forthcoming Plan Change for the Landing Special Area (required as part of Policy 11.38).

Recommendation:

Submission 257/102 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/100	Waitakere City Council	Amend Policy 11.35 to better explain the need to provide adequately for carparking - encouragement is to be given through such means as incentives or mechanisms to reduce use of cars, with Council's Parking and Driveway Guideline standard to be	<p>Supported By: 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority</p> <p>Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)</p>

		applied only if it can be shown that reduced use of cars is not possible.	250 Auckland Regional Council
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------

Discussion:

The Council has sought to intensify land use and residential density in the Base Village Special Area to enable public transport to be viable and enable opportunities for people to live close to their community focal points (such as schools and convenience retail). Consequently there is provision in the Policy for the Council to work with the developers at Comprehensive Development Plan stage and during subsequent consents to achieve these outcomes. The utilisation of the Council's Code of Practice for City Infrastructure and Land Development is an appropriate standard to fall back on if parking reduction is not achievable, and that is triggered by the application of Living Environment Rule 12 or the medium Density Design Criteria (as specified in Rules 21.5 Other Rules Applying).

Recommendation:

Submission 257/100 is accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/98	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to add a further policy statement explaining the importance of the open space areas as shown on the Concept Plan (for instance, the relationship of those areas to the coast and to future development). Include a statement that development "shall" provide for open space in general accordance with the Concept Plan.	Supported By: 250 Auckland Regional Council

Discussion:

The Base Village Special Area will be an area that has high intensity of residential use, along with land uses in the neighbouring Special Areas. Consequently open space will be an important factor in the amenity of the Special Area. This open space includes the existing parks and reserves and the potential for new open space areas. Therefore it is important to ensure that the open space is adequately provided for in the Policy and rule framework, and it is appropriate to include the requested text in the new Policy 11.34 (inserted via submission 250/115) and 11.36 (inserted via submission 250/119).

Recommendation:

Submission 257/98 is accepted in part

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/96	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to add a further policy statement explaining the intent of the district plan provisions, which provide for flexibility in the design of development (such as through the absence of height and other bulk and location controls), but only where a Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP) has first been prepared and approved. Include a statement that development "shall" be in accordance with a CDP. Include reference to the importance of the CDP not being changed once development has commenced (that being a non-complying activity); Include reference to the need for buildings to be designed and sited to allow access to light and sun, and the maintenance of outlook.	Opposed By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

257/155	Waitakere City Council	Amend Policy 11.35 to add a further policy statement explaining the intent of the district plan provisions, which provide for flexibility in the design of development (such as through the absence of height and other bulk and location controls), but only where a Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP) has first been prepared and approved. Include a statement that development “shall” be in accordance with a CDP. Include reference to the importance of the CDP not being changed once development has commenced (that being a non-complying activity).	
---------	------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Discussion:

This submission seeks further clarification of how the policy and rule framework in the Base Village Special Area will work. The Plan Change proposes that comprehensive development plans for the whole Precinct be given consent, followed by other consents. It is therefore important that the framework adequately addresses the requirements in a manner that ensures that the environment is sustainably managed and the outcomes being sought from the LGA(A)A are achieved.

The submission also seeks that a Comprehensive Development Plan not be changed once the development has commenced, and if it does, it should be treated as a non-complying activity. It is possible that as the development that is in accordance with the consented Comprehensive Development Plan proceeds, alterations to or completely different Comprehensive Development Plans may be applied for. If these alterations or new applications meet the performance standards, they should be assessed as a discretionary activity, as they will comply with the District Plan (albeit in a different form). Such applications should not be assigned limited discretionary activity status, to ensure there is an incentive to get the application correct the first time (numerous applications for alterations or new Comprehensive Development Plans will not be cost effective or efficient.

Consequently the submission is accepted in part.

Recommendation:

Submissions 257/96 and 257/155 are accepted in part.

5.7.1.2 Specific Policy Amendments

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
107/53	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	Amend the last bullet point in Policy 11.35 B. Parade Ground Precinct by adding the underlined words (or words to like effect): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “<i>Provision for a neighbourhood retail centre including commercial/office uses, located, designed and sized such that it will provide a community/shopping node sufficient to service the needs of the local community. <u>Retail development will be limited to convenience retail to ensure that retail uses are encouraged to locate in the Hobsonville Village Town Centre</u>”.</i>” 	Supported By: 300 IMF Westland Ltd Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 109 The Warehouse Ltd Support and Opposed By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
108/63	Progressive Enterprises Limited	Amend the last bullet point in Policy 11.35 B. Parade Ground Precinct by adding those words underlined (or words to like effect): “ <i>Provision for a neighbourhood retail centre</i> ”	Supported By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd Opposed By:

		<p><i>including commercial/office uses, located, designed and sized such that it will provide a community/shopping node sufficient to service the needs of the local community. <u>Retail development will be limited to convenience retail to ensure that retail uses are encouraged to locate in the Hobsonville Village Town Centre</u>.</i></p>	<p>95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 109 The Warehouse Ltd</p>
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discussion:

The Council is seeking to ensure that the Centres based approach to retail in the City is correctly referenced in the Plan Change. It is important that the size and nature of the retail activity that is being enabled to occur is correctly specified in the District Plan to enable appropriate development to establish. These two submitters have identified the need to more clearly specify the nature and scale of retail in the (renamed) Sunderland Head Precinct.

Submitter 108 has also identified the limitation to retail activity in its submission numbered 108/71. This submission seeks to amend the gross floor area from 6,000 square metres to 2,000 square metres, with individual tenancies not to exceed 500 square metres. This further amendment provides greater certainty about the type of retail being enabled in this Precinct. Submission 108/71 is discussed in Section 5.7.2 of this Report (below). It may be appropriate to review the nature and scale of retailing in the (re-named) Sunderland Head Precinct as part of the development of the forthcoming Plan Change for the Landing Special Area (required as part of Policy 11.38).

Recommendation:

Submissions 107/53 and 108/63 are accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
107/54	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	<p>Amend the first bullet point in Policy 11.35 D. Motorway Interchange Precinct as follows (or words to like effect) (deletions in strikethrough and additions underlined):</p> <p><i>“Provide for small- scale vehicle oriented retail/commercial activities, complementing <u>and not detracting from other commercial nodes at the Hobsonville Village Town Centre and the neighbourhood retail centre in the Parade Ground Precinct. The total amount of retail floorspace and the nature of the retail activities will be controlled to ensure that retail uses are encouraged to locate in the Hobsonville Village Town Centre</u>”.</i></p>	<p>Supported By: 300 IMF Westland Ltd Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd Support and Opposed By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited</p>
108/64	Progressive Enterprises Limited	<p>Amend the first bullet point in Policy 11.35 D. Motorway Interchange Precinct as follows (or words to like effect) (deletions in strikethrough and additions underlined):</p> <p><i>“Provide for small-scale vehicle oriented retail/commercial activities, complementing <u>and not detracting from other commercial nodes at the Hobsonville Village Town Centre and the neighbourhood retail centre in the Parade Ground Precinct. The total amount of retail floorspace and the nature of the retail activities will be controlled to ensure that</u></i></p>	<p>Supported By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority</p>

		<u>retail uses are encouraged to locate in the Hobsonville Village Town Centre”.</u>	109 The Warehouse Ltd
300/19	IMF Westland Ltd	<p>Amend Policy 11.35, the first bullet under the subheading ‘D. Motorway Interchange Precinct’ as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Provide for small-scale retail <u>of a scale and suitable for the walkable catchment, that complements</u> other neighbourhood commercial nodes at the Hobsonville Village Centre <u>and the Parade Ground Precinct and does not detract from the major commercial node at Westgate</u> ■ <u>Provide for non-retail commercial activities that are vehicle oriented or service the neighbourhood catchment</u> ■ <u>Provide for mixed-use including intensive residential.</u> 	<p>Supported By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited</p> <p>Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd</p> <p>Support and Opposed By: 259 Transit New Zealand</p>
300/20	IMF Westland Ltd	<p>Amend Assessment Criteria 21(ay) to insert additional criteria as follows:</p> <p><i>(vii) to provide for a total gross floor area of retail of not more than 2000m2 including retail associated with any proposed mixed use activity</i></p> <p><i>(viii) commercial uses such as offices that are vehicle oriented or service the neighbourhood catchment</i></p> <p><i>(ix) the exclusion of any retail activity that has a Gross Floor Area of greater than 500m2.</i></p>	<p>Supported By: 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited</p> <p>Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd</p>

Discussion:

The Motorway Interchange Precinct was provided in the Plan Change to acknowledge the nature of the environment created by the State Highway 18 on and off ramps located in the vicinity. The Council accepted that retail activity was likely to occur in that area, and created this Precinct to provide guidance for that retail activity. The submitters are all seeking further clarification of the nature and extent of the retail that is able to locate in that Precinct. It is appropriate to provide that certainty, while retaining the Precinct’s role in the Council’s centres based approach to retailing.

Submission 300/19 also seeks that mixed use development be enabled to locate in this Precinct. This submission aligns with the Council’s policy approach to intensify land use, and it is appropriate that this also be included. The subsequent submission 300/20 indicates the submitters preference in terms of what limitations are appropriate in terms of gross floor area for the Precinct. This preference is housed within a requested amendment to assessment criterion 21(ay). It is appropriate that this preference be replicated in re-numbered Policy 11.36, and within Rule 21.3(h) to ensure that this limitation is able to be enforced.

Recommendation:

Submissions 107/54, 108/64, 300/19 and 300/20 are accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
107/55	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	Amend the plan change through the addition of a proviso to the end of Policy 11.35 I. Hobsonville Village Precinct as follows (or words to like effect): <i>“Provided that the total amount and nature of future retail development in the Hobsonville Village Precinct will be limited to ensure that retail uses are encouraged to locate in the Hobsonville Village Town Centre”.</i>	Supported By: 300 IMF Westland Ltd Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd Support and Opposed By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
108/65	Progressive Enterprises Limited	Amend the plan change through the addition of a proviso to the end of Policy 11.35 I. Hobsonville Village Precinct as follows (or words to like effect): <i>“Provided that the total amount and nature of future retail development in the Hobsonville Village Precinct will be limited to ensure that retail uses are encouraged to locate in the Hobsonville Village Town Centre”.</i>	Supported By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd

Discussion:

The Hobsonville Village Precinct was provided in the Plan Change to acknowledge the nature of the environment created by the existing commercial development located in the vicinity and the additional Village Centre being created via Plan Change 14. The Council accepted that retail activity was likely to occur in that area, and created this Precinct to provide guidance for that retail activity. The submitters are all seeking further clarification of the nature and extent of the retail that is able to locate in that Precinct. It is appropriate to provide that certainty, while retaining the Precinct’s role in the Council’s centres based approach to retailing.

Recommendation:

Submissions 107/55 and 108/65 are accepted in part

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
107/56	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	Retain the ‘Explanation’ to Policy 11.35 insofar as it is consistent with submission 107/51.	Supported By: 300 IMF Westland Ltd Support and Opposed By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
108/66	Progressive Enterprises Limited	Retain the ‘Explanation’ to Policy 11.35 insofar as is consistent with submission 108/61.	Supported By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd

Discussion:

Submission 108/61 was considered in Report WCC 5 (in the Hearing Series 4A Vol 2). That Report addressed submissions under the Category of “Business”.

The submitters support Plan Change 13 (and 16) provided it is in accordance with a centres-based policy for retail and business development. The submitters also seek consistency with the ARGS and the RPS and other relief as sought in their other submissions.

A centres-based policy is an important component of the Council’s overall strategy for urban consolidation and its obligations to provide intergrated land transport and land use provisions consistent with the ARGS and the LGAAA. A key component to the consolidation strategy is the management of retail and business development and centres. The Plan promotes a hierarchy of business development sequencing with the centralisation of retail and business activities,

particularly within existing and proposed town centres at the top of this hierarchy. A secondary hierarchy applies to the periphery of town centres for activities that are not well accommodated within them. The strategy also enables a third hierarchy for certain business development along specifically identified major roads. This is the case with the proposed business corridor between Hobsonville Road and the new motorway extension (Plan Change 14). This location, however, is not considered appropriate for higher intensity retail activities that are traditionally found in retail and town centres. On this basis, this approach is not inconsistent with a centres-based policy.

A focus of the Council's centres-based policy is the concentration of retail activities in town centres and on existing and/or proposed passenger transport routes. This will promote the improved viability of passenger transport, reduce vehicle trip frequency and length and relieve the wider pressures on the City's water and land resources and infrastructural systems that arise from the outward expansion of the urban area.

Equally as important, the strategy also recognises a need to respond to the important economic and social needs of the community, represented by the physical environment within town centres. That physical environment has a heavy reliance on the retail sector and amenity values and could suffer through the unmanaged establishment of retail development elsewhere. It is important to ensure the positive effects on amenity values that are derived from the concentration of retail and community facilities are recognised, provided for and maintained. It is also noted that the above strategies have been fully tested by the district planning process (including appeals to the Environment Court) and are now operative.

Plan Changes 13-18 have been prepared in accordance with this strategy and provide for a new town centre at the Hobsonville Village Centre and at Massey North while also consolidating and revitalising its town centre at New Lynn. At the same time, Plan Change 14 is focused on business and industry activities with a compact mixed use town centre. It is considered that these plan changes are consistent with a centres-based policy and the regional instruments referred to in the submission. Furthermore, it is considered that the plan changes are consistent with the provisions of the LGAAA as it promotes town centres and associated urban form that are favourable to establishing efficient public and land transport systems.

The Business Report noted that it was appropriate to consider the other specific relief requested by the submitter at a later hearing that deals with specific provisions in the various plan changes. On this basis it is recommended that these submissions be accepted in part insofar as they support the approach to retail taken in Plan Change 13 on the basis that they are consistent with a centres-based policy and are consistent with the ARGS and RPS. These are commensurate with the needs of the community in particular the need to maintain and enhance the growth and development of existing and proposed business centres in the District.

Recommendation:

That submissions 107/56 and 108/66 be accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/119	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the introductory paragraph of Policy 11.35 by adding those words underlined "...which recognise the unique quality and history of this area, <u>its coastal location</u> , and <u>its...</u> " And; Amend points A-I to include the intended urban form and densities of residential development for each of the precincts. In particular, amend Precincts A, B and F, to require the retention and enhancement of coastal natural character through reserves/open space and the provision of appropriate public access.	

257/99	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to add a further policy statement explaining the importance of achieving minimum densities of housing development (regional/ district strategies, efficient use and development). Include a statement that development "shall" meet the minimum density standards prescribed, and repeat those minimum standards from the rules.	Supported By: 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority
--------	------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------

Discussion:

The first point of the ARC submission aligns with submission 250/115, which inserted a new policy numbered 11.34 into the District Plan. This Policy includes, amongst other things, recognition of the coastal character of the Airbase. It is therefore appropriate to include this reference to coastal location in the re-numbered Policy 11.36.

Re-numbered Policy 11.36 includes sub policies (following amendment these are labelled from "A' to "H"). The submission goes on to request three amendments;

- include the intended urban form; and
- densities of residential development for each Precinct

in all sub-policies, and

- amend Precincts A, B and F, to require the retention and enhancement of coastal natural character through reserves/open space and the provision of appropriate public access.

The intended urban form is contained within the Policy in the bullet points that occur as a list before the commencement of the sub policies. These bullet points have been amended via other submissions, and are considered to provide appropriate guidance on the urban form. Consequently no specific amendment is required in relation to this part of the submission.

It is appropriate to provide more specific definition of the residential intensity sought in each of the Precincts. This is requested by both points of submission. This will provide some certainty that the residential intensity will achieve some of the purposes of the LGA(A)A, in terms of aligning landuse and transport networks and providing sufficient residential intensity to assist with the efficient use of the transport network. The amendment sought in relation to the retention and enhancement of coastal natural character through reserves/open space and the provision of appropriate public access also aligns with submission 250/115, which inserted a new policy numbered 11.34 into the District Plan. This Policy includes, amongst other things, recognition of the coastal character of the Airbase. It is therefore appropriate to include this requested text in the re-numbered Policy 11.36.

Recommendation:

Submissions 250/119 and 257/99 are accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/106	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of bullet point 11 in Policy 11.35 by deleting those words struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: "...promotion of sustainable infrastructure <i>and development</i> ., including, but not limited to (wording to be added)."	

Discussion:

This typographical error is acknowledged, and it is appropriate that this amendment be made.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/106 is accepted.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/107	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of bullet point 13 in Policy 11.35 by deleting those words struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: “... the Special Area and it <u>its</u> Precincts...”	

Discussion:

This typographical error is acknowledged, and it is appropriate that this amendment be made.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/107 is accepted.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/108	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of the second paragraph of the Explanation to Policy 11.35 by deleting those words struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: “...meets regional and city district objectives...”	

Discussion:

This typographical error is acknowledged, and it is appropriate that this amendment be made.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/108 is accepted

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/109	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of the third paragraph of the Explanation to Policy 11.35 by deleting those words struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: “...has been further <u>divided</u> broken-down into Precincts...”	

Discussion:

This text is able to be improved by the use of a different word, and it is appropriate that this amendment be made.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/109 is accepted

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/110	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of the fifth paragraph of the Explanation to Policy 11.35 by adding the text in italics and underlined: “...in the Parade Ground and Motorway <u>Interchange</u> Precincts.”	

Discussion:

This typographical error is acknowledged, and it is appropriate that this amendment be made.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/110 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/111	Waitakere City Council	Amend paragraph four of the 'Hobsonville Base Village Special Area' section of Policy 6.2.15 by deleting those words struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: "The plan change <i>Hobsonville Base Village Special Area</i> also includes two Concept Plans: Hobsonville <i>Peninsula Urban</i> Concept Plan and the Hobsonville <i>Peninsula Urban</i> Concept Plan 4 - Features."	

Discussion:

This text is able to be improved by the use of different phraseology and correction of typographical errors, and it is appropriate that this amendment be made.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/111 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
259/3	Transit New Zealand	Amend Policy 11.35 (general part) by adding those words in italics and underlined: "The Hobsonville Base Village Special Area may be developed for a range of activities which recognise the unique quality and history of this area, and its suitability for a range of sustainable urban development, focused on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ensuring that land use development requiring the construction of new roads is compatible with a highly inter-connected roading system</i>." 	Opposed By: 157 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)

Discussion:

Transit NZ are currently constructing its new State Highway 18 Motorway, which has, amongst other things, on and off ramps at the Hobsonville Airbase and in its vicinity. The development of the Base Village Special Area has the potential to increase the utilisation of the Motorway, and it is appropriate that the internal roading system has a high level of connectivity to ensure that traffic flows freely and consequently will have no effects on the State Highway system.

Recommendation:

Submission 259/3 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
259/4	Transit New Zealand	Delete that part of Policy 11.35 that applies to "D. Motorway Interchange Precinct", unless suitable traffic modelling is provided to Transit's satisfaction demonstrating that the proposed land uses for this area are compatible with operation of the adjacent motorway interchange.	Opposed By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd 157 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

Transit NZ are currently constructing its new State Highway 18 Motorway, which has, amongst other things, on and off ramps at the Hobsonville Airbase. The Motorway Interchange Precinct was provided in the Plan Change to acknowledge the nature of the environment created by the State Highway 18 on and off ramps located in the vicinity. The Council accepted that retail activity was likely to occur in that area, and created this Precinct to provide guidance for that retail activity. The submitter is seeking traffic modelling to demonstrate that the proposed land use is compatible with the operation of the motorway. Transit NZ's designation for the motorway is located in the middle of Precinct D, and proceeds all the way to the intersection of the existing Buckley Avenue. This means that the off ramp is a limited access road, which means that Transit NZ has the power to approve or decline motor vehicle access to that road.

Consequently the Council is relocating the retail centre of the Precinct to the south side of the intersection of Squadron Drive and Buckley Avenue. Further to this the Council is providing policy (in the re-numbered Policy 11.36) that indicates that road will be a limited access road (under section 346 of the Local Government Act 1974 (not repealed). That method will ensure that development locates its vehicular access away from the off ramp, thereby assisting in avoiding any effects on the motorway itself.

Recommendation:

Submission 259/4 is accepted in part.

5.7.2 Hobsonville Base Village Special Area Rules

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/122	Auckland Regional Council	<p>Amend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 21.3(b) standards and conditions such that (iii) becomes (i).• 21.3(e) to read: "... <i>The creation subdivision of any...</i>"• 21.3(g)(x) to read: "<i>A transport management plan in accordance with assessment criteria 21(n)-(w)</i>".• 21.3(g)(xi) to read: "<i>An infrastructure management plan in accordance with assessment criteria 21(x)-(aj)</i>".• 21.3(h) Marlborough Crescent Precinct A by adding a further standard to read: "<i>Provision for the protection and enhancement of the coastal margin as reserve and open space, and the provision of public access to and along the coast.</i>"• 21.3 (h) Parade Ground Precinct B by adding a further standard to read: "<i>Provision for the protection and enhancement of the coastal margin as reserve and open space, and the provision of public access to and along the coast.</i>"• 21.3(h) Campus/Runway Park Precinct C to read "<i>(ii) the exact boundaries for schools (including state educational facilities) designed to promote shared use of the sports fields and open space</i>".	<p>Opposed By: 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21.3 (h) Buckley Precinct F by adding a further standard to read: <u>“Provision for the protection and enhancement of the coastal margin as reserve and open space, and the provision of public access to and along the coast.”</u> • 21.4(a) such that it is specific to any changes to an existing CDP and classify any CDP that does not meet the standards in rule 21.3(a) as a non-complying activity. <p>And;</p> <p>Delete rule 21.4(d) so that activities that are not consistent with the Comprehensive Development Plan, are non-complying.</p>	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Discussion:

This extensive submission addresses matters of detail associated with the ordering and terminology and the inclusion of additional text into performance standards for parts of Rule 21.

The first bullet point seeks the re-ordering of Rule 21(b), which is appropriate and accepted.

The second bullet point seeks to rephrase the Rule 21(e) which relates to subdivision, which is appropriate and accepted.

The third bullet point seeks to rephrase the Rule 21.3(g)(x) which relates to transport management, which is appropriate and accepted.

The fourth bullet point seeks to rephrase the Rule 21.3(g)(xi) which relates to infrastructure management, which is appropriate and accepted.

The fifth, sixth and eighth bullet points seek to include consequential text relating to access to the coast, in alignment with other submissions by this submitter, which is appropriate and accepted.

The seventh bullet point seeks to include the ability for shared use of resources such as school sports fields and land identified as Open Space. This is efficient and effective use of these resources, and is supported.

The ninth bullet point relates to the status of amendments of a previously consented comprehensive development plan. It is appropriate that this status be Discretionary, given the Limited Discretionary status assigned to the initial comprehensive development plan. This amendment is supported.

The tenth bullet point relates to activities that are not consistent with a consented comprehensive development plan (which is different to an application for a new comprehensive development plan). It is appropriate that these applications be non-complying, as they have the potential to be significantly different to the outcomes sought within each Precinct. This amendment is supported.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/122 is accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
107/58	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	Amend Rule 21.3(h): The Hobsonville Village Precinct (Precinct I) (i) by adding those words underlined (or words to like effect): <i>“(i) Provisions for Mixed Use Activity</i>	Supported By: 300 IMF Westland Ltd Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

		<i>buildings with a gross floor area limit of 2,000m².</i>	110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 109 The Warehouse Ltd Support and Opposed By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discussion:

The submitter requests amendments to clarify the extent of mixed use within the Precinct. This is appropriate, as the Precinct is adjacent to the retail centre in the Hobsonville Village Centre. The submitter sees this limit as important, given the role and function of the Hobsonville Village Centre, and the retail nature of the precinct itself. It would, however, be useful to clarify the nature of the limitation on retail activities that is expected to occur in this Precinct, and the submitter and further submitters may wish to discuss this matter in their evidence.

Recommendation:

Submission 107/58 is accepted in part

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
95/13	Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)	Amend Rule 21.3 (H), Precinct F by replacing reference to 'Escarpment Precinct' with ' <i>Buckley Precinct</i> '.	

Discussion:

This amendment to the text corrects a typographical error and improves the clarity of the Rules, and is appropriate.

Recommendation:

Submission 95/13 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
95/15	Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)	Amend Rule 21.3 (g) by the addition of a new item (xii) as follows; <i>“(xii) The nomination of areas to which Rule 1.10 (Mixed Use Development - Noise) shall apply”</i>	

Discussion:

It is possible that within some precincts within the Honbsonville Peninsula Base Village Special Areas, mixed use activities will not occur. Consequently it is appropriate that the matter of any noise arising from mixed use should be identified as and when it is appropriate during the processing of a resource consent application for a comprehensive development plan.

Recommendation:

Submission 95/15 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
107/57	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	Amend Rule 21.3(h): The Parade Ground Precinct (Precinct B) (viii) by adding those words underlined (or words to like effect): <i>“(viii) Provision, including exact boundaries, for a neighbourhood retail centre, retail gross floor area not to exceed 2,000m² with individual tenancies not to exceed 500m².”</i>	Supported By: 300 IMF Westland Ltd Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority Support and Opposed By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited

108/71	Progressive Enterprises Limited	Amend Rule 21.3(h): The Parade Ground Precinct (Precinct B) (viii) by deleting the struck through number, and adding the words underlined (or words to like effect): <i>“(viii) Provision, including exact boundaries, for a neighbourhood retail centre, retail gross floor area not to exceed <u>2,6,000m2 with individual tenancies not to exceed 500m2</u>”.</i>	Supported By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 109 The Warehouse Ltd
--------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discussion:

These submitter consider that the 6,000 square metres of gross floor area for the retail is too extensive for the type of retailing that is expected to occur in this Precinct. The submitter refers to the Hobsonville Village Centre as the significant retail location for the Base Village Special Area, and that the gross floor area of retailing in this Precinct should be reduced to reflect this. This submission is accepted, as the amount of gross floor area of retailing is too extensive for the retail activity expected in this Precinct. It would, however, be useful to clarify the nature of retail activities that are expected to occur in this Precinct, and the submitter and further submitters may wish to discuss this matter in their evidence.

Recommendation:

Submissions 107/57 and 108/71 are accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
108/72	Progressive Enterprises Limited	Amend Rule 21.3(h): The Hobsonville Village Precinct (Precinct I) (i) by adding those words in italics and underlined (or words to like effect):: <i>“(i) Provisions for Mixed Use Activity buildings with a gross floor area limit of <u>2,000m2</u>”.</i>	Supported By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 109 The Warehouse Ltd

Discussion:

The submitter requests amendments to clarify the extent of mixed use within the Precinct. This is appropriate, as the Precinct is adjacent to the retail centre in the Hobsonville Village Centre. The submitter sees this limit as important, given the role and function of the Hobsonville Village Centre, and the retail nature of the precinct itself. It would, however, be useful to clarify the nature of retail activities that are expected to occur in this Precinct, and the submitter and further submitters may wish to discuss this matter in their evidence.

Recommendation:

Submission 108/72 is accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/115	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to add a rule stating which street frontage typologies are to apply.	Opposed By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 111 The National Trading

			Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited
--	--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discussion:

This amendment to the text improves the clarity of the Rules, and is appropriate.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/115 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/125	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 21 to add a further bullet point under "Resource Consent Conditions" as follows: <i>"Such other matters provided for in the assessment criteria."</i>	Supported By: 250 Auckland Regional Council

Discussion:

Assessment criteria are used to identify matters that require assessment when a resource consent is processed.

Rule 21 includes a list of matters that can be addressed via a condition when granting a resource consent. This includes a reference to section 108 of the Resource Management Act 1991, which specifies the matters that can be addressed via a condition on a resource consent.

The submitter is seeking that any matter included in the Assessment Criteria should be able to have a condition related to it placed on a resource consent. This would include assessment criteria 21(a) to 21(bc), and any relevant assessment criteria included in the other Rules that apply to the Hobsonville Base Village Special Area. This ability already exists via section 108 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Unless the submitter can identify a specific matter contained within Special Area's Rule 21 Assessment Criteria that requires a specific reference in the "Resource Consent Conditions" part of the Rule, this submission is vague and is rejected.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/125 is rejected.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/127	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 21 by providing an explanation in the 'Notes' box relating to how 'City-Wide Rules' are to be applied when implementing the Hobsonville Base Village Special Area Rules.	Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited

Discussion:

This matter has been addressed in the Explanation to the Policy Section for the Special Area, and so the requested amendment provides an unnecessary duplication of this process. On this basis the submission is not supported.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/127 is rejected.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/124	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 21 to add further bullet points under "Resource Consent Conditions" allowing a 10 year consent period in respect	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

		of Comprehensive Development Plans and requirements for street frontage typologies.	Opposed By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discussion:

The standard term of a resource consent is five years. It is likely that a resource consent for a Comprehensive Development Plan will be complex and may require more than five years to be given effect to. A ten year timeframe is therefore appropriate, but no longer given the ten year life of the District Plan before it requires review.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/124 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
104/1	AA Environmental Ltd	Amend Rule 21 so that it does not make maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure and streetscape a non-complying activity overriding the normal human environment or natural area rules that apply to such projects.	Supported By: 1207 Watercare Services Ltd

Discussion:

The submitter correctly identified that while the establishment of infrastructure is a Limited Discretionary Activity under Rule 21.3(f), no mention is made of the maintenance or upgrading of infrastructure, which means that those activities default to Non Complying activity status. This matter has been addressed elsewhere in the District Plan by enabling upgrading and maintenance to be undertaken as a permitted activity. It is therefore appropriate that this activity status be applied in the Hobsonville Base Village Special Area.

Recommendation:

Submission 104/1 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/139	Waitakere City Council	Amend the 'Note' to Rule 21.3(h), by adding those words in italics and underlined: "Note: Number references relate to the <i>Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan Features Appendix XVIII.</i> "	

Discussion:

This amendment to the text improves the clarity of the Rules, and is appropriate.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/139 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/112	Waitakere City Council	Amend the last paragraph in Rule 21.2 by placing a comma after the word "safety", deleting the word "and" after the word "safety", deleting "21(a) - 21(bb)" and replacing with " <u>21(b)-(e),(g)-(k),(m),(o),(s)-(u),(w),(x),(ad)-(ah),(an),(az)-(bb) and the</u>	Opposed By: 259 Transit New Zealand

		<i>criteria from the relevant precinct (ao)-(ay)</i> " (note: amend as necessary to align with Submission 257/128 below).	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Discussion:

This submission seeks to clarify the application of assessment criteria in Rule 21.2. It reduces the number of assessment criteria that are to be applied, without any valid basis for doing so. It may be that the assessment criteria for particular performance standards that have not been selected could be relevant to a particular consent application, and so it is appropriate to be inclusive in this instance. Consequently the requested amendment is not supported.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/112 is rejected

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/129	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 21.2 to replace '(ii) - (v)' with bullet points.	

Discussion:

The submitter seeks the utilisation of bullet points rather than roman numerals in Rule 21.2. Roman numerals are more certain and clear, and are easier to reference than bullet points. There is no compelling reason to undertake this amendment.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/129 is rejected.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/114	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of Rule 21.3(a) by deleting those words struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: "A Comprehensive Development Plan for any one or more of the following precincts as shown on the <i>Hobsonville Concept Plan</i> provided that the specified General Standards (Rule 21.3 (g)) and Precinct Standards (Rule 21.3 (h))are satisfied, and provided further that any consent under this rule shall be limited to the first Comprehensive Development Plan only in respect of each precinct (any further Comprehensive Development Plan or any amendment to a Comprehensive Development Plan shall be a Discretionary <u><i>Non Complying</i></u> Activity pursuant to Rule 21.4 6)."	Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited

Discussion:

The amendment seeks a change from a discretionary to non-complying activity status for any second resource consent application for a comprehensive development plan or any amendment to an already consented comprehensive development plan. The first comprehensive development plan will be assessed as a limited discretionary activity. This activity status reflects the level of detail included in Plan Change 13 and required as part of the resource consent application. It is appropriate that second applications or amendments to existing consented comprehensive development plans are given more stringent assessment, but they should not default to non-complying activity status because the second application or the amendment, while differing to the original consent, may well meet the requirements of the District Plan.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/114 is rejected.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/113	Waitakere City Council	Amend the last paragraph in Rule 21.3 by placing a comma after the word "safety", deleting "and matters within Assessment Criteria 21(a) - 21(bb)" and replacing with:- <i>"in respect of Rule 21.3(a), Assessment Criteria 21(a), (c)-(d), (f)-(an), (az)-(bb) and the criteria from the relevant precinct (ao)-(ay)"; in respect of Rule 21.3(b) and 21.3(c), Assessment Criteria 21(b)-(k),(m)-(o),(r)-(x), (az)-(bb) and the criteria from the relevant precinct (ao)-(ay); in respect of Rule 21.3(d), Assessment Criterion 21(l); in respect of Rule 21.3(e) Assessment Criteria 21(b), (h)-(k), (m)-(g), (x)-(an), (az)-(bb) and the criteria from the relevant precinct (ao)-(ay); in respect of Rule 21.3(f) Assessment Criteria 21(b), 21(x)-(aj),(az)-(bb) and the criteria from the relevant precinct (ao)-(ay)." (note: amend as necessary to align with Submission 257/128).</i>	

Discussion:

This submission seeks to clarify the application of assessment criteria in Rule 21.3. It reduces the number of assessment criteria that are to be applied, without any valid basis for doing so. It may be that the assessment criteria that have not been selected for particular performance standards could be relevant to a particular consent application, and so it is appropriate to be inclusive in this instance. Consequently the requested amendment is not supported.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/113 is rejected.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/132	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 21.3(a) to delete the reference to 'City-Wide Rule 2 Site Analysis'.	

Discussion:

The City Wide Site Analysis Rule seeks to provide the applicants and council with a clear and certain list of matters that information is required about as part of any resource consent application. Given the extensive nature of the Comprehensive Development Plan approach, it is considered that the application of this rule in Comprehensive Development Plan applications is unnecessary because the policy and rule framework would be duplicated. Further to this, the City Wide Site Analysis Rule applies to individual sites, rather than precincts.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/132 is rejected.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/131	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 21.3(a) to add the text in italics and underlined: <i>"City-Wide <u>Urban Design</u> Rules."</i>	

Discussion:

This amendment to the text improves the clarity of the Rules, and is appropriate.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/131 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/133	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 21.3(b)(i) to add the following text in italics and underlined: "City-Wide <u>Urban Design</u> Rule 2..."	

Discussion:

This amendment to the text improves the clarity of the Rules, and is appropriate.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/133 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/134	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 21.3(c)(ii) to delete those words struck through, and add those in italics and underlined: " Rule 3 City-Wide <u>Urban Design</u> Rule 3 - design Intensification Developments... "	

Discussion:

The City Wide Urban Design Rules are contained within the Council's Plan Change 18. This amendment to the text improves the clarity of the Rules, and is appropriate. It is also appropriate to retain the reference to the nominated street frontage typology approach within the City Wide Rule 3, as there are six differing typologies in that Rule, and the applicant for the comprehensive development plan must nominate the relevant typology.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/134 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/135	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 21.3(g)(ii) to delete those words struck through: "The exact location and design of Principle Rroads and other proposed roads. "	

Discussion:

This amendment to the text improves the clarity of the Rules, and is appropriate. There are no "Principle Roads" identified on the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/135 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/136	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 21.3(g)(iii) to replace the existing wording with the following: " <i>Street frontage typology.</i> "	

Discussion:

The City Wide Urban Design Rules are contained within the Council's Plan Change 18. This amendment to the text improves the clarity of the Rules, and is appropriate. It is also appropriate to make reference to the nominated street frontage typology approach within the City Wide Rule 3, as there are six differing typologies in that Rule, and the applicant for the comprehensive development plan must nominate the relevant typology.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/136 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/137	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 21.3(g)(vi) to add an "s" to the end of "active".	

Discussion:

This amendment to the text improves the clarity of the Rules, and is appropriate.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/137 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/138	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of Rule 21.3(g)(viii) by deleting those words struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: "The method by which the development of each precinct is to be <u>staged and the means of managing any vacant land during the staging process</u> managed, and how precincts will relate to each other and other surrounding land/coast."	Supported By: 250 Auckland Regional Council

Discussion:

This amendment to the text improves the clarity of the Rules, and is appropriate.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/138 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
95/3	Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)	Amend the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan such that the disposition of the boundaries of the precincts are as per the plan attached and labelled as 'Attachment B'. Or, amend Rule 21.3(h) (Precinct A) (xiv) with the addition of the following words: "The proposed method by which no less than 130 household units will be provided within this precinct, <u>or if fewer than that number are provided, how the balance will be accommodated in an adjacent precinct (in addition to the number of units otherwise specified for that Precinct in Rule 21.3)</u> "	Opposed By: 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited
95/4	Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)	Amend Rule 21.3(h) Precinct B (xvi) with the addition of the following words: "The proposed method by which no less than 130 household units will be provided within this precinct, <u>or if fewer than that number are provided, how the balance will be accommodated in an adjacent precinct (in addition to the number of units otherwise specified for that Precinct in Rule 21.3)</u> "	

Discussion:

The submitter is seeking to amend the boundaries of the Precincts or to enable some flexibility to vary the minimum number of household units in each precinct. The submitter is not seeking an overall reduction in the number, but rather the ability to re-distribute the number of household units within the Precincts. Given the nature and scale of medium density and apartment style housing

development options available, it remains probable that these minimum densities will be exceeded in a cumulative manner across all precincts. Consequently that flexibility is acceptable, rather than the amendment to precinct boundaries. It is appropriate, however, that given the amendments to the size and shape of the Precincts, that the minimum number required within each Precinct be re-calculated to reflect the change. The submitter is invited to provide the Panel with the methodology and calculations for the minimum number of household units in each Precinct.

This will be based upon the minimum household unit numbers provided in the Plan Change when notified, the expected yield identified in the Hobsonville Interim Urban Design Summary Report June 2006 (or its successor), and details of the land areas within each revised Precinct. This will provide the Panel with certainty that the Regional and Council density goals will be achieved.

Four Precincts (Sunderland Head, Campus/Runway Park, Buckley Avenue and Hudson Bay Road) were identified in submissions 257/183, 257/184, 257/185, 250/127 and further submission 95 (1). These Precincts were identified as those that will be used to determine when the plan change for the Hobsonville Future Development Special Area can be notified. The threshold for that future plan change is passed when 80% of the minimum household units have been built in each of those four Precincts. Certainty about the minimum numbers is therefore important, to provide certainty about the timing of the forthcoming plan change.

Recommendation:

Submissions 95/3 and 95/4 are accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
95/5	Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)	Amend Rule 21.3(h) (Precinct C) (xv) with the addition of the following words: “The proposed method by which no less than 637 household units will be provided within this precinct, <u>or if fewer than that number are provided, how the balance will be accommodated in an adjacent precinct (in addition to the number of units otherwise specified for that Precinct in Rule 21.3)”</u> ”	

Discussion:

The submitter is seeking some flexibility to vary the minimum number of household units in each precinct. The submitter is not seeking an overall reduction in the number, but rather the ability to re-distribute the units within the Precincts. Given the nature and scale of medium density and apartment style housing development options available, it remains possible that these minimum densities will be exceeded in a cumulative manner across all precincts. Consequently that flexibility is acceptable.

It is appropriate, however, that given the amendments to the size and shape of the Precincts, that the minimum number required within each Precinct be re-calculated to reflect the change. The submitter is invited to provide the Panel with the methodology and calculations for the minimum number of household units in each Precinct.

This will be based upon the minimum household unit numbers provided in the Plan Change when notified, the expected yield identified in the Hobsonville Interim Urban Design Summary Report June 2006 (or its successor), and details of the land areas within each revised Precinct. This will provide the Panel with certainty that the Regional and Council density goals will be achieved.

Four Precincts (Sunderland Head, Campus/Runway Park, Buckley Avenue and Hudson Bay Road) were identified in submissions 257/183, 257/184, 257/185, 250/127 and further submission 95 (1). These Precincts were identified as those that will be used to determine when the plan change for the Hobsonville Future Development Special Area can be notified. The threshold for that future plan change is passed when 80% of the minimum household units have been built in each of those four Precincts. Certainty about the minimum numbers is therefore important, to provide certainty about the timing of the forthcoming plan change.

Recommendation:

Submission 95/5 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
95/6	Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)	Amend Rule 21.3(h) (Precinct D) (xi) with the addition of the following words: “The proposed method by which no less than 54 household units will be provided within this precinct, <u>or if fewer than that number are provided, how the balance will be accommodated in an adjacent precinct (in addition to the number of units otherwise specified for that Precinct in Rule 21.3)</u> ”	

Discussion:

The submitter is seeking some flexibility to vary the minimum number of household units in each precinct. The submitter is not seeking an overall reduction in the number, but rather the ability to re-distribute the units within the Precincts. Given the nature and scale of medium density and apartment style housing development options available, it remains possible that these minimum densities will be exceeded in a cumulative manner across all precincts. Consequently that flexibility is acceptable.

It is appropriate, however, that given the amendments to the size and shape of the Precincts, that the minimum number required within each Precinct be re-calculated to reflect the change. The submitter is invited to provide the Panel with the methodology and calculations for the minimum number of household units in each Precinct.

This will be based upon the minimum household unit numbers provided in the Plan Change when notified, the expected yield identified in the Hobsonville Interim Urban Design Summary Report June 2006 (or its successor), and details of the land areas within each revised Precinct. This will provide the Panel with certainty that the Regional and Council density goals will be achieved.

Recommendation:

Submission 95/6 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
95/7	Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)	Amend Rule 21.3(h) (Precinct E) (viii) with the addition of the following words: “The proposed method by which no less than 215 household units will be provided within this precinct, <u>or if fewer than that number are provided, how the balance will be accommodated in an adjacent precinct (in addition to the number of units otherwise specified for that Precinct in Rule 21.3)</u> ”	

Discussion:

The submitter is seeking some flexibility to vary the minimum number of household units in each precinct. The submitter is not seeking an overall reduction in the number, but rather the ability to re-distribute the units within the Precincts. Given the nature and scale of medium density and apartment style housing development options available, it remains possible that these minimum densities will be exceeded in a cumulative manner across all precincts. Consequently that flexibility is acceptable.

It is appropriate, however, that given the amendments to the size and shape of the Precincts, that the minimum number required within each Precinct be re-calculated to reflect the change. The

submitter is invited to provide the Panel with the methodology and calculations for the minimum number of household units in each Precinct.

This will be based upon the minimum household unit numbers provided in the Plan Change when notified, the expected yield identified in the Hobsonville Interim Urban Design Summary Report June 2006 (or its successor), and details of the land areas within each revised Precinct. This will provide the Panel with certainty that the Regional and Council density goals will be achieved.

Four Precincts (Sunderland Head, Campus/Runway Park, Buckley Avenue and Hudson Bay Road) were identified in submissions 257/183, 257/184, 257/185, 250/127 and further submission 95 (1). These Precincts were identified as those that will be used to determine when the plan change for the Hobsonville Future Development Special Area can be notified. The threshold for that future plan change is passed when 80% of the minimum household units have been built in each of those four Precincts. Certainty about the minimum numbers is therefore important, to provide certainty about the timing of the forthcoming plan change.

Recommendation:

Submission 95/7 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
95/8	Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)	Amend Rule 21.3(h) (Precinct F) (xi) with the addition of the following words: “The proposed method by which no less than 283 household units will be provided within this precinct, <u>or if fewer than that number are provided, how the balance will be accommodated in an adjacent precinct (in addition to the number of units otherwise specified for that Precinct in Rule 21.3)”</u> ”	

Discussion:

The submitter is seeking some flexibility to vary the minimum number of household units in each precinct. The submitter is not seeking an overall reduction in the number, but rather the ability to re-distribute the units within the Precincts. Given the nature and scale of medium density and apartment style housing development options available, it remains possible that these minimum densities will be exceeded in a cumulative manner across all precincts. Consequently that flexibility is acceptable.

It is appropriate, however, that given the amendments to the size and shape of the Precincts, that the minimum number required within each Precinct be re-calculated to reflect the change. The submitter is invited to provide the Panel with the methodology and calculations for the minimum number of household units in each Precinct.

This will be based upon the minimum household unit numbers provided in the Plan Change when notified, the expected yield identified in the Hobsonville Interim Urban Design Summary Report June 2006 (or its successor), and details of the land areas within each revised Precinct. This will provide the Panel with certainty that the Regional and Council density goals will be achieved.

Four Precincts (Sunderland Head, Campus/Runway Park, Buckley Avenue and Hudson Bay Road) were identified in submissions 257/183, 257/184, 257/185, 250/127 and further submission 95 (1). These Precincts were identified as those that will be used to determine when the plan change for the Hobsonville Future Development Special Area can be notified. The threshold for that future plan change is passed when 80% of the minimum household units have been built in each of those four Precincts. Certainty about the minimum numbers is therefore important, to provide certainty about the timing of the forthcoming plan change.

Recommendation:

Submission 95/8 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
95/9	Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)	Amend Rule 21.3(h) (Precinct G) (ix) with the addition of the following words: "The proposed method by which no less than 50 household units will be provided within this precinct, <i>or if fewer than that number are provided, how the balance will be accommodated in an adjacent precinct (in addition to the number of units otherwise specified for that Precinct in Rule 21.3)</i> "	

Discussion:

The submitter is seeking some flexibility to vary the minimum number of household units in each precinct. The submitter is not seeking an overall reduction in the number, but rather the ability to re-distribute the units within the Precincts. Given the nature and scale of medium density and apartment style housing development options available, it remains possible that these minimum densities will be exceeded in a cumulative manner across all precincts. Consequently that flexibility is acceptable.

It is appropriate, however, that given the amendments to the size and shape of the Precincts, that the minimum number required within each Precinct be re-calculated to reflect the change. The submitter is invited to provide the Panel with the methodology and calculations for the minimum number of household units in each Precinct.

This will be based upon the minimum household unit numbers provided in the Plan Change when notified, the expected yield identified in the Hobsonville Interim Urban Design Summary Report June 2006 (or its successor), and details of the land areas within each revised Precinct. This will provide the Panel with certainty that the Regional and Council density goals will be achieved.

Recommendation:

Submission 95/9 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
95/10	Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)	Amend Rule 21.3(h) (Precinct I) (viii) with the addition of the following words: "The proposed method by which no less than 197 household units will be provided within this precinct, <i>or if fewer than that number are provided, how the balance will be accommodated in an adjacent precinct (in addition to the number of units otherwise specified for that Precinct in Rule 21.3)</i> "	

Discussion:

The submitter is seeking some flexibility to vary the minimum number of household units in each precinct. The submitter is not seeking an overall reduction in the number, but rather the ability to re-distribute the units within the Precincts. Given the nature and scale of medium density and apartment style housing development options available, it remains possible that these minimum densities will be exceeded in a cumulative manner across all precincts. Consequently that flexibility is acceptable.

It is noted that the assessment of this submission has omitted the request of the submitter to have this amendment applied to Precinct H. A closer reading of the text of the submission indicates that this is what the submitter sought, and this amendment will consequently also be applied to Precinct H.

It is appropriate, however, that given the amendments to the size and shape of the Precincts, that the minimum number required within each Precinct be re-calculated to reflect the change. The

submitter is invited to provide the Panel with the methodology and calculations for the minimum number of household units in this Precinct.

This will be based upon the minimum household unit numbers provided in the Plan Change when notified, the expected yield identified in the Hobsonville Interim Urban Design Summary Report June 2006 (or its successor), and details of the land areas within each revised Precinct. This will provide the Panel with certainty that the Regional and Council density goals will be achieved.

Recommendation:

Submission 95/10 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/140	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of Rule 21.3(h), Precinct E(i) by deleting the word struck through, and adding that in italics and underlined: "Provision for retaining within the Hobsonville base village Special Area the <u>dwelling</u> s houses currently located in Sunderland Avenue."	

Discussion:

The District Plan currently uses the term "dwellings" and has defined it, but it has not provided a definition of "house". Consequently this amendment assists Plan users in terms of providing clarity and certainty, and is supported.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/140 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/141	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording in Rule 21.3(h), Precinct F by deleting the word struck through, and adding that in italics and underlined: " Escarpment <u>Buckley</u> Precinct."	

Discussion:

This amendment to the text corrects a typographical error and improves the clarity of the Rules, and is appropriate.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/141 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/142	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording in Rule 21.3(h), Precinct F(iii) by deleting those words struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: "Provision for development to front a public lane <u>Access Place (refer to Appendix M)</u> running along the top of the escarpment..."	

Discussion:

This amendment to the text corrects a typographical error and improves the clarity of the Rules by correctly referring to Appendix M in the District Plan. Appendix M provides Plan users with a description of the Roading Hierarchy that applies within the City.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/142 is accepted.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/148	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to correct the cross reference in the 'Note' for the 'Infrastructure Criteria' as follows: "Rule 21.3(g) (vi) -(xi)"	

Discussion:

This amendment to the text corrects a typographical error and improves the clarity of the Rules by correctly referring Plan users to the correct performance standard.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/148 is accepted.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/147	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to correct the cross reference in the 'Note' for the 'Transportation Criteria' as follows: "Rule 21.3(g) (vi) -(x)"	

Discussion:

This amendment to the text corrects a typographical error and improves the clarity of the Rules by correctly referring Plan users to the correct performance standard.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/147 is accepted.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/116	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 21.4 by deleting those words struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: "The following are <i>Discretionary Activities</i> :- Any Comprehensive Development Plan not meeting the standards in Rule 21.3(a), and any changes to a Comprehensive Development Plan approved pursuant to Rule 21.3(a). (b) <u>(a)</u> Additions and alterations to any <i>building</i> identified as a heritage building on the <i>Hobsonville Concept Plan</i> ; Activities which do not satisfy the Precinct Standards in Rule 21.3(a), Activities which do not meet the standards in Rule 21.2. <i>Discretionary Activity</i> applications will be assessed having regard to Assessment Criteria 21(a)-21(bb) <u>(b) - 21 (f), (az)-(bb) and the criteria from the relevant precinct (ao)-(ay)</u> and any other relevant matter under section 104 of the Act."	Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited

Discussion:

The submitter seeks various changes to Rule 21.4. While these changes may have appeared appropriate, they have been superseded by the response to other submission (including some of those by the submitter) in this report. Consequently these requested amendments are not supported.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/116 is rejected.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/143	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording in Rule 21.4(e) by deleting those words struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: "City-Wide <u>Urban Design</u> Rules - design Intensification Developments... "	

Discussion:

This amendment to the text corrects a typographical error and improves the clarity of the Rules, and is appropriate.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/143 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/144	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of the last bullet point in Rule 21.5 by deleting those words struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: "City-Wide <u>Urban Design</u> Rules - design Intensification Developments... "	

Discussion:

This amendment provides greater clarity for the Plan users, in terms of correctly referencing the City Wide Urban Design Rules.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/144 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/130	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rules 21.2 and 21.3(a) to add the text in italics and underlined: "City-Wide <u>Urban Design</u> Rules."	

Discussion:

This amendment provides greater clarity for the Plan users, in terms of correctly referencing the City Wide Urban Design Rules.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/130 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/128	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to, as necessary, reword the rules and assessment criteria to eliminate ambiguity and promote greater	Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

		word economy. (Further particulars of proposed amendments will be provided at any hearing of this Plan Change).	
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Discussion:

This general submission seeks to address minor errors throughout the Plan Change. This is appropriate, and some errors have been identified and amended.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/128 is accepted.

5.7.3 Hobsonville Base Village Special Area Assessment Criteria

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/120	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to add further detail in Assessment Criterion 21(c) referring to the need for buildings to be designed and sighted to allow access by windows of habitable rooms in residential units to sunlight, daylight, and outlook.	

Discussion:

The submitter seeks to ensure that important on-site residential amenity values are maintained in developments in the Hobsonville Base Village Special Area. These requirements exist throughout the District Plan's other residential Human Environments, and it is appropriate that they be included in this assessment criteria.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/120 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/146	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of Assessment Criteria 21(i) by deleting those words struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: "The extent to which a <u>comprehensive</u> demonstrated landscape treatment theme <u>concept</u> will ensure."	

Discussion:

This amendment provides greater clarity for the Plan users, as it is not clear what a "demonstrated design theme" is, and so the amendment is supported.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/146 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/145	Waitakere City Council	Amend Assessment Criteria 21(i), (o), (z) and (ac) by further clarifying the reference to 'Demonstrated design theme', by adding words such as: " <i>...which has a high visual amenity value consistent with the overall existing or introduced environmental context...</i> "	

Discussion:

This amendment provides greater clarity for the Plan users, as it is not clear what a “demonstrated design theme” is, and so the amendment is supported.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/145 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/123	Waitakere City Council	Amend Assessment Criterion 21(o) to state that main pedestrian routes are to be identified at CDP stage and are to adequately provide for circulation around a precinct, between precincts, to schools, parks and community services, and integrated with public transport nodes and bus stops.	

Discussion:

This submission seeks an amendment to Assessment Criterion 21(o). However the requested amendments are more appropriately contained in Rule 21.2(g), the General Standards for Comprehensive Development Plans, as they are standards rather than matters for assessment. Clarity and certainty about pedestrian routes for each precinct is an important matter in terms of linking land uses and reducing the need to use motorised transport to move around the community facilities. Consequently the submission is supported in part, with the addition of an extra performance standard into Rule 21.3(g) to address the matters raised by the submitter.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/123 is accepted in part.

259/5	Transit New Zealand	Amend Transport Criterion 21(r) by adding those words in italics and underlined: “The extent to which traffic generation from proposed activities creates adverse effects on: (i) the capacity of roads giving access to the site; (ii) the safety of road users including cyclists and pedestrians; (iii) <u>the sustainability of the primary road network</u> ; (iv) neighbourhood character”.	109 The Warehouse Ltd 157 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited
-------	---------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The submitter seeks the inclusion of an additional sub-criterion within Assessment Criterion 21(r). While on the face of it the inclusion of the sub-criterion appears appropriate, it is not clear what the submitter means when it refers to the “primary road network”. While it is likely that this reference is to the existing State Highway 18 (Hobsonville Road), it may also refer to the forthcoming new motorway. Further to this, the submitter seeks that any effects arising from traffic generation on the primary road network be assessed in terms of the sustainability of the network. It is not clear how the submitter interprets sustainability, whether it be environmental, ecological, or perhaps the sustainability of the road network in terms of traffic flow and efficiency. Clarification from the submitter on what it means when it seeks an assessment of the sustainability of the primary road network would assist in the consideration of this matter.

Recommendation:

Submission 259/5 is accepted in principle, subject to further explanation by the submitter about what is being sought.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/119	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to reword Assessment Criterion 21(s) to refer to the extent to which incentives or mechanisms have been utilised to reduce use of cars, with Council's Parking and Driveway Guideline standard to be applied only if it can be shown that reduced use of cars is not possible.	Supported By: 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 250 Auckland Regional Council

Discussion:

Expansion of the assessment criterion to refer to other methods that reduce the utilisation of cars sends a signal to developers about the nature of development that the Council is seeking. The inclusion of a reference to the Council's Car Parking and Driveway Guideline (which is contained within the Council's Code of Practice for City Infrastructure and Land Development) is a useful addition to making this assessment criterion clear and certain. The application of the Parking Guideline in the assessment of a resource consent will determine whether the applicant has demonstrated that the parking demand requires fewer parking spaces. Consequently this requested amendment is not accepted.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/119 is accept in part

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
108/67	Progressive Enterprises Limited	Amend the Assessment Criteria: General Criteria by adopting with the following additions (or words to like effect): <i><u>"21(X) The extent to which any proposed Comprehensive Development Plan is consistent with Policy 11.35 and the specific policies for each precinct as appropriate.</u></i>	Supported By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd

Discussion:

This submitter requests that the assessment of applications for a comprehensive development plan resource consent consider the application in terms of its consistency with Policy 11.35. This is appropriate, as is assessment against the new Policy 11.34.

Recommendation:

Submission 108/67 is accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/149	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of Assessment Criteria 21(af) by deleting those words struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: "The extent to which recognition has been given to <i><u>development meets the standards within</u></i> the document "3 Waters Infrastructure Management Initiatives: Hobsonville Peninsula" when designing infrastructure."	

Discussion:

The requested amendment sought by the submitter has been superseded by the Council's Integrated Catchment Management Plan application for a network discharge consent. This consent, when issued, will be the relevant document to refer to, and consequently assessment criteria 21(af) should be deleted.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/149 is accepted in part.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/150	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of Assessment Criteria 21(al(iv) by deleting those words struck through as follows: “...proposed Council Parks and Open Space Strategy”	

Discussion:

This amendment provides greater clarity for the Plan users, as it incorrectly references the Council's Parks Strategy, and so the amendment is supported.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/150 is accepted.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/151	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of Assessment Criteria 21(ao) by deleting the word struck through, and adding that in italics and underlined: “The extent to which ...for the Catalina Green and its bounding <i>adjacent</i> streets.”	

Discussion:

This amendment provides greater clarity for the Plan users, as it provides a universally known word for locations that are in proximity with each other, and so the amendment is supported.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/151 is accepted.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/121	Waitakere City Council	Amend Assessment Criterion 21(as) to state that development should avoid large individual tenancies (mention maximum individual tenancy size of 500m ² and maximum average size of 200m ²), with <u>all</u> premises to have externally-focussed active street edges and the ability to be integrated with other commercial and residential development (for instance, apartments above shops).	Supported By: 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd Opposed By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd

Discussion:

This submission seeks an amendment to Assessment Criterion 21(as). However the requested amendments are more appropriately contained in Rule 21.2(h), the Precinct Standards for Comprehensive Development Plans, as they are standards rather than matters for assessment. Clarity and certainty about tenancy size and active frontages for the Sunderland Head Precinct is an important matter in terms of achieving the residential density and amenity value outcomes that are being sought in this Precinct. Consequently the submission is supported in part, with the addition of an extra performance standard into Rule 21.3(h) to address the matters raised by the submitter.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/121 is accepted in part.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
108/68	Progressive Enterprises Limited	Amend the Plan Change by including an additional criterion into Assessment Criteria: Precinct Specific Design Criteria: Parade	Supported By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd

		Ground Precinct 21(as) as follows (or words to like effect): <i><u>"(X) the extent to which the impact on Hobsonville Village Centre which is to be the focus for future retail and commercial development in the Hobsonville area is minimised".</u></i>	Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discussion:

The submitter refers to the Hobsonville Village Centre as the significant retail location for the Base Village Special Area, and that retailing in this Precinct should not be so extensive so that it adversely affects this. This submission is accepted, as the amount of retailing in this precinct should not adversely affect the Hobsonville Village Centre.

Recommendation:

Submission 108/68 is accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
108/69	Progressive Enterprises Limited	Amend the Plan Change by including an additional criterion into Assessment Criteria: Precinct Specific Assessment Design Criteria: Motorway Interchange Precinct 21(ay) as follows (or words to like effect): <i><u>"(X) the extent to which the impact on Hobsonville Village Centre which is to be the focus for future retail and commercial development in the Hobsonville area is minimised".</u></i>	Supported By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd

Discussion:

The submitter refers to the Hobsonville Village Centre as the significant retail location for the Base Village Special Area, and that retailing in this Precinct should not be so extensive so that it adversely affects this. This submission is accepted, as the amount of retailing in this precinct should not adversely affect the Hobsonville Village Centre.

Recommendation:

Submission 108/69 is accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
108/70	Progressive Enterprises Limited	Amend the Plan Change by inserting the following into the Assessment Criteria: Precinct Specific Design Criteria following clause 21(ay)(vi) (or words to like effect): <i><u>"Hobsonville Village Precinct (X) the extent to which the impact on Hobsonville Village Centre which is to be the focus for future retail and commercial development in the Hobsonville area is minimised".</u></i>	Supported By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd

Discussion:

The submitter refers to the Hobsonville Village Centre as the significant retail location for the Base Village Special Area, and that retailing in this Precinct should not be so extensive so that it adversely affects this. This submission is accepted, as the amount of retailing in this Precinct should not adversely affect the Hobsonville Village Centre.

Recommendation:

Submission 108/70 is accepted in part

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/122	Waitakere City Council	Amend Assessment Criterion 21(ay) to state that the centre should be designed to present an attractive gateway to the community, an attractive façade to surrounding streets, and to make provision for customers arriving on foot.	

Discussion:

The current assessment criteria do not address amenity values associated with aesthetics, and this submission seeks to rectify this matter. It is important that amenity values are maintained and enhanced where it is possible to do so. On this basis the submission is supported.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/122 is accepted.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/152	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of Assessment Criteria 21(ay)(iii) by deleting those words struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: "it may contained car-orientated activities, such as a service station , but not car sales yards <i><u>based activities.</u></i> "	

Discussion:

The submitter seeks to broaden the application of assessment criterion 21(ay)(iii) beyond service stations to yard based activities. This is appropriate, as this Precinct is expected to develop in a manner that accesses the motoring industry and motoring retailing. However extensive yard based activities are likely to require significant areas of land that is not greatly available in this Precinct (and there are other areas of the City available to this activity). Consequently this amendment is supported.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/152 is accepted.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/126	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 21 to add, after the end of the Assessment Criteria in 'See also Policies', reference to Policy Section 6.2.15.	

Discussion:

This amendment provides greater clarity for the Plan users, as it provides a reference to the Explanation of the Policy Section. The amendment is supported.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/126 is accepted.

5.7.4 Hobsonville Base Village Special Area Maps

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/131	Auckland Regional Council	<p>Amend the Hobsonville Urban Concept Plan by:</p> <p>Combining Precincts A and B to form an integrated town centre with heritage, harbour views and strong connections to the ferry terminal the dominating design drivers.</p> <p>And;</p> <p>Establishing a new ferry wharf terminal location at the end of a main street, to offer better connection to, and be a major focus of, the neighbourhood centre.</p>	<p>Supported By: 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority</p> <p>Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited</p> <p>Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)</p>

Discussion:

Plan Change 13 included Precincts A and B (amongst others), called Marlborough Crescent and Parade Ground respectively. The Precincts seek to acknowledge and retain the existing development associated with the Airbase, while enabling appropriate development to occur. The character of the two Precincts is closely integrated, and it is appropriate to combine the two Precincts into one Precinct, renamed the "Sunderland Head Precinct". This combination will enable the Comprehensive Development Plan to be further integrated, thereby ensuring that the important existing environmental and amenity values are retained. The combination of these two precincts creates consequential deletions of redundant (duplicate) text and re-labelling of the other Precincts.

The Landing Special Area is the subject of re-numbered Policy 11.38, and that Policy indicates that the exact form and provision of activities on that Special Area will be the subject of a later planning process. Until such time as that process is complete, it would be premature to constrain development in that Special Area by tying development to a specific ferry terminal site. Consequently this part of the submission is rejected.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/131 is accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/126	Auckland Regional Council	<p>Amend the Concept Plan so that the Triangle Precinct (Precinct G), and, the Hobsonville Base Village Special Area are depicted on the map.</p> <p>And;</p> <p>Amend the 'Precinct Classification' <i>H - Base Housing</i> to state "<u>medium density residential</u>"; and, <i>B - Parade Ground</i> to state medium and apartment density residential so that the residential densities depicted are consistent with the corresponding policies and rules.</p>	

Discussion:

The identification of Precinct G was left off the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan in error. This submission rectifies this matter, and is accepted.

The classification of precinct H was notified as “medium/low density residential” to reflect the existing housing that exists in parts of the Precinct. It is, however, appropriate that the reference to “low’ be removed from the classification, as it is not reflected in the policy and rule framework.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/126 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/133	Auckland Regional Council	Retain the location of Precinct D, which provides for vehicle oriented retail and commercial activities located on a bus corridor and close to motorway access.	Supported By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd Support and Opposed By: 259 Transit New Zealand

Discussion:

The support for this Precinct (re-named “Precinct C” as a consequence of changes arising from other submissions) is noted. No amendments arise as a result of this submission.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/133 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/129	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the Hobsonville Urban Concept Plan to provide for intensified landuse 200 metres either side of Buckley Avenue and higher densities through the southern half of Buckley Avenue, to support a bus corridor connecting to Hobsonville Road.	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited

Discussion:

Buckley Avenue will serve as one of the key roads within the Hobsonville Base Village, and it is expected that the residential activity within the Special Area will provide the intensity required to support public transport. The submitter seeks the intensification along Buckley Avenue, which is appropriate as this will assist with the provision of public transport. As a result of this submission, the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan has been amended to require apartment development along parts of Buckley Road.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/129 is accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
160/6	Lloyd Morris	Amend to expand the description of Precinct G to include the option of a retirement complex	
160/8	Lloyd Morris	Amend to expand the comprehensive development plan in Precinct g to include provision for the development of a Retirement Complex option	

Discussion:

The Triangle Precinct is a small area of land that has limited scope for development, in terms of the land area available. The policy and rule framework for this Precinct enables medium density housing to occur. The possibility of a retirement village is not prohibited by the policy and rule framework, but nevertheless this type of development does not require specific inclusion as a possible development option. The development of the Precinct will require approval via a

comprehensive development plan, and so its integration with adjacent Precincts and land that has not been included in Plan Change 13 will occur at that time.

Recommendation:

Submissions 160/6 and 160/8 are rejected.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
160/4	Lloyd Morris	Amend to incorporate the unformed part of Clark Road beyond Chapel within Precinct G (the Triangle Precinct). If Precinct G was expanded then the short section of the unformed road could be closed.	

Discussion:

The submitter seeks the inclusion of additional land within the Auckland Regional Council Metropolitan Urban Limit, adjacent to the boundary of the Council's application. The Council has addressed this matter in its Plan Change 16, which provides a policy framework and sequencing for the development of the City for the next 15 years. The area known as "Scotts Point" (which includes the land identified in this submission has been given low priority in relation to other areas identified for development. This means that concept planning is scheduled to commence after 2021. The Council does not consider that this priority and sequencing should change, and consequently does not support the submission.

Recommendation:

Submission 160/4 is rejected.

5.8 Hobsonville Landing Special Area

5.8.1 Hobsonville Landing Special Policies

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
28/1	Hobsonville Yacht Club	Amend 3.9 by adding the words <i>"that have included provision for recreational boating administered by the incumbent Yacht Club. The surrounding waters contain mooring areas for a large number of private boats."</i> after the words '...for Defence purposes' Add the sentence <i>"Facilities for recreational boating will remain extant."</i> after the words '...boat access as well as ferry facilities.'	Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)
28/2	Hobsonville Yacht Club	Amend 7.1 by adding new sentence at end of paragraph (i) to read: <i>"Public access to the harbour and facilities for recreational boating will remain extant."</i>	
28/3	Hobsonville Yacht Club	Amend Policy 11.37 by adding the words <i>"recreational boating activities by approved clubs"</i> after the words 'In the interim the area may be utilised for'.	Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)
28/4	Hobsonville Yacht Club	Amend by adding the sentence <i>"Continued use by the recognised and established recreational boating clubs is also required and is provided for as a permitted activity."</i> after the sentence 'Those activities are therefore provided for as a discretionary activity.'	Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

28/5	Hobsonville Yacht Club	Amend proposed fifth paragraph by adding the words <i>"an important community resource and continued use by established boating clubs is permitted. More.."</i> after the words 'However this area is also'.	Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)
28/6	Hobsonville Yacht Club	Amend proposed first paragraph by adding the sentence <i>"Historic use of facilities within the hardstand of the Hobsonville Landing Special Area by established Hobsonville Yacht Club is acknowledged and provided for as a permitted activity."</i> Before the sentence 'The Hobsonville Landing Special Area is important for...'	Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)
28/7	Hobsonville Yacht Club	Amend proposed Rule 23 by adding a new Rule 23.1 to read: <i>"23.1 Permitted Activities Facilities directly related to the launching, retrieval, storage and maintenance of recreational boats up to 12 metres, together with the associated Clubhouse, race start tower, jetty and pontoon, as may be authorised by the Council."</i>	Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

The Hobsonville Yacht Club is a long-standing user of the Landing Special Area. While the Club is associated with the Defence Base, it includes members of the public in its activities. It retains existing use rights under section 10 of the Resource Management Act 1991. As such, it will be able to continue its activities until such time as the forthcoming plan change addresses the final form of development on the Landing Special Area. The Yacht Club will be able to participate in that process (and may achieve the matters it is seeking in these six submissions), but it cannot assume that it has a pre-eminent right to remain in its existing location. Consequently the amendments to the policy framework that the submitter is seeking are premature, and are not supported. The consequential amendment in the Landing Special Area Rules is also not supported.

Recommendation:

Submissions 28/1 - 28/7 are rejected.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/117	Auckland Regional Council	Amend Policy 7.1 to clarify that the <i>"development"</i> referred to is limited to that development which is dependent on the coastal location and directly associated with the adjoining marine industry area or ferry activities.	

Discussion:

The amendment to Policy 7.1 relates specifically to the Landing Special Area. The exact form and nature of development in this Special Area will be determined by a further plan change in the future. Consequently the planning framework in this Plan Change is interim in nature, and enables, in Rule 23.1 as a discretionary activity, activities associated with the forthcoming marine industry, ferry services and road construction. All of these activities are associated with the proximity of the deep water in the Waitemata Harbour and the coastal location of this area. This is not, however, made clear in Policy 7.1, and amending it as the submitter seeks will provide that clarity during this interim period of time before the next plan change for this area.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/117 is accepted.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/177	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of Policy 11.37 to replace the words "In the interim..." with " <i>As an initial stage of development...</i> "	

Discussion:

This text is able to be improved by the use of a different word, and it is appropriate that this amendment be made.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/177 is accepted

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/178	Waitakere City Council	Amend Policy 11.37 to add a further policy statement stating that it may not be possible to accommodate all parking associated with the ferry in the Hobsonville Landing Special Area and encouragement will be given, if necessary, to identifying suitable options in other Special Areas for parking.	

Discussion:

The Hobsonville Landing Special Area is a very limited portion of mostly reclaimed land that is a key area for the launching of boats constructed in the Marine Industry Special Area. The submission seeks to acknowledge the car parking associated with ferry facilities, and enable that activity to occur at least until the forthcoming plan change determines the longer term policy and rule framework for the Special Area. Car parking for ferry users in areas adjacent to but not part of the Special Area may ultimately be necessary, and it is appropriate that this be acknowledged in the Explanation to the Policy.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/178 is accepted in part

5.8.2 Hobsonville Landing Special Rules

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/179	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 23 to add, after the end of the Assessment Criteria, in "See also Policies" reference to Policy Section 6.2.15.	

Discussion:

This submission seeks to include a cross reference to the relevant part of Section 6 of the District Plan Policy Section. This cross reference will assist Plan users to understand the policy direction being sought through the District Plan provisions, and is appropriate.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/179 is accepted.

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/180	Waitakere City Council	Amend Rule 23 to add a further bullet point under 'Resource Consent Conditions' as follows: <i>"Such other matters provided for in the assessment criteria."</i>	

Discussion:

Assessment criteria are used to identify matters that require assessment when a resource consent is processed.

Rule 23 includes a list of matters that can be addressed via a condition when granting a resource consent. This includes a reference to section 108 of the Resource Management Act 1991, which specifies the matters that can be addressed via a condition on a resource consent.

The submitter is seeking that any matter included in the Assessment Criteria should be able to have a condition related to it placed on a resource consent. This would include assessment criteria 23(a) to 23(r), and any relevant assessment criteria included in the other Rules that apply to the Hobsonville Landing Special Area. This ability already exists via section 108 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Unless the submitter can identify a specific matter contained within Special Area's Rule 23 Assessment Criteria that requires a specific reference in the "Resource Consent Conditions" part of the Rule, this submission is vague and is rejected. Without such specificity, this submission is rejected.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/180 is rejected.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/181	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of Rule 23.1(c) by deleting the word struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: "The construction of an access roadway between the <i><u>existing</u></i> Hardstand <i><u>located within the Hobsonville Landing Special Area</u></i> and the Hobsonville Marine Industry Precinct Special Area."	

Discussion:

This submission seeks to clarify the intention of Special Area Rule 23.1(c) as the Rule relates to an activity (the access roadway) that is located in two Special Areas (the Marine Industry Special Area and the Hobsonville Landing Special Area). It is appropriate that this Rule be clarified in the manner sought by the submission.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/181 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
258/193	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend so that ferry services be a permitted activity under rule 23.0	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) Opposed By: 300 IMF Westland Ltd

Discussion:

The submitter seeks that ferry services be a permitted activity in the Hobsonville Landing Special Area. The Hobsonville Landing Special Area is an area where the exact form of development will be determined by a future plan change (as identified in Policy 11.37). This is because of the unique and limited nature of the resource that is available at the Landing, and the expectation that various different activities will establish and operate in a limited space in a coherent manner. The Landing Special Area is a key resource associated with the development of the Marine Industry Special Area, particularly for the launching of yachts.

In the interim (until such time as a further plan change is prepared), all activities on the Landing Special Area require resource consent as a discretionary activity. It is noted that Rule 24.2(a)(iii) states that a "boat launching facility" can be given consent as part of a comprehensive development plan as a limited discretionary activity. This is, however, in conflict with Hobsonville Landing Special Area Rule 23.0(b), which states that where such conflicts exist, the Hobsonville Landing Special Area Rules apply. Discretionary activity status for any proposed activity on the

Landing Special Area is therefore appropriate to ensure that the full range of matters provided for under section 108 of the Resource Management Act are available to the Council should a resource consent application be applied for. The Explanation of the Hobsonville Landing Special Area incorrectly refers to this as a limited discretionary activity, and this error should be amended.

Recommendation:

Submission 258/193 is accepted in part to the extent that a typographical error is corrected.

5.8.3 Hobsonville Landing Special Area Assessment Criteria

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/123	Auckland Regional Council	Amend Assessment Criterion 23(e) by adding those words underlined: “... <i>environment and water quality are avoided, or where avoidance is not possible, appropriately remedied or mitigated.</i> ” And; Amend 23(g) by adding those words underlined: “... <i>complements the natural landscape character, including the natural character of the coast.</i> ”	

Discussion:

Assessment Criterion 23(e) seeks to address two matters:

- (a) adverse effects arising from activities on land, and how they are avoided remedied or mitigated on the adjacent coastal marine environment; and
- (b) adverse effects arising from activities on land, and how they are avoided remedied or mitigated in terms of water quality.

The submitter seeks to amend criterion 23(e) to provide more scope to addressing the adverse effects, and if avoidance is not possible, then the effects be remedied or mitigated. It acknowledges that the Resource Management Act provides for mitigation in certain circumstances. The addition sought by the submitter is appropriately provided for in this assessment criterion.

The submitter seeks to amend criterion 23(g) to reflect the coastal nature of the Landing Special Area. Development in such close proximity to the coastal environment should be assessed in terms of its effects on that environment. The addition sought by the submitter is appropriately provided for in this assessment criterion.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/123 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/182	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of Assessment Criterion 23(d) by deleting those words struck through, and adding those in italics and underlined: “The extent to which the <i>amenity values of the coastal environment and the natural landscape qualities</i> of the area are respected maintained.”	

Discussion:

Assessment Criterion 23(d) seeks to ensure that the coastal environment and natural landscapes within Plan Change 13 are assessed as part of a resource consent application. The submitter has sought to clarify and align the wording of this assessment criterion with the terminology of the

Resource Management Act. The submission clarifies that it is the amenity values of the coastal environment that is to be assessed, and that the natural landscape is to be maintained. The wording suggested in the submission will assist plan users in the implementation phase of this Special Area.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/182 is accepted.

5.8.4 Hobsonville Landing Special Area Definitions

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
258/194	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend so that the definition of Ferry Services includes car and bus transfer facilities	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

Ferry Services is defined as follows:

Ferry Services means facilities for the carriage of passengers for hire or reward by means of a harbour ferry and includes carparking and infrastructure associated with such facilities

It appears that the Plan change has used the word “infrastructure” to mean all the built requirements associated with ferry services. The existing definition of infrastructure in the District Plan does not include car and bus transfer facilities. These facilities are likely to be part of the “infrastructure” of ferry services, using “infrastructure in its widest sense. The inclusion of car and bus transfer facilities is an appropriate inclusion in this definition.

Recommendation:

Submission 258/194 is accepted.

5.9 Residential intensity

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
95/2	Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)	Retain the number of residential units specified for each precinct as notified in the Plan Change.	

Discussion:

The specification of residential units is a key approach in ensuring the achievement of the strategic goals for residential density in the Hobsonville Base Village Precincts. The support of the submitter for this method is noted.

Recommendation:

Submission 95/2 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
301/1	Nola Anne Daly	Amend Plan Change to include increased variation in the sizes of sections being made available for subdivision including more sites of 1/3, 1/2, 3/4 or 1-2 acres.	Supported By: 160 Lloyd Morris

Discussion:

The submitter is seeking the opportunity for low density residential development within Plan Change 13. This is contrary to the Council's strategic vision for the Hobsonville Airbase. This vision seeks a much higher density of residential development and the various Precincts identify the density being sought. The site size being sought by the submitter does not accord with compact urban form, and intensification around transport nodes.

Recommendation:

Submission 301/1 is rejected.

5.10 Integration With State Highways and Public Transport

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
127/21	Land Transport New Zealand	Withdraw Plan Change 13. Land Transport NZ may review its position on this primary relief once it has had the opportunity to review a complete and robust s32 analysis from the Council that includes a comprehensive transportation study that addresses the impacts on the land transport system including State highways and public transport networks compared with alternative growth scenarios, and has held further discussions with the Council to address the matters set out in this submission.	Supported By: 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority Opposed By: 300 IMF Westland Ltd Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

The Council has been involved in the development of a report that addresses request by the submitter of a comprehensive transportation study. This is referenced as "Northern Strategic Growth Area, Overview of Future Traffic Volumes", and was prepared by the City Services Unit of Waitakere City Council during August and September 2006. This report addressed future traffic volumes in the Upper Harbour Corridor.

This study was forwarded to John Raines at Transit New Zealand, Don Houghton at the Auckland Regional Council, Stuart McDougal at the Auckland Regional Transport Authority and Coralie McDonald at Land Transport New Zealand on 4 October 2006..

Subsequently the Council has been engaged in discussion of this report with the submitter, and the reports findings were addressed in Report WCC 3 as part of the hearings by the Panel on the Transport topic.

Consequently the Council considers that it has addressed the matters raised in the submission in the intervening time between the submission being made and this hearing.

Recommendation:

Submission 127/21 is rejected

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/128	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the plan change to incorporate a 'transport concept' for the whole of the Hobsonville Urban Concept Plan area which addresses how the proposed development is to integrate with the wider transport network.	Supported By: 127 Land Transport New Zealand 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

The Council has prepared a "Transport Audit" in response to submissions by the Auckland Regional Transport Authority. This Audit expands on the previously narrower scope of the traffic generation based traffic impact assessments that have traditionally made up part of environmental impact assessments for proposed activities. It is 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 transport framework.

Further to this, the Council completed a report referenced as "Northern Strategic Growth Area, Overview of Future Traffic Volumes", which was prepared by the City Services Unit of Waitakere City Council during August and September 2006. This report addressed future traffic volumes in the Upper Harbour Corridor.

Plan Change 13 contains numerous transportation criteria to which all future development is subject. These criteria cover the more traditional traffic generation criteria, and also include that regard is given to the provision of public transport, and features that support public transport, for example appropriate infrastructure, walking accessibility, and good urban form. Plan Change 13 also identifies, on the Honsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan – Features, indicates bus routes, and walkways, and each Precinct has been defined in part by its relationship to the transport network.

Consequently the Council considers that it has addressed the matters raised in the submission in the intervening time between the submission being made and this hearing. Consequently the submission is accepted in part, to the extent that this, other submissions and analysis that has occurred since the Plan Change was notified has amended the transport components of the Plan Change.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/128 is accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/130	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the plan change by locating landuses according to transport accessibility requirements. For example freight industries are best located near a motorway interchange, whilst an office development should be on a bus corridor.	<p>Supported By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd 127 Land Transport New Zealand 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited</p> <p>Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)</p>

Discussion:

The Council has endeavoured to align transport and land use throughout its Plan Changes that have responded to the LGA(A)A. This is evidenced by the utilisation of the Precinct method to provide “sub zones” that reflect both the environmental constraints that exist in the location of the Precinct, and to enable land uses that integrate with the transport nodes and the wider network that exists. The Council acknowledges however that this could be made more explicit by including an explicit requirement to achieve the integration of development with the transport concept shown on the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan – Features Map. This is achieved by the inclusion of text in the new Policy 11.34 (inserted via submission 250/115).

Recommendation:

Submission 250/130 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/134	Auckland Regional Council	Amend Hobsonville Urban Concept Plan so that the major road in Precinct I connects to Clark Road to align with the connected road pattern and to facilitate the bus service along Buckley Avenue and pedestrian access to Hobsonville Village.	<p>Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited</p>
250/136	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the plan change to provide for bus services along Hobsonville Road and designate to create a suitable transit boulevard of an appropriate width to support public transport, and provide for links to ferry and future motorway bus rapid transit.	<p>Supported By: 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited</p>

Discussion:

In terms of submission 250/136, the Council is not a public transport provider, as this falls outside of its legislative duties. The Council has, however, worked extensively with the Auckland Regional Transport Authority to prepare a Transport Audit. That Audit addresses, amongst other things, public transport facilities and routes on the Hobsonville Peninsula, and the connection of this system to wider public transport networks. This is evidenced by the amendments to the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan and the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan – Features. These amendments to Precinct boundaries (such as the Motorway Interchange Precinct and the amendments to the bus routes on the Features Map illustrate the amendments that the submitter is seeking.

The submitter is also seeking a “transit boulevard” for public transport and the connection of the major road in Precinct I to Clark Road. The Council accepts the need for connectivity of the major road, but consider it appropriate that it connect to Buckley Road rather than Clark Road. This connection creates an alignment with the existing Hobsonville Road, and will facilitate the creation of a transit boulevard to the extent that public transport routes have been identified on the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan – Features Map utilising this connection.

Recommendation:

Submissions 250/134 and 250/136 are accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/137	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the plan change to keep the bus route along Hobsonville Road and Buckley Avenue for quicker travel times and to enable bus lane provisions and streetscape design to be consistently implemented rather than create a deviation off Buckley Avenue, near Precinct E the Future Development Area; and integrate the bus route with the final ferry terminal location; and provide pedestrian connections to the ferry terminal and bus route.	Supported By: 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority

Discussion:

The Council has reviewed the public transport routes since the Plan Change was notified. In conjunction with the connection of the major road in Precinct I to Buckley Avenue, the bus routes have been amended to reflect the increased importance of this road. The detailed design of these facilities is required as part of the comprehensive development plan resource consent (see Rule 21.3(g) (ii) - (xii) and assessment criteria 21(n) – 21(w) . .

The location of the ferry terminal will be the subject of a future Plan Change process, and at that time the connectivity to the bus routes and the creation of pedestrian connections will be addressed. This matter has been addressed in the Explanation to the Policies (section 6.2.15).

Recommendation:

Submission 250/137 is accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
258/192	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Amend to include objectives for urban development be set for the Hobsonville Airbase area which include specific transport outcomes sought for the area.	Supported By: 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited Opposed By: 300 IMF Westland Ltd

Discussion:

The Council has endeavoured to align transport and land use throughout its Plan Changes that have responded to the LGA(A)A. This is evidenced by the utilisation of the Precinct method to provide “sub zones” that reflect both the environmental constraints that exist in the location of the Precinct, and to enable land uses that integrate with the transport nodes that exist.

The Council acknowledges however that this could be made more explicit by including an explicit requirement to achieve the integration of development with the transport concept shown on the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan – Features. While the inclusion of an objective for transport outcomes is not required for the Hobsonville Peninsula (as this is contained in the Council’s Objective 0 in Plan Change 16), this is achieved by the inclusion of text in the new Policy 11.34. The new Policy 11.34 is inserted via submission 250/115, and includes a bullet point that states:

- achieve forms of development and patterns of land use that are integrated with the transport concept shown on the Hobsonville Urban Area Concept Plan - Features, which are supportive of pedestrian, cycle and public transport use, located according to transport accessibility requirements where possible and which reduce reliance on private motor vehicles;

Recommendation:

Submission 258/192 is accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
259/1	Transit New Zealand	Reject and withdraw the Plan Change until such time as the issues and information deficiencies outlined in Transit’s submissions (259/1 - 259/5) have been satisfactorily addressed.	Supported By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited Opposed By: 157 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)
259/2	Transit New Zealand	Amend the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan to address the issues outlined in Transit’s submissions (259/1 - 259/5).	Opposed By: 157 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

The submitter seeks five different items of relief in its submissions. A significant amount of discussion has occurred between the Council and the submitter since the submission was made. The Transport Audit has been prepared, as has a comprehensive transport study. These documents have both been prepared in consultation with the submitter.

The Council considers that all of the analysis that has occurred has led to several changes to the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan. Submission point 259/2 has been accepted in part, in that the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan has been amended in response to the transport analysis (for example the amendment to Motorway Interchange Precinct I). Submission point 259/3 has been accepted, 259/4 has been accepted in part, 259/5 has been accepted in principle. Consequently the Council does not consider it appropriate to grant the relief sought in submission 259/1.

Recommendation:

Submissions 259/1 and 259/2 are accepted in part

5.11 Stormwater

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/138	Auckland Regional Council	<p>Reject Plan Change 13 because it has not been fully informed by the stormwater and wastewater Network Discharge Consent and Integrated Catchment Management Plan processes, and does not reflect the outcomes of these processes.</p> <p>Or;</p> <p>Amend the assessment criteria in relation to infrastructure to include a requirement that development be consistent with the Integrated Catchment Management Plan; and promotes Low Impact Design and source control for stormwater management; and fully incorporates and reflects the outcomes of the Upper Waitemata Harbour Study.</p>	<p>Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)</p>

Discussion:

The submitter seeks that the link between the land use controls in Plan Change 13 and the Council's Integrated Catchment Management Plan needs to be reinforced to ensure sustainability, especially for the Upper Waitemata Harbour.

Hobsonville Airbase is within the Hobsonville Peninsula Catchment, which drains to the Brighams sub-estuary of the Upper Waitemata Harbour. The Upper Waitemata Harbour is a sensitive estuarine environment. It is a recognised estuarine settling zone and is therefore potentially susceptible to the accumulation of contaminants via stormwater from adjacent land-based activities including urban activities. It is important that the future development proposed under Plan Change 13 does not contribute significantly to long-term degradation of the Upper Harbour. This is a significant sustainability test for Plan Change 13.

Accordingly Waitakere City Council has prepared the Integrated Catchment Management Plan - Hobsonville Peninsula (ICMP), which forms the documentation for the Hobsonville Peninsula Catchment network consent application (ARC permit application 27016). The ICMP was first submitted to the Auckland Regional Council (ARC) on 31 August 2005 in association with a network discharge consent application. The ARC issued a section 92 notice (request for further information) on the 10 November 2005. Responses to the information request are incorporated into the current ICMP document dated 27 April 2006, which has been publicly notified by the ARC for submissions. At the completion of any hearings of submissions, the ARC may make a decision on the network consent application. The decision making process for the network discharge consent application will be approximately contemporaneous with the decision making process for Plan Change 13, but will be independent.

Preparation of the ICMP and the preparation of the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plans have been fully integrated. The contents of the ICMP show that the discharge of stormwater from the urban area can be managed to ensure that the urban development in accordance with the ICMP and the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plans will not significantly alter long-term contaminant accumulation rates in the Upper Waitemata Harbour. In addition, the proposed development will not cause significant contaminant accumulation in the immediate Waitemata Harbour.

The ICMP was amended as a result of the section 92 requests. The ICMP has a detailed and integrated approach to stormwater management. A preferred option for stormwater management has been selected (refer to Option 4A discussed in section 11.4 of the ICMP). The preferred option will comprise three essential elements: source control of zinc coating systems, five constructed wetlands to provide treatment and detention for the entire developed catchment, and rainwater

detention tanks. This option will allow a compact urban form, is relatively cost effective, and will be effective in the long-term.

It is important that development on the Hobsonville Airbase remain consistent with the ICMP and the ultimate network discharge consent. Therefore it is recommended that the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plans be updated to be consistent with Figure 11-2, Revision C, dated 27 March 2006, of the ICMP. In addition, relevant text of Plan Change 13 should be amended to ensure that development is consistent with the ICMP. In particular:

- the ICMP is not referred to in the Plan Change, and Policies 11.34 (Marine Industry Special Area) and 11.35 (Hobsonville Base Village Special Area) should be amended to require consistency with the ICMP. Policies 11.36 (Hobsonville Future Development Special Area) and 11.37 (Hobsonville Landing Special Area) both require further Plan Changes, and the ICMP requirements will be addressed at that time;
- Rule 21.3(g) and Rule 24.2(a) should refer to the ICMP so that comprehensive development plan applications specifically provide for the ICMP and that Low Impact Design relevant to the ICMP is used;
- Assessment criteria 21(ag) and 24(am) which apply to Limited Discretionary and Discretionary Activities, should be amended to ensure that development is consistent with the ICMP;

The ICMP process is underway, and while it is not yet completed, it is not appropriate to reject the Plan Change on this basis. Nevertheless, improved referencing of the ICMP is appropriate.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/138 is accepted in part, to the extent that amendments are made to Policies, Rules and Assessment Criteria in Plan Change 13 to correctly reference the ICMP and its related network discharge consent.

5.12 Water Quality / Coast

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
31/2	Elizabeth Collins	Amend plan change to take into account environmental issues, specifically in respect of Hobsonville.	

Discussion:

The submitter seeks an area of land around the coast of the Hobsonville Peninsula be made reserve. The council in its concept planning has identified many areas that are appropriate for reserve, and much of this is located along the coastal edges. The Council has also identified a walkway around the coast, so that the public can have access to the coast for passive recreation purposes. Other areas of open space may be identified following consideration of other submissions, which would assist in meeting this submission.

Recommendation:

Submission 31/2 is accepted to the extent that consideration of other submissions may give rise to additional areas of open space.

5.13 Reverse Sensitivity

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/160	Waitakere City Council	Amend Policy 11.34 to add a further policy statement confirming that it will be a requirement, at CDP and individual development stages, to address potential adverse effects (noise, vehicle movements, glare, odour, dust, etc) on surrounding sites, particularly where residential activities exist or	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

		are possible under relevant rules.	
250/118	Auckland Regional Council	Amend Policy 11.34 by adding a further point which requires development to avoid issues of reverse sensitivity in relation to the discharge of contaminants into air.	

Discussion:

The submitters raise the matter of the possibility that existing and potential residential development may be adversely affected by discharge of contaminants into the air in the Marine Industry Special Area. It is appropriate that this matter be included in the policy framework for the Marine Industry Special Area. As a consequence of addressing reverse sensitivity effects, the Council is conscious of air discharge effects from the marine industry.

Following on from the addition to the policy framework, it is appropriate that additional requirements associated with air discharges be inserted into Rule 24.2. The additional requirements form part of the comprehensive development plan for the Hobsonville Marine Industry Special Area. This includes rules and assessment criteria relating to the buffering of the industry, and how Areas "bb", "cc" and "dd" may be required to meet requirements to address this issue. The new requirements also include the need for an Air Discharge Management Plan that establishes structures and processes to manage air discharges throughout the Precinct. It is understood that Waitakere City Council is obtaining further advice on this matter, and that submitter is invited to respond to the Panel regarding any new matters or amendments to the recommended changes arising from that advice.

Recommendation:

Submissions 250/118 and 257/160 are accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/101	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to add a further policy statement confirming that it will be a requirement, at CDP and individual development stages, to address potential reverse sensitivity effects, having regard to land uses which exist or may develop under the relevant rules, on adjacent or nearby sites.	Supported By: 259 Transit New Zealand Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

This submission was made in relation to the Hobsonville Base Village Special Area. Given the intensive nature of development within and adjacent to the Hobsonville Base Village Special Area, it is appropriate that this matter be included in the policy framework for the Special Area, and specifically the new Policy 11.34.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/101 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/118	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to reword Assessment Criterion 21(g) to refer to wider (than aural) reverse sensitivity effects including hours of activity, traffic and security.	Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

This submission is a consequential matter arising from the amendments to Policy 11.35 relating to reverse sensitivity. It is appropriate that this matter be revised to reflect the amendments to the Policy.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/118 is accepted

5.14 Heritage

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/140	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the Plan Change to undertake a built heritage assessment and make any necessary amendments to Plan Change 13, including the preparation of a Heritage Management Plan with which the future Comprehensive Development Plans must comply.	Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)
257/158	Waitakere City Council	Amend Policy 11.34 to add a further policy statement explaining the importance of existing heritage features. State the requirement for a heritage inventory as part of the CDP process, and the need to make heritage protection and enhancement an integral component of CDP preparation. State the requirement for a heritage design statement to accompany any building or other development proposal, covering the design philosophy in respect of the heritage features of this Special Area.	

Discussion:

The Council has previously listed several items of heritage significance in its District Plan at the time that it was first publicly notified (1995). These items remain in the District Plan, and have not been amended by Plan Change 13. The Council undertook an archaeological and heritage study in November 2004 (Clough and Associates, November 2004). There are many notable buildings and Special Features within the Hobsonville Base Village Special Area of Plan Change 13, and these have been identified on Appendix XVIII – Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan – Features. The Council therefore considers that the built heritage assessment requested by the submitter has been undertaken as part of the development of this Plan Change, and this part of the submission is not accepted.

Heritage is referred to in the Plan Change in Policy 11.35, which relates to the Hobsonville Base Village Special Area, and in Section 6.2.15, which is part of the District Plan's Explanation of the Strategic Direction. It does not appear that the heritage values identified in Policy 11.35 and on Appendix XVIII to the District Plan Maps has been carried through to the Special Area Rule 21.3. This Special Area Rule provides performance standards and assessment criteria for the Hobsonville Base Village. Special Area Rule 21.3(g) sets out the general standards for Comprehensive Development Plans. It is appropriate that a new item (xiii) be added to this list of performance standards, requiring a heritage management plan for the Base Village Special Area. This part of the submission is accepted. A consequential change to the definition of the term "heritage" is required to include the notable buildings and special features identified on the Appendix XVIII – Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan – Features.

Recommendation:

Submissions 250/140 and 257/158 are accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/141	Auckland Regional Council	Amend all rules related to heritage by adding the words " <u>or area</u> ". For example - Hobsonville Airbase Village Special Area, add those words underlined: <i>21(m) "The extent to which any development adversely affects the historical, cultural or spiritual significance of a site <u>or area</u>, or any waahi tapu of significant to iwi."</i>	

Discussion:

It is commonly accepted that heritage items are often not just a building or a structure, but extend to a site (for example a garden associated with a historic building). The submitter seeks to go beyond this, and include an "area" within the Rules that apply to Hobsonville Base Village Special Area. An "area" in this context is taken to mean a tract of land that may go beyond existing property boundaries. The historical significance of this tract of land may deserve assessment as part of the development of the Hobsonville Base Village. It is appropriate to include the words "or area" in the Hobsonville Base Village Rules.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/141 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/142	Auckland Regional Council	Amend all provisions that relate to the retention of particular historic structures such as the cadet building and flagpole, to include a buffer area within which proposed structures, additions to structures and earthworks require resource consent in order to have the effect of preserving the curtilage and minimising the chance of archaeological deposits being inadvertently disturbed.	

Discussion:

Plan Change 13 includes Rule 21.4(b), which requires a discretionary resource consent for:

"additions and alterations to any building identified as a heritage building on the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan – Features".

This performance standard goes some way to meeting the relief sought by the submitter, but the performance standard has not included all of the "Special Features" that are also identified on the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan – Features. It is noted that this Appendix is incorrectly referenced in Rule 21.4(b). It is appropriate that development in the vicinity of these Special Features be required to meet the requirements of the District Plan in the same manner as Notable Buildings. When combined with the requirement for a Heritage Management Plan (provided for in response to submission 250/140 above), and the application of the City Wide Heritage Rules to any identified heritage item, an appropriate framework for the management of these Special Features is provided. Consequently this submission is accepted.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/142 is accepted

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/97	Waitakere City Council	Amend the Plan Change to add a further policy statement explaining the importance of existing heritage features. State the requirement for a heritage inventory as part of the CDP process, and the need to make heritage protection and enhancement an integral component of CDP preparation. State the requirement for a heritage design statement to accompany any building or other development proposal, covering the design philosophy in respect of the heritage features of the relevant precinct.	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

257/117	Waitakere City Council	Amend the wording of assessment criteria 21(c)-(f) to strengthen the importance of existing heritage features. State the requirement for a heritage inventory as part of the CDP process, and the need to make heritage protection and enhancement an integral component of CDP preparation. State the requirement for a heritage design statement to accompany any building or other development proposal, covering the design philosophy in respect of the heritage features of the relevant precinct.	Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)
---------	------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------

Discussion:

This submitter seeks five amendments to the heritage provisions of Plan Change 13. They are:

- (a) Additional text in the policy section to explain the importance of existing heritage features.
- (b) Amend the wording of assessment criteria 21(c)-(f) to strengthen the importance of existing heritage features.
- (c) State the requirement for a heritage inventory as part of the CDP process, and
- (d) the need to make heritage protection and enhancement an integral component of CDP preparation.
- (e) State the requirement for a heritage design statement to accompany any building or other development proposal, covering the design philosophy in respect of the heritage features of the relevant precinct.

Item (a) seeks additional text about existing historical features. Policies 11.34 and 11.35 makes mention of historical, cultural and spiritual significance of the area contained within the Base Village and Marine Industry Special Areas. As the Future Development and Landing Special Areas will be subject to further Plan changes, the relief sought is not necessary in Policies 11.36 and 11.37. Given the clarification of heritage requirements arising from other submissions, amendments to the policies are appropriate. It is noted that the Chapel at the Hobsonville Base Village Special Area has recently been relocated by the Ministry of defence in its role as a Requiring Authority, and it is appropriate that reference to it be deleted.

Item (b) relates to “existing heritage features”, and seeks to increase their importance during the redevelopment of the Hobsonville Airbase. Given the extensive heritage sites and areas that exist on the Hobsonville Airbase, the relief sought is appropriate. One amendment to Assessment Criterion 21(e) is recommended.

Item (c) seeks that a heritage inventory be prepared as part of the Comprehensive Development Plan process, and this has been generally accepted via the relief sought in submission 250/140 above. The inclusion of the words “inventory” in the Heritage Management Plan requirement in Rule 21.3(g)(xii) is appropriate.

Item (d) is a further requirement sought in the preparation of a Comprehensive Development Plan process, and is an appropriate alignment with the Policy approach contained in Policy 11.35.

Item (e) is a component of the larger Heritage Management Plan (sought in submission 250/140), and it is appropriate to include this explicitly in the District Plan.

Recommendation:

Submissions 257/97 and 257/117 are accepted.

5.15 Comprehensive Development Plan / Consenting Issues

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
159/8	Ministry of Education (Auckland Office)	Amend Section 6.2.15 or elsewhere in the Plan Change to include more guidelines to clarify who may prepare a Comprehensive Development Plan and the need to get substantial stakeholder agreement before lodging with the Council.	Supported By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 259 Transit New Zealand 109 The Warehouse Ltd Opposed By: 300 IMF Westland Ltd Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)
159/9	Ministry of Education (Auckland Office)	Amend Rule 21.3(a) or elsewhere in the Plan Change to include more guidelines to clarify who may prepare a Comprehensive Development Plan and the need to get substantial stakeholder agreement before lodging with the Council.	Supported By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 300 IMF Westland Ltd

Discussion:

The Comprehensive Development Plan approach is described in Policy Section 6.2.15, under the Hobsonville Base Village and Hobsonville Marine Industry Special Area sections of that Explanation. It is appropriate to clarify who can apply for resource consent for a Comprehensive Development Plan. It is expected that consent applicants will be required to consult with the usual agencies and affected parties as part of the preparation of their application, and so no additional guidance on this matter is required.

Recommendation:

Submissions 159/8 and 159/9 are accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/120	Auckland Regional Council	Retain the Comprehensive Development Plan approach.	Supported By: 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority

Discussion:

The Comprehensive Development Plan approach is a key process in achieving the strategic and environmental outcomes being sought from this Plan change. The support of the submitter for this method is noted.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/120 is accepted.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
254/15	North Shore City Council	Amend Plan Change 13 to include an adequate rules package to ensure the proper control of activities (including industrial activities) as limited discretionary or discretionary activities, or provide assurances that processes such as further plan changes will be introduced to ensure the participation of North Shore City, its residents and businesses, in determining the nature of development in this area.	Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

The submitter is concerned about the potential for adverse effects on the residents of North Shore City from industrial activities located within Plan Change 13. The Plan Change as notified provided policies and rules to manage industrial activities within the Airbase. Industrial activities associated with the marine industry are provided for in the Marine Industry Special Area. The Special Area Rule 24.4 refers plan users to operative Working Environment Rules 6 (Air Discharges), 8 (Noise), 9 (Parking, Loading and Driveway Access) and 10 (Odour, Glare and Vibration) as the management framework for industrial activities. Rule 24 also provides performance standards for the bulk and location of buildings within the Marine Industry Special Area.

The Council considers that the operative Working Environment Rules are appropriate to address any effects arising from industrial activities. The Council and others have made submissions on the rules managing the bulk and location of the buildings within the Marine Industry Special Area, and these are addressed in Section 5.5 of this report. It is considered that the Plan Change plus any amendments recommended in Section 5.5 will address the concerns of the submitter.

Recommendation:

Submission 254/15 is accepted in part, to the extent that amendments to the Rules are recommended in other Sections of this report.

5.16 General Matters: District Plan Rules / Assessment Criteria

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
177/1	John Ingram	Amend to introduce additional rules and assessment criteria that require sustainable building and subdivision	

Discussion:

The submitter seeks that additional rules and assessment criteria based upon sustainable practices are inserted into the Plan via Plan Changes 13-18. The Council has endeavoured to include sustainability measures throughout the Plan Changes, including the policies, rules and assessment criteria. This is the basis of the “planning jargon” that the submitter refers to in his submission. The Council is responding to all submissions, and amendments to the Plan Changes are occurring as a result of that process. Those amendments seek, amongst other things, a more sustainable planning framework. Without further clarification about appropriate terminology from the submitter at the hearing, there is little merit in the submission.

Recommendation:

Submission 177/1 is rejected.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
177/3	John Ingram	Amend to ensure that rules are ‘watertight’	

Discussion:

The submitter refers to “watertight” in terms of ensuring that the rules cannot be avoided by developers, rather than being a reference to “Leaky Building Syndrome”. The Council has made general submissions that seek to reduce the ambiguity within the notified policies and rules, to ensure that the plan changes achieve the environmental, design and strategic outcomes that the Council is seeking. The submission is accepted to the extent that policies and rules are amended by other submissions to provide greater certainty and where gaps, contradictions or errors are identified, those matters are rectified.

Recommendation:

Submission 177/3 is accepted. No changes are required.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/125	Auckland Regional Council	Amend all assessment criteria by deleting the words “ <i>the extent to which</i> ” and add words that are more specific and directive to reflect	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

	<p>the intention of the LG(A)AA and the vision for the area.</p> <p>For example, Assessment Criteria 21(n) states: <i>“The extent to which development has been designed to integrate land uses with transport systems, including provision for public transport...”</i> This should be amended to read:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“21(n) Development shall be designed to integrate land uses with transport systems, including providing for public transport...”</i></p>	<p>Opposed By: 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------

Discussion:

The Council uses the term *“...The extent to which...”* in almost all of its assessment criteria throughout the operative District Plan. It is important to note that assessment criteria are not performance standards, which need to be distinct and specific. Assessment criteria are used when a performance standard is not met and as a consequence the Council is afforded a discretion in the assessment of that matter within a wider resource consent application. The use of *“The extent to which...”* enables the resource consent processing staff to utilise their professional expertise within the policy and rule framework of the District Plan when assessing a proposal, especially where the matters being assessed are not “hard and fast” within the environment. The blanket removal of the words *“The extent to which...”* may inadvertently elevate some assessment criteria into the realm of performance standards, which is not appropriate within the District Plan.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/125 is rejected.

5.17 Errors

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
95/11	Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)	Amend “Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan - Features” by replacing the title with: <i>“Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan”</i> .	

Discussion:

This submitter seeks clarity about the title of one of the Concept Plans relating to Hobsonville Airbase. It is important that this be clear for users of the District Plan.

The appropriate title is “Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan – Features”

Recommendation:

Submission 95/11 is accepted to the extent that all Concept Plans for the Hobsonville Airbase shall be clearly and appropriately named.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
95/12	Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)	Amend “Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan “ by replacing the title with: <i>“Hobsonville Concept Plan”</i> .	

Discussion:

This submitter seeks clarity about the title of one of the Concept Plans relating to Hobsonville Airbase. It is important that this be clear for users of the District Plan. The appropriate titles are "Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan" and "Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan - Features".

Recommendation:

Submission 95/12 is accepted to the extent that all Concept Plans for the Hobsonville Airbase shall be clearly and appropriately named.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/121	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the plan change by deleting all references to " <i>Hobsonville Concept Plan</i> " and adding in their place, " <i>Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan</i> "; and deleting all references to " <i>Hobsonville Concept Plan 1 - Features</i> " and adding in their place " <i>Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan - Features</i> "	

Discussion:

This submitter seeks clarity about the title of one of the Concept Plans relating to Hobsonville Airbase. It is important that this be clear for users of the District Plan.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/121 is accepted to the extent that all Concept Plans for the Hobsonville Airbase shall be clearly and appropriately named.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/135	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the plan change by adding the Hobsonville Marine Industry Concept Plan.	

Discussion:

This phrase occurs in the new definitions inserted into the District Plan by Plan Change 13. The term "Hobsonville Marine Industry Concept Plan" is itself defined, and it is referred to in the definition of "Boat Haulage Road". The term "Hobsonville Marine Industry Concept Plan" was included in the Plan Change 13 in error, and this term was meant to be "Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan - Features". It is important that this be clear for users of the District Plan. Consequently it is appropriate that the terms "Hobsonville Marine Industry Concept Plan" and "Boat Haulage Road" are deleted.

Recommendation:

Submission 250/135 is accepted in part.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/154	Waitakere City Council	Amend Appendix XVII by adding "G" in 'Precinct G' on the Concept Plan Map.	

Discussion:

This submitter seeks clarity about the title of one of the Precincts within the Concept Plan for Hobsonville Airbase. It is important that this be clear for users of the District Plan.

Recommendation:

Submission 257/154 is accepted to the extent that all Precincts within the Concept Plans for the Hobsonville Airbase shall be clearly and appropriately named.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/153	Waitakere City Council	Amend Appendix XVIII by adding 'Street Types' to the 'Features' Concept Plan.	Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited

Discussion:

The submitter seeks the inclusion of Street Types on Appendix XVIII – the Hobsonville Peninsula Urban Concept Plan – Features. The submission referring to street types is an error and should actually refer to “Street Typologies”.

Street typologies have been utilised in other recent Proposed Plan Changes. The requirement for the nomination of appropriate street frontage typologies has been inserted into the General Standards for Comprehensive development Plans in response to submissions WCC 257/115 and 257/136. The submitter is invited to present evidence at the hearing about this matter (in conjunction with evidence supporting submissions 257/115 and 257/136).

Recommendation:

Submission 257/153 is accepted.

5.18 Process Issues

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
301/2	Nola Anne Daly	Amend Plan Change to offer land surplus to Council's or Transits requirements to those who were displaced as a result of the taking of that land.	

Discussion:

This submitter is referring to Transit New Zealand's designation of land for the purpose of constructing State Highways 16 and 18. If, following completion of the construction of the motorways, areas of land are not required for the operation of the motorways, Transit New Zealand may dispose of that land, following the appropriate legislative requirements. That is a matter for Transit New Zealand to determine. It is inappropriate to include this matter in Plan Change 13, as it is outside of the role and function of the Council .

Recommendation:

Submission 301/2 is rejected.

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
309/10	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society - North Shore Branch	Seeks that widespread notification of changes to the Metropolitan Urban Limit be given and that independent commissioners be appointed for the hearing.	Support and Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

This submitter sought that certain process issue be resolved to their satisfaction. They considered that the notification of the plan changes was not sufficient. The Council acted with the Regional Council and the six other territorial local authorities in jointly notifying the plan changes. Each council also individually notified many people in their respective territories. The councils' met the legal requirements of the Resource Management Act.

The submissions are being heard by a Joint Panel that will make recommendations on the plan changes back to each council. This approach provides an appropriate level of independence.

Recommendation:

Submission 309/10 is rejected.

5.19 PLAN CHANGE 18

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
95/14	Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)	Amend the first paragraph of Rule 1.10.1 to read as follows: "Additions and alterations to any ■ Of the Hobsonville Village Centre Special Area ■ Of the Any part of the Hobsonville Base Village Special Area <i>where nominated by an approved Comprehensive Development Plan in accordance with Rule 21.3 (g)(xii)</i> ■ Of the Massey North Town Centre Special Area - Precinct B Shall be required to be designed"	

Discussion:

This submission seeks to clarify the format of this Rule, which is accepted.

It also seeks to clarify where this Rule will be applied in Hobsonville Base Village Special Area via an inclusion of text into the General Standards for Comprehensive Development Plans. While this submission seeks that this Rule be applied at Comprehensive Development Plan Stage, it does not identify which Precincts that this amended Rule will apply to. As the number, location, nature and Rules that apply to the Precincts in the Hobsonville Base Village Special Area may change through the submission process, this submission is accepted in part, by inserting a new Rule 21.3(g)(xii), and also including a requirement for the application of Rule 1.10.1 to be specified in those revised Precincts where appropriate.

Recommendation:

Submission 95/14 is accepted in part.