

NPSUD Webinar

Information session 20 April 2022

Megan Tyler (MC)

Kia ora koto, good evening everybody. Welcome to this first webinar that we Auckland Council are holding to go through the changes that the government have put through just lately and that we are needing to implement. This is an engagement period for the next three weeks where we are asking for your feedback and just providing you some information about what changes are helping you understand them, understand the GIS viewer and hopefully getting your feedback both tonight and over the next few weeks. My name is Megan Tyler and I'm the chief of strategy here at Auckland Council. It's my pleasure to just be able to share this for you and make sure this evening runs smoothly and that we get information out to you and hopefully answer as many questions as we can from you. Just a reminder, the consultation we're running started last night or yesterday, so the 19th of April through to the 9th of May. So you have plenty of time to think about what you hear tonight and provide that feedback. In particular, we have AK have your say, which is our website where you'll be able to get more information on all of this and to provide your feedback, we will provide a link to you and we'll continue to remind you about that as the night progresses.

Just a little bit of housekeeping before we start, the session is being recorded so that we can put that up on the website so that those who haven't been able to make it tonight can view it at their leisure. So that will be happening tonight. All members of the audience will have their cameras and microphones disabled. So the way in which you pass comments and questions, please will be through the Q and A function. So that should be at the bottom of your screen, an icon that says Q and A. If you click on that, there's an opportunity for you to type in your questions. So please start that as soon as you like. Please don't wait until the end of the presentation. We want to get a sense of your questions so that we can crack right into questions and answers as soon as we finish the presentation, we are moderating it so I would ask that you keep your comments respectful and clear and we will get through as many of them as we can. I wanted to recognize a few councillors that are on the call tonight. Councillor Pippa Koom from the Waitamata ward, councillor Angela Dalton from the Manurewa papakura Ward and Councillor Paul Young from the Howick ward. Thank you for joining us tonight.

From the planning team, we have Eric Shield, who you'll be hearing from very shortly. He'll take you through the presentation. Wayne Sue, Ross Moffatt, Tian Liu and Noel Redon. So, look, we're planning to go for about 90 minutes tonight. We want to take the first 20 minutes or so to go through a presentation for you, which hopefully just gives you that overall overview of what the government has required us to do and our response to that, particularly those areas where we have some discretion because there are some mandatory things the government's already required. We don't have any discretion on those, but there are some areas where we do. So we will take you through an overview. And as I said, please use that Q and A function to pop your questions in as soon as you like. So I'd like to hand over to Erin Shields

now for a presentation on the overview of these new rules from central government and how they can apply to Auckland. Erin, thank you. Over to you.

Eryn Shields

Thank you Megan, I appreciate your welcome. And I'd just like to welcome our counselors who have joined the call with me this evening are a number of our planning staff who have had different and various roles contributing to the council's response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and also the more recent amendment to the Resource Management Act, which provided further policy direction to all councils around the country on how to implement this. I just wanted to check that you can see the agenda for this evening. That's all good? I've got about 40 slides, and that might sound like a lot, but there's quite a number of better pictures and so there are one or two that are rather word heavy, so bear with me. It is partly the nature of the work that we do that words do tend to predominate and so if I skip through them too quickly, we can certainly go back to slides and discuss them in the Q and A section. I'm just going to give a quick overview about where has the NPS and the RMA amendment come from, talk briefly about the well functioning urban environment, and then really spend a bit of time talking about the intensification policies three and four in the National Policy Statement. And I've tried to make a logical flow here for you to talk about walkable catchments and then intensification around town and local centers, followed by the medium density residential standards, or NDRS, as they're often called. And that's followed by the qualifying matters, which are matters that might serve to constrain the intensification that we are able to do. Got a quick slide about Auckland light rail just to help you understand the implications of that and how that looks on the GIS viewer. And a quick slide about the next steps at the Council taking.

So we'll get into it, if I may. So the overview and this really is the next step in the government's approach to urban development. In 2016, the government established the National Policy Statement Urban Development Capacity, and that was the forerunner to the 2020 National Policy Statement Urban Development. It had a number of requirements for councils to improve planning processes to enable more development. Our Council worked hard through 2018 to include the requirements of the National Policy statement, Urban development capacity into the Auckland Plan, and that was done successfully in 2020. The government essentially updated their 2016 document and provided for more requirements on all councils across the country.

Auckland Council is one of what is known as the tier one councils, and there are five of those. And we have the greatest responsibilities to provide for Intensification. And the other tier one councils are Hamilton and Tauranga, Wellington and Christchurch. So we have been talking with our colleagues and the planning teams in those councils as well to talk through the government's requirements. Essentially, we are focused on providing for a well functioning urban environment, providing for intensification, providing for qualifying matters. And in a separate but related matter, the government identified the removal of car parking minimums as an aspect of the growth of the urban environment in the cities and

towns across New Zealand. While we were working on preparing for the notification in August. The government has further amended the Resource Management Act at the end of last year, and you may have observed some of the debate about that, and that is where the medium density residential standards were introduced, and we are required to implement them. So throughout 2021 and 2022, we have been responding, and the Planning Committee has undertaken a number of policy directions setting, and we have worked on the basis of that policy direction to provide for the preliminary response.

That is online, and we are now heading into our consultation in April and May, the very short version of the National Policy Statement. It seeks to improve housing affordability by addressing the fundamentals of land supply, development capacity and infrastructure provision. It also supports reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. And that's a really important element of the government's response in the Blue Circle. You'll see what the MPs require us as councils to do. We have to plan for growth and ensure the delivery of a well functioning urban environment for all people, communities and future generations. The second bullet point is really important to remove restrictive development provisions in the unitary plan to allow growth up and out in locations that have good access to existing centers, services and public transport networks. And so you might be interested to see what forms a well functioning urban environment, which was the first policy in the National Policy Statement. This is one of the words heavy ones. I'm not sure that I want to read that, but our planning decisions as councils contribute to a well functioning urban environment that enables a variety of homes that meet the needs of different households.

In Māori, we also have to enable a variety of sites that are suitable for different business sectors in terms of location and size, have good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces and open spaces, and support and limit as much as possible adverse impacts on the competitive operation of land and development markets, support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and be resilient to the likely and current future effects of climate change. That's a whole big bag of stuff that we have to attend to, and that is mostly being provided and implemented by changing what is called the Regional Policy Statement, which is our Regional planning document, is part of the Unitary Plan and beneath that sits on the District plan provisions. So there's been work undertaken to review our Regional Policy Statement to see how well we already attend to these particular requirements. And we are expecting to have to amend and improve some of our requirements to meet these. So that's what a well functioning urban environment is about. Moving on to the intensification policies and policy three is the really important intensification policy. What this does is it requires our Regional Policy Statement and our District plan to enable in the city center zones as much capacity as possible.

Now, the city center zone already provides significant development capacity, but there will still be some changes to that. In our Metropolitan centers. We have to provide at least six stories, and most Metropolitan centers already do that. If you're wondering what a Metropolitan Center is, if you think of

Albany, Takapuna, Westgate, Henderson, New Lynn, Newmarket, Manukau and Papakura, they are some of the Metropolitan centers. Now, everywhere else outside of the Metropolitan centers, we have to apply the medium density residential standards. Now, this is widespread across suburban Auckland, and so that's where most of you live and work. And so there is significant change everywhere across suburban Auckland. Interestingly, they have introduced the concept of a walkable catchment, and we'll talk a bit more about this in the presentation. And this requires at least six stories of development around something called rapid transit stops. And if you think of our train stations and the Northern busway for that six stories around the edge of the city center. So that's really heading into the area of Ponsonby, south of Queen Street and over towards New Market and the edge of all of the Metropolitan centers. Now, currently, very few areas in our Unitary Plan provides for this.

And you'll see in green text in the bottom right hand corner that we're not seeking feedback on these intensification policies as the government requirements. We don't particularly have a choice about doing them, but it is really important to understand the policy concept. So we've been doing a lot of testing of six stories and what does that do? What does it look like? And so I've just provided a couple of images of some of our modeling so that you can understand what six stories looks like adjacent to what is commonly seen across suburban Auckland and around our centers, two to three story developments. So I just sort of popped those images in to help you visualize what six stories might look like and these two versions of that on screen at present.

I'd like to just talk about these concepts of walkable catchments. The Council, in its policy direction setting, has established that the Walkable catchment is 15 minutes from the city center zone, and so that's around 1200 meters. And from the edge of our Metropolitan centers and our rapid transit stops, it's around 800 meters. I've made the words around red because they are important, because it's not exactly 1200 and it's not exactly 800.

But these distances are ones that the planning committee considered appropriate, particularly for some parts of the population who might find covering longer distance hard to achieve. Now the Council is seeking feedback on our approach to Walkable catchments and the distances, and you can do that via the Have your say website. We talked on the previous slide about the edge of existing and planned rapid transit stops. So existing transit stops are what the train stations and the bus way as we know it, and planned transit stops, projects that are funded in the next ten years. And so that's usually in the regional land transport plan, which has a ten year horizon. Projects outside of the ten year horizon generally don't fall into the idea of a planned transit stock. And what is rapid transit, you might ask? It's really these things and there are some parameters around us. So it's not every bus route and every bus stop. Rather, it's where you have a frequent service at least every 15 minutes, all day, seven days a week. It's consistent, it's reliable, it has high capacity. So if you think of the trains in the NX two type busses and it's separated from other vehicles, particularly if you think of the Northern bus way.

We also looked at modifying factors for the development of the extent of our Walkable catchments. So we looked at where public transport was a factor, and we also looked at environmental factors and there are a list there. Some of those affect how far people can walk and some of them affect how far people want to

walk. What does that look like? It's this sort of image that you see on screen, and that is on the GIS viewer. The round circle that is dashed is as the Crow flies 800 meters from the Metropolitan Center zone. The Orange area that is inside the Crow flies circle is the actual distance that people are willing to walk and can walk depending on those modifying factors. So when you look at those on the GIS viewer, you'll see these types of irregular shapes and they're dependent on those modifying factors. We're very interested to hear from you through the feedback if you think we've got some of those extents wrong or we've missed something that is important and is a common walkway that you know people use.

Moving on to the Policy 3D as it's called, which is an intensification around our centers. This is what Policy 3D requires of us, enables building heights and density commensurate, which is a big word with the level of commercial activity and community service and that is within an adjacent to town centers, local centers and neighborhood centers. We have a centers hierarchy. At the bottom of the hierarchy we have our neighborhood centers, then we have local centers and then we have business centers. Neighborhood centers are often your corner dairy or your corner petrol station or a small group of shops along the street. Business and local center zones are the bigger ones and then the big town centers. You can see an example of that. What we've done is we've identified the size of the town and local centers. We have some small and large town centers and local centers and we are required to assess those in terms of the accessibility to them. So we've done that work and we have come up with four town centers that are large town centers and have high accessibility. We're suggesting terraced housing and apartment zone for at least 400 meters around the center. So that's about half of the walkable catchments to the train stations.

For the local centers that are large local centers and have high accessibility and the town centers that have smaller and have high accessibility we're suggesting in our preliminary response 200 meters from the center. Local centers that are small will have very low accessibility in our town centers with our accessibility. We're not suggesting any increase in intensification other than applying the medium density residential standards around those centers. And that's the same for the neighborhood centers so if you think around your corner dairies and your strips of shops. What does this look like? So there's no intensification in the outer lying areas of the region. We identified eleven centers in the north and the west, eleven in the south and the east and 22 centers across the Auckland isthmus where we will be increasing the intensification of the residential around those centers.

Just moving on to the medium density residential standards which were enacted in December last year. What they require they have some mandatory objectives, policies and standards that need to go into our unitary plan. They enable three stories and three dwellings per site without a resource consent. More than three dwellings you do still need a resource consent. We have proposed to amend the terraced housing and apartment zone to comply with these requirements in our centers and our walkable catchments in our mixed housing urban zone to comply with the MDRS requirements across suburban Auckland. This is except where there might be more relaxed standards already or where a qualifying matter applies, and I'll speak about that in the moment. There are also a number of small settlements outside of our urban environment that this does not apply to. Now in the green text on the right hand side, we are saying that we're not seeking feedback on the MDRS because they are legislated government requirements so we

cannot change them. What it might look like I've just provided you with a couple of images here of the sort of development that is anticipated to be built in accordance with the medium density residential standards, and you may have seen some of that starting to be constructed in your local areas. Policy four provides for qualifying matters, and these are really important. What this means is that where a qualifying matter exists, Council may reduce or change the building heights and densities.

However, where a qualifying matter applies, it may still be subject to some level of intensification. So some qualifying matters create either a specific limitation for sites or neighborhoods, or prevent what are called reverse sensitivity effects. And that's a bit of planning jargon for you, which means that residents who might complain about activities adjacent to them. And so we might limit the residential development on sites close to a qualifying matter, like an industrial zone. We're still busy with qualifying matters. We're still assessing the best mapping techniques to provide for them, whether it be zones overlays, a new technique or a combination. But we have put most of the qualifying matters into the GIS viewer. This is a very word, heavy slide. These are all of the qualifying matters, and I won't read them all out. You'll see at the bottom item J in red, what this is this is the government's provision for Council to make some decisions about what are qualifying matters that are appropriate in the Auckland context. Items A to I are the national level qualifying matters that apply to all councils. Now, again, in the green text, we note that we're not seeking feedback on qualifying matters that are required by the government A to I, so those are listed there.

But we are seeking feedback on J matters, so the Council identified matters that we're calling J. We've identified a number of these in our planning committee resolved to adopt those in July 2021. We've done a lot of analysis on them since that time, and we've identified that some of those July 2021 qualifying matters do not affect intensification, and we've mapped where all of the qualifying matters apply, and they are in the GIS field now. The Council identify qualifying matters, require a site by site analysis, and are required to meet a high evidential standard. And we continue to work on these, and particularly on items associated with infrastructure constraints. We've also been working with our mana whenua, and there's a number of potential qualifying matters that will be presented to the planning committee for their consideration as part of the forthcoming plan change. And you'll note in green that we are seeking feedback on these matters that are J, so please feel free to provide feedback through the have your say on our J matters.

I've also just added a slide in here about special character areas. You may have seen some commentary in the media about special character areas, so I thought I'd add in a little bit if you were curious about what they are. Essentially they're older parts of Auckland that have special architectural or other build character values. They are covered by an overlay in the Auckland Unitary Plan currently. The government is, however, directing us to enable increased housing density within walkable catchments and some of these walkable catchments are exactly where our special character areas are and the government importantly has not included special character areas as a qualifying matter. However, through using subset J, we are proposing to include areas of special character. If this proceeds to be made operative in the Unitary Plan, it will reduce building heights and housing density in those areas to ensure the character values of those areas are retained. This proposal is shown in the MPS map viewer and importantly, it

responds to the special character qualifying matter and is called it in the legend of the GIS view of the two storey single dwelling residential area.

So trying to pull all this together, there's a lot going on. And so we have three main themes. We have our rapid transit stops and our walkable catchments, along with our centers, which is in the circle. We've got qualifying matters that constrain intensification and we've got medium density residential standards and all other residential zones.

What we are doing in our plan changes that will come forward in August and that we're asking for feedback on presently is your view of all of this, and that will help us to weave these together into a planning framework that works for Auckland.

Just a quick slide now, on the light rail. Currently are the decisions on the location of the stations along the Light rail corridor. They're not going to be made in time for our August 20 deadline, and it may be better to apply the National Policy statement and the medium density residential standards to the light rail corridor once there is greater certainty about the route and the station locations. And you can see the route generally on the map on the right hand side. So we have treated this area differently. When you look at the GIS viewer as we're not sure exactly where the stations will be and hence where the Walkable catchments will extend to, we've just provided that because that might have sort of caused some uncertainty about what we were doing in those areas, and you may have questions about that after this presentation. We're just about there in terms of the next steps, we're into the first bullet point public engagement from now until the 9 May. We have ongoing engagement with Mana whenua and attended a number of Hui throughout this year, and we're seeking their feedback on the draft plan change the preliminary response you see. We need to report back to the planning committee in late May, providing the committee with a review of the feedback and what that means in terms of any changes to the proposals as we work towards the draft plan change. We need to report to our local boards in June and our iwi in June. And then on the 4 August, we will report to the planning committee again seeking approval for our proposed plan change to be notified. And we expect that will be done by the 20 August. So that brings me to the end of the presentation. I do hope that wasn't too long. I hope it made sense most of the time. I'll hand it back to you, Megan. Thank you.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Eryn you did a great job, but I know there is a lot of information to take in. Having said that, we've got a lot of questions already that have come through. So that's fantastic. Please, if you still have questions, feel free to post them in the Q and A function. I can predict already that we won't be able to get through them all. So just letting you know that we'll get through as many as we can tonight. But we will take your questions and we will try and answer those for you after the session sometime. So just before I go into Q and A, I'm just wondering, Councillors Coom, Dalton and Young, was there anything any of you would like to add or acknowledge tonight? Just leave it open for you. Thanks.

Councillor Angela Dalton

Thanks Megan. I just want to acknowledge the presentation by you it was really good and to welcome everyone here. And I'm so grateful to see all of the questions coming through because we're all on this learning journey together and it'll be great to get feedback from people across the region. So thank you.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Thanks Councillor Dalton, anyone else? Councilor Coom?

Councillor Pippa Coom

Yes, Kia ora and thank you for everybody who's joined tonight. We've got a huge number of participants, which is fantastic. I think it's really important to emphasize that this is a preliminary response and it's a pre notification engagement that we are undertaking. So this is very much a time to tell us, have we got it right? This is what we've got out to put out there as an initial response. But there's a lot more work to do before a notification in August. So very keen to get the feedback and also to work through this whole heap of questions. Lots of different angles there. So I better let the team get on with them. Crack on. Thank you.

Councillor Paul Young

I totally agree with my fellow councillors and thank you to the staff in particular, we got so many participating and that's a new role and that's a big challenge for our city so let's work in together. Thank you.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Kia ora Councillors, appreciate that thank you very much. So again, just a reminder Q and A function that you know. Also, if it hasn't happened already, it will shortly we're going to just flick you a link to the [Akhaveyoursay.nz/housing](https://akhaveyoursay.nz/housing) website. So that is [Akhaveyoursay.nz/housing](https://akhaveyoursay.nz/housing) that's where you'll get the information that you have tonight, more fact sheets and access to the GIS view of the maps if you haven't seen those already, and there's the opportunity to provide written feedback in particular. So if that hasn't come out to you already, it will very shortly.

Right let's crack into the questions Noel, I should have given you a heads up. This is first one for you, please Noel. So the reference here is the Birkenhead and North Coast points removal of the special character overlay. The question is, what does this mean for building on a two story single dwelling residential area with no special character qualifying matters? And how does this fit with the changes outlined in the medium density residential standard? The info sheet five. Noel, thank you.

Noel Redden

Thanks, Megan. It's Noel Redden here manager Heritage. As the question implies, the special character overlay is not proposed for some areas of Birkenhead and Northcote Point. And what will replace it, as I

understand will be what the NDRS requires in that area, which is three stories. But perhaps one of the planning experience could answer the question about what is replacing the special character in those areas, but from a special character perspective, it only applies to a limited area now in Birkehead and Northcote point.

Eryn Shields

Megan, if perhaps I could add to Noels reply, what this means for the site that the question relates to is that the owner of that site can develop up to three dwellings of three stories in height without the need for a resource consent. If they want to go beyond that, they will need to obtain a resource consent from Council. And so that is aligned with what is outlined in information sheet number five that's on the have your say site.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Eryn, I appreciate that the next question relates to the Auckland Light Rail overlay. I might use chairs prerogative and just quickly respond to that myself. There was a slide that may have answered the question, but the question is explaining that light rail overlay. So what we've done, as Erin has said, is we've not yet done all of the work to understand what intensification might look like along that route. And so when you see it on the map, you'll see a little text box that says it's still an area under investigation. So you won't see any change in the zoning pattern in that corridor area at this stage. As part of this preliminary consultation, we will need to make a decision for August about what that looks like. But for the purposes of this period of time and how much work we still need to do there, we haven't provided any increased intensification provisions in that corridor. That doesn't stop any of you from providing feedback about that, although we still are not entirely clear where the route or the weather station locations will be. But please do provide feedback around that corridor, even if we haven't proposed anything for your feedback specifically, the next question Eryn, I might ask you to start, please.

What percentage of demand for housing is from developers and investors now?

Eryn Shields

It's a good question. I can't say I know the answer, but I know that the Council, through the National Policy Statement, was required to undertake a housing and business assessment. And that was reported to the planning committee in July last year. And what our economic people did was look at the nature and extent of demand across Auckland, the capacity of housing to meet that demand, and which bit of that capacity was feasible for development. And so I would recommend that if the person who asked that question would like to access that report, it was in the July planning committee agenda, it's an extensive economic assessment. And not being an economist, I looked at it from a planner's eyes, but that might well provide a good insight for anybody who is interested in the issues of demand and capacity and feasible capacity. I'm not sure if that holds the answers Megan.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Thanks, Eryn. I think that's going to be a difficult one to answer. There will be no absolute number for that or percentage of demand for housing from developers or investors. But thank you, Erin. That's pointing to some further information, hopefully that's helpful.

To continue for the next question for you please, can you explain what the two story single dwelling residential area zone is and which rules are proposed to apply to that?

Eryn Shields

Yeah. What this is about is that in the legend of the GIS viewer, there is something called the two storey single dwelling residential area. And that is essentially the equivalent of what is known as a single house zone. And the approach that we've taken in that viewer is to identify, particularly for special character areas, where we would expect the density and height to be reduced. And while we continue to work on exactly how we might do that, for the plan change to provide the public with an understanding of the spatial extent of where that applies, we have called the overlay that you see on the viewer two story single dwelling residential area. It won't be called that in the final plan change, but that is what that means. So if you see that, if you think single house zone, that is known and operative in the unitary plan, you're on the right track.

Megan Tyler (MC)

I appreciate that. I'll give you a rest for a second. Ross, question for you, please. How rigid are the walkable catchment areas? And so if you remember the slide there, that was the Crow flies circle, I think Erin referenced it and the color within that. So how rigid are those walkable catchments, Ross? And are you considering defensible boundaries? I guess, like roads or Hills when you're considering the edge of those catchments?

Ross Moffatt

Got it. Thank you, Megan. I hope you can hear me. Yes walkable catchment work to define the boundaries certainly did consider the edges and those conditions on the route to get to those edges at the 800 meters or around 800 meters or 1200 meters. So we were looking at road boundaries, certainly property boundaries and the edges of zones like open space that the walkable catchment wouldn't apply to. So it was very particularly delivered through planning assessment, looking at the individual conditions of the edges and not just generated by a GIS function that sort of automatically applies it. So definitely it was adjusted to take account of a range of factors, including the topography that was experienced in walking to that edge. So hopefully that's given a bit of context.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Thank you, Ross. And that's certainly one of the areas we would appreciate any feedback on if it's an area that you particularly know might be your local area, if you think we haven't quite got that right, or in fact, there can be a greater walkable catchment for whatever reason, we'd really appreciate your feedback on that. Thank you, Ross. I appreciate that.

Tian, I'm going to throw to you. Next question is around subdivision. How is subdivision being approached? For example, the permitted three buildings under this medium density residential standards? Is that going to be permitted to subdivide to three lots as well? Thanks Tian.

Tian

So as a part of the NDRS, there is a specific requirement for residential subdivision to be a controlled activity, but there are a few additional clauses that apply that restrict the way that subdivision can be restricted based on lot sizes and building platforms and stuff like that. So it doesn't necessarily mean that it will automatically be limited three lots. It could be more, but these are still something that we are currently working through with the subdivision workstream, and we'll be able to provide more feedback later once we understand the requirements in more detail.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Kia ora Tian, Thank you for that.

Eryn we've got a question here that talks about these areas under investigation. I know I mentioned it a little and so did you. There's a reference, particularly to one in the Grafton area, the south of the hospital. Could you just give us a general reminder about what does under investigation mean? Why aren't we seeing any up zoning there, and what are we thinking about things?

Eryn Shields

Okay yeah thanks, Megan. It's a good question and you'll see quite a number of areas in the viewer that are under investigation. What we have in our unitary plan currently is a thing that is called a precinct which sits on top of our zones, and it usually manages a particular aspect of development that the zone doesn't manage currently. And it can be a curious thing or it could be a particular area of development. And so we have the better part of 90 precincts that we are working and analyzing because a lot of those precincts have residential density and height requirements and some of those no longer are appropriate under the NDRS and the walkable catchments. It's a big piece of work that we've got started, but we weren't ready to be able to provide the analysis of all those precincts as part of this preliminary response. And so we have identified those areas as under investigation. And the signal there is that when it comes time to notify the plan change, there will be changes to some of those precincts. And that will be true for the one at Grafton that is referred to. Thanks, Megan.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Sure if I could just add to that, as Councillor Coom mentioned, this is a preliminary consultation before the formal consultation period in August, so we still have not had the time to do all of the work. I personally don't think that's a bad thing that doesn't stop the conversation or the feedback, but it does mean that we've wanted to highlight really clearly where we still need to do work. And we haven't perhaps seen the implementation of this NPSUD work all those up zoning, so we just wanted to make that really clear for you as well. So that's also some context to that. Thanks, Eryn.

Eryn Shields

Sorry I was just going to answer the next question in the chat about height overlays.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Okay please feel free

Eryn Shields

We have a number of height overlays scattered across all of the centers throughout the urban environment. Some of those are overlays that provide greater height and development capacity than what the NPSUD requires, but some reduce the height as indicated in the question. And so we are working on identifying all of those controls that are less than what the NPSUD requires and they will be removed or the heights will be increased to the requirements of the MPS as part of the plan change. So that's just another aspect and a detail which is important, but it's another aspect that we're working on. So they will change if you are concerned about a height control that achieves a restraint on the yield in a particular area.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Kia ora Eryn, thank you. Tian, I'll shoot to you again, another subdivision question. Is there a minimum sight size or land area for the medium density?

Tian

No, the NPSUD does not specify a minimum site size for the medium density zoning. The medium density residential standards apply to all sites that are defined as part of the relevant residential zone. It doesn't specify a site size.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Good Tian, thank you. And I'll maybe leave you and Wayne to find out who wants to answer this one again, a kind of subdivision certainly a development question. Could you define the term net site area and what makes it up? So, for example, if the site size is 800 m² and a new density is 50% of the net site area, does that always equal 400 square meters?

Tian

Yeah, I can answer that one. So the NetSite area is defined currently in our unitary plan, and it's the total area of the site, excluding any part of the site that is subject to a road winding designation, any part of a site that's part of an ancient strip, any part of the site that is part of a legal right of way and any part of the site that's an access site. So for example, if you had a front lot that was 800 meters squares, then that would be your entire NetSite area usually, unless you've got road winding designation. However, when you have a rear site, the entrance strip would be excluded and that would be excluded from your NetSite area. That is just part of your gross site area and your net site area excludes the entrance strip. But if you require further information, there is some diagrams in the definitions chapter of the unitary plan.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Thank you for that. I hope that's clear. Tian, if you had an opportunity, maybe there's a link to maybe that definition or something, perhaps put that in the chat.

Tian

Yes, I can send that through as well.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Great. Thank you. Right. We have a few questions here, I think particularly around the next housing suburban and special character. The first one relates to the difference between the two story single dwelling residential area and single house zone. I think Erin responded to that to say the same thing. Eryn, can you just confirm that?

Eryn Shields

Yes Megan, that's correct. It's the same question that we had above. In terms of the second bullet point, is there any residential mixed house suburban remaining? There is another category when you look on the viewer, which is two storey dwelling medium residential, and so that is where mixed housing suburban currently exists. So we're still reflecting mixed housing suburban currently and indicating that there may well be some constraints on development where that zone currently is in operation. Does that make sense?

Megan Tyler (MC)

Sure. Thanks, Eryn. The third question is, is the special character area to remain? And I think chapter D 18 is in relation to the Unitary Plan. Noel, do you want to prep answer that?

Noel Redden

Yes, sure. The special character area where it's identified as a qualifying matter will be retained. And if I could just go on to there is another question there around. The question relates to the inconsistency between the historic heritage overlay and the special character overlay and then an underlying zoning being that. And that's a valid point to raise through the feedback. Eryn, I'm not sure whether you have a comment on why we have to do it that way, but certainly it's an issue that we're conscious of.

Eryn Shields

Thanks, Noel. Yeah, the requirements for six stories in our walkable catchments in particular are enshrined in the NPSUD and the challenge for us as the Council is how we reconcile the special character areas that are in walkable catchments alongside that requirement for six stories to be enabled. And so therefore, the way that we do manage special character that remains in place through this process will mean that there will be some provisions in the unitary plan that constrain the height and walkable catchments. So six stories will not be enabled where there is special character.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Kia ora Eryn, thank you for that. The next question relates I guess it relates to the question around precincts or the areas under investigation in that Grafton precinct that was the example that the audience member referenced. The question here is around Flat Bush precinct. So it's a similar question about how the very prescriptive typology, quite detailed precinct, how do they work under this new MDRS framework? Thanks, Eryn.

Eryn Shields

Yeah, it's another good question. There are some very prescriptive precincts, and a lot of the more bespoke residential areas have used precincts to provide what they consider to be really high quality urban design and great environments to live in. And so that includes, on occasion, rules around heights and density for residential dwellings. A task in front of us. And we've started this is to look at all of those precincts, including those at Flat Bush, and reconcile them with the requirements of MDRS and also if any other NPSUD requirements. And so you will see change in those precincts. We just haven't quite got there yet and it is on occasion, particularly complex.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Good Eryn, stay on the line. The next question. There's a comment in a question and it says, I welcome the new rules for their clarity, but have concerns about the qualifying matters you're trying to add, for example, the Ridge protection, which are vague and caused difficulties for applicants. What will be done to make their meaning and application clear?

Eryn Shields

Yeah, that's the question. The questioner is referring to the Ridgeline protection overlay, which is an overlay that exists mostly out adjacent to the Waitakere Ranges and also in the Hunuvas, where significant Ridge loans extend into the urban area. And the councils in the past have sought to protect the landscape values of that Ridgeline by reducing the height of residential development on and around and on the top of the ridges. So you're right that sometimes the provisions are not particularly clear, and that is a matter that we are trying to attend to ensure that when development does occur where a Ridgeline protection overlay or any other overlay is in place, that the people who are using the plan and the people who are developing in accordance with the plan understand those provisions. So we are working not just to implement the government's requirements, but also to make sure that the unitary plan works as an integrated whole and as straightforward for plan users to understand as possible.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Kia ora thanks, Eryn I appreciate that. Maybe this is you again, Eryn. The question is how we are complying with some of the new provisions of the Resource Management Act, which says every relevant residential zone of a Council must have the medium density residential standards incorporated into that zone when you propose to keep the single housing zone.

Eryn Shields

Yeah, that's a good question as well. When you look at the GIS viewer, you'll see that inside the urban environment and if you use the slider tool which some of you may have found, you will see that we are uniformly changing single house and mixed housing suburban to be the dark Orange that is equivalent to mixed housing urban. We are only keeping the single zone at the moment for those rural settlements outside the urban environment. And so you're likely to see very little if any single zone inside the operative inside the urban environment that we know as it is today.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Eryn, you're absolutely right. I think perhaps the next phase and while this wasn't the question, but the next element to that is, however, the qualifying matters can then further constrain or reduce that development that would otherwise be occurring. And an example of that is the special character area. So while it may not show anymore as single house zone is, if that qualifying matter is applied, then it will effectively restrict that development down to what was effectively the single house. So I guess that's the next step for that question is that we are in what we're putting out at the moment. We are still applying some level of restriction to those MDRS provisions. And the question is, have we got that right? And so that's again, part of the feedback we really appreciate from you all on that.

Eryn Shields

And if I may add Megan, we're still sort of talking about the single house zone because we're conscious of that. People understand what that is and they can visualize it and they see it on their streets if they live in

those areas. And so to help people understand the implications of the NPSUD and what we're doing, we're still using it. But as a zone, it might not feature in our future unitary plan, but it may well be something equivalent or similar to the single house zone used to implement some of the qualifying matters like special character.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Good one for you, please. What assessment work has been done to justify retaining so much special character overlay when much of this housing stock is past being upgraded to meet the new tenancy rules?

Noel Redden

The Council undertook survey of all 21,000 residential special character properties either via site visit or when locked down came about via Google Street View. We assist those 21,000 properties against the criteria and the unitary plan in terms of whether the ability of a house to be renovated to meet new tenancy rules that was not considered. It's not possible for Council to determine that unless we were entering the house itself, which we did not do, I would say that much of the stock that we surveyed was in remarkably good condition and we are also experiencing large numbers of resource consent to renovate many of these dwellings.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Kia ora Noel and thank you for that. Wayne, question for you please. Is Council intending to change the height in relation to boundary rule for the terraced housing and apartment building zone?

Wayne

Megan, thanks for that question. Yes, council is currently investigating changes to the height to boundary rule in the terraced housing apartment zone. The NPSUD Direct Council will enable at least six stories within a walkable catchment. So obviously it stands to reason that we ought to not have rules which prevents development occurring of up to six stories. And the next question follow ups relates to the alternative hydro vision boundary. So yes, we will be considering revisiting that standard as part of our work. The information sheet number three of a recorded residential intensification to highlight some of the parts of investigation we're looking into and one of that is looking at potentially a 19 meters plus a 60 degree recession plane.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Thanks, Wayne thank you for that. This question relates it could be Wayne or Aaron relates to the medium density residential standard. Does that apply to the two story single dwelling residential area zone? And if not, what is the rule for this zone? I can't recall have we answered that one? And if not, could someone answer that please?

Eryn Shields

Sorry about that, Megan. Yes, we have answered this and we have invented the two story single dwelling residential area to indicate where we are contemplating constraining development because of a qualifying matter and it usually applies in the relation to the special character areas and so it is akin to the single house own. However, it will not necessarily be called that when we get to the notified version of the plan change. The next question is for me as well, Megan, about the bus way between Pakuranga and panmure yes. So Councillor Young, who's on the call has taken a keen interest in this as well. And you may recall from the presentation I talked about the existing and planned transit stops and where we're going with the bus way is that the stops have not yet been identified and notice of requirement for a designation to take the land for the bus stops as not there yet. So we haven't identified walkable catchments around those future bus way stops. When that happens, we will it's important to remember that the national policy statement is not a one shot policy statement, that it will continue to apply into the future. And so when the bus way and the stations are operative in the plan having been designated, we will also be doing a plan change to introduce walkable catchments around those stations to support the public transport endeavour associated with that busway.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Kia ora Eryn, that's right. There's another question that's a little bit similar that talks about an earlier slide mentioning intensification around existing transport infrastructure or something to that effect. What about future transport possibilities? And I think Eryn, you answered that in the sense that the NPSUD does have quite a narrow definition of kind of rapid transit and it needs to have gone quite a way through a process before the intensification from a Council perspective gets put on the site. Is that right? Is there anything else to add to that?

Eryn Shields

No, I think you've got that.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Great. Thank you. Here's a general question maybe Eryn as well. Will a combination of historic heritage, special character and national heritage volcanic height sensitive overlays be sufficient to trigger the qualifying matters and to exempt a site from the NPSUD and the medium density residential thing.

Eryn Shields

Thanks, Megan. I think the short answer is yes, we've got a way to go in this process. And so if those are matters that you're particularly interested in seeing able to achieve a qualifying matter, we welcome your feedback on that. And you might wish to make a submission when the plan changes notified in August as well.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Kia ora Eryn. Let me just add that as Eryn said in his presentation, the act itself provides a list of qualifying matters that are kind of automatic, and those include historic heritage. So Council doesn't have to make a decision about whether or not that's a qualifying matter. Where we have historic heritage designations or provisions, then they continue to be qualifying matters. Similarly, we are saying that the volcanic View shafts are also automatic qualifying matters. An example of one where we have discretion, i.e. we are proposing it at the moment, is the one of special character. So again, the questioner here may just want to have a quick look at that list of kind of automatic qualifying matters versus the ones that Council are proposing. And the most obvious one is special character. That's not an automatic one. Wayne or Eryn, qualifying matters aside will the current single house zone, urban and suburban zones be renamed? I think we kind of answer that one where we have we've said that while the single house zone for example, is remaining in the small, particularly coastal or small settlements or on the Islands, we are changing the suburban and single house zonings within the urban and suburban areas. Is there anything you wanted to add to that?

Eryn Shields

No, not particularly.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Wayne, how do you plan to accommodate service provision without resource consent?

Wayne

Yeah, that's a great question. I think there's several components in this question I attempt to address them more individually. So firstly, in terms of not requiring resource consensus development that only relates to free dwellings or less, so that's been mandated by the resource management amendment. So due to parliamentary supremacy, it is law. And so Auckland Council must give effect to that in regard to development of four or more dwellings. The provisions will still require resource consent, so the more intense development there will still be the requirement and expectation for surfacing of infrastructure as well. I also note that I think as Tian alluded to, we are still considering and progressing investigations into the subdivision component of the provisions. So even though it's a contributor to activity, that may still provide some opportunity for Council to assess infrastructure requirements for those MDRS type of developments. Eryn, I'm just wondering if you have any other comment from a qualifying matter perspective around this question or cool.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Wayne, that's fantastic. Thank you. Eryn we have kind of a user question around the GIS viewer itself, asking how do we view how do we view the qualifying matters on the viewer so that you can see what

that does to the MDRs kind of zoning provisions? Are you able to answer that easily without showing the viewer itself?

Eryn Shields

Yeah, I can try. Thanks, Megan. Before you start with the viewer, I would recommend that you read the information sheet that is on the have your Say website. There's also a video that shows how to operate the various buttons and parts of the GIS viewer that we have put together with a voiceover to help people understand how to do that. Essentially, the viewer has a great many different functions depending on where you are and what you do. I think the key one to remember is that if you haven't zoomed in far enough, you tend to not see anything and stuff doesn't look like it's there. But when you Zoom in, all of a sudden things are become able to be seen. So remember to Zoom in and out as you use it.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Got it. You did well there. It's always hard to explain how to use something when we're not showing it, but the viewer has layers of information. So please do look at that video and that information sheet. It is on the AK have your Say site. You've got the link in the chat on that as well on your Q and A function. Hopefully you'll be able to use that. Well, Ross, maybe I'm shooting to you. Does Council have a policy for providing more public open space, amenities and community facilities due to intensification?

Ross Moffatt

Yeah. Thanks, Megan. Generally we do, and over many years we have attempted to adjust their investment in community facilities in open space in terms of acquisitions, where it aligns with our growth strategy, which is essentially in and around our town centers and major hubs and their transport. Yes, there is an alignment there. Of course. It's always about the budget that's available and prioritized for acquiring open space or paying for community facilities. And there's always a lot of competition and candidates for funding in these areas. Generally, though, it's not something the NPS has directed us to do or requires of us. So it's certainly something that we as a Council need to continue working at and aligning with where the growth is expected to happen in a game, it's around our major centers and transport stops. So there is an ongoing program and has been for many years of this type of investment in these decisions getting made. But this new NPSUD is an additional potential dollar for potential growth being enabled, so there's potential for more intensification and more people needing those amenities and facilities. So that challenge continues.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Kia ora Thank you for that. Noel. There's a question here about what is the methodology adopted by Council when identifying the special character area? I know you referenced it a little bit earlier. Is there any more detail or any FAQ you can point anybody to.

Noel Redden

Yes, thanks, Megan. What I was going to say in response to that question is we have a document that sets out the methodology for the special character area survey. So I would suggest you, through the links provided, request a copy of that document. Plus, also there is what we've called a survey findings document for each area. When you set the methodology alongside the survey findings report, you'll get a better understanding of how the survey was conducted. So if you go to our contact details, we will send you those documents to you.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Kia ora Thank you Noel. So yes please through that again, AK, have your say if you want further detail about that methodology, please just ask and we will send it out to you no problem. Wayne, this links a little bit to some answers you've given previously. Can you clarify if Council is proposing to change the terrace housing and apartment building rules as background this question asks? I thought I saw a slide saying that the model terrace housing, apartment building zone, six story.

Wayne

Kia ora Megan, thanks for that. Council is absolutely looking into modifying the terraced housing and apartment building rules, as I think Eryn alluded to in his presentation, NPSUD directs council to enable six stories. So as part of those changes to standard the modelling we've looked at is to see how a typical site and what the rules are needed to allow that six story to occur. Also, as part of the modelling, we also want to consider how we can ensure that the six story has been enabled, still delivering some of those quality and well-functioning urban environment outcomes, particularly effects on joining sites and its relation to the streets. So as I mentioned previously, information sheet number three provided, and the link will give you an indication of some of the standards we're looking at to sort of achieve those multiple outcomes.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Kia ora Wayne, appreciate that. We've got time for I think two more questions then I'd just like to provide a bit of an opportunity to wrap up. So again, thank you. If you have any last minute questions, do please pop them in the chat and we will post those responses up again on that AK, have your same website. So second to last question, Eryn again this is a bit of a viewer question so do your best help with this response. Is the NPSUD layer the only layer to consider when looking at zoning changes, I. E. If there is no change in the zone shown in the NPSUD layer, then no zone changes being proposed, even if for example it's in a walkable catchment?

Eryn Shields

Yeah and I think but I don't know that the question relates to the nonresidential zones that we have, like the town center, the Metropolitan Center and the industrial and business zones. And so currently they

have not changed. In the GIS viewer, we are looking at the height requirements in those zones because some of them do not enable six stories and all buildings in walkable catchments must be six stories in height. So the zones aren't necessarily changing, but maybe some of the height requirements will. The next question about commensurate, the definition of that is something that is in proportion to something else.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Thanks, Eryn. So that was just that last question was what does commensurate mean? And that was in the context of the scale of intensification required by these government regulations versus the appropriateness of that in any particular location, wasn't it? Was that the context of comments?

Ross Moffatt

That's right. Can I add to that, Megan, and things Eryn? I think this one pops up in Policy 3D. I think it is where it says that the extent of an area around the town, local or neighbourhood center for Intensification should be commensurate with the level of activities in that center to do with commercial or community activities. So commensurate would mean it's sort of like a size and number factor. So if you've got a large town or local centre with lots of services and shops, then the area around that, which we have made some choices about which we're asking for feedback, is the area that's commensurate with the size of that center. So there's explanation for this in the info sheets and on the feedback form as well. Thank you.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Kia ora Ross. Thank you for that. I'm just looking at the time. Let's try and squeeze in a couple more. Eryn, can I get you to answer this one please? Are the zones in the future urban zones being updated as well? If you could just define future urban zones and then are they being updated as well? Thank you.

Eryn Shields

Sure. Thanks, Megan. So for those of you who might not be familiar, the Council during the development of the Unitary plan, identified a great deal of land that was on the edge of the city and it features North, south and west and northwest and we've called that future urban. And so it's not urban, it mostly looks like paddocks and is rural in nature. But we are progressively rezoning that to provide for urban environments, and that's no short process. And so that has started to happen in some places. I've just lost track of the question. Yes, sorry. In terms of the response that the Council is making, we're not anticipating to make any of the future urban zone into a live urban zone. So no rezoning of future urban land as something that could have terraced housing and apartments or MDRS. What we have provided for in terms of the regional policy statement is a process by which a structure plan is developed so that we can manage things like bulk infrastructure and where it all goes and how it is funded and financed. And following a structure plan, we then do plan changes to the Unitary plan to make that land a live urban zone. So that

doesn't change. And there's a great number of plan changes underway doing that at present, and they will continue into the future, I expect.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Eryn, thank you for that. I'm going to give you perhaps one more, I think.

Eryn Shields

Sure.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Within a walkable catchment, if a terraced house zone is next to a special character or one of those two story residential zones, does this limit the height of the terraced housing zone?

Eryn Shields

Yeah, it's a good question because this is likely to occur in our walkable catchments that sit on top and around special character areas if they are retained. Currently, we are working on what we're calling some transitions between six stories and what is often one to two story special character houses and how that might work. We have limited ability to do this given the requirements that we have to meet in terms of the NPSUD and the Amendment Act. But we are certainly exploring that issue and would be interested to hear if you have ideas about that, if you could put that into a feedback that would be appreciated.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Kia ora thanks, Eryn. I'll let you take a breath because I will just start wrapping this up, firstly by offering Councillor Dalton, Coom or Young any comments or reflections that they have on the session, any questions they really wanted to answer that they didn't get a chance to. Any comments you want to make, maybe. Councillor Dalton, I will start with you first.

Councillor Angela Dalton

Megan, thank you for that and I could just about repeat what I said at the beginning because I didn't have my microphone down so nobody could hear me. But just a great participation tonight. And the questions that have been asked are really valuable to me as well. I think that's the importance that we really understand how Auckland is feeling about that and what's important to them. And like all of us, we learn through repetition and this is adding great value. So I look forward to seeing the questions and the answers that we haven't been able to get to. There are other things around special character areas and it's not just towards the housing. Sometimes it is to protect significant urban ngahere and that's a point particularly out in the south and it's good to see that there are people here that are interested in how they can give effect to that. And by submitting, that's the end game, isn't it? Get those submissions in and just

thank you, Megan, to your team who have answered the questions and giving us all an opportunity to have our say, because that certainly wasn't the government's requirement, was it? So appreciate all of that work, kia ora everyone. Thanks to everyone that's come on tonight.

Councillor Pippa Coom

I think that's a really good sum up from Angela, so I'm very happy to leave it there. Covered all the main points and the importance of listening to the feedback, learning lots more new information, which is great. So thanks to the team, and look forward to getting the feedback through the haveyoursay form online on the Council website.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Councillor young.

Councillor Paul Young

Me too, I think. Thank you to start and so many participate in a very good question, but I just want to emphasize there's lots of developer or builder, actually, probably not English speaking or different ethnic. We probably should have this kind of forum targeted in a different market segment to help to understand what's going changed in Auckland. Thank you.

Megan Tyler (MC)

Kia ora councillor young, thank you very much. I want to make a particularly special thanks to Eryn, Wayne, Ross, Tian, and Noel for answering all those questions. Particularly Eryn, you've had a lot of airtime tonight and have some tricky questions, so thank you for leading the team on the presentation. I just want to give any of you an opportunity, if you had any comments or anything you kind of wanted to say but didn't get a chance to or any messages you think we need to leave before we wrap up and no is fine, so that's all good. To everybody that's still online thank you so much. We really do appreciate your time on a Wednesday evening. The purpose, as we said at the beginning, was to provide you a background and overview really, of the changes that both the mandatory changes the government has made, but also the areas where we have some discretion and where we particularly want your feedback. This is a preliminary consultation. This is not the final informal one that will come in August. So the fact that some of our responses are not fully formed, I think is a really good opportunity for you to provide that feedback, to help provide some direction both to us as staff and to the elected members who will be ultimately making decisions about what we go out with in that formal consultation in August. So please feel free to provide feedback on anything. But just know that on the mandatory matters, there is nothing we can do about those the area we really want to focus on and those areas of discretion, those walkable catchments that intensification around centres and those qualifying matters. Again, I just point you to the [akhaveyoursay.nz/housing](https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/housing). Please use that link again. Provide your feedback. Get the information on the FAQ and the GIS viewers. Ask for information like the methodology that Noel has mentioned. Please use

that. You can re look at this recording or point your friends and colleagues to this as well. We are having a few more over the next couple of weeks, but if you get your feedback in by ninth of may, we really appreciate that to help us through the coming months heading to that August date. So again, thank you so much. We hope this has been useful for you. If you are traveling homes, please take care. Otherwise, enjoy the rest of your evening. Ka kete.