

Webinar 3 Transcript

27/04/2022

Phill Reid (MC)

Good evening everybody. Tena koto, welcome. I'm Phil Reid, the Auckland wide council planning manager within the chief planning office here at Auckland Council. I'll be facilitating the conversation this evening. So thank you for joining us for tonight's webinar for consultation, government's new housing rules and what it means for Auckland. A reminder, this consultation runs from the 19 April through until the 9 May. And do look at our website at [Akhaveyoursay.nz\housing](https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/akhaveyoursay/housing). There's a lot of information on there and I encourage you to go through the material. Tonight's webinar will give you an overview of the new rules from central government and how we think they could apply to Auckland. This plan change or series of plan changes for NPSUD is the most extensive of changes that will have made to the Unitary plan since it was proposed back in 2013. So the scale of this work warrants going through this phase of a preliminary response and opening to everybody the opportunity to understand more fully what's going on. First, a few housekeeping notes and Zoom etiquette. So this session is being recorded and will be available at that [Akhaveyoursay.nz\housing](https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/akhaveyoursay/housing). I'll mention that a few times. Just remind everybody to visit that website and it will be loaded up and available for everybody to see in the next few days.

Phill Reid (MC)

All members of the audience will have the cameras and microphones disabled. Members of the audience can ask questions by the Q&A function. And please note that due to time constraints, we've got best endeavours to get through and answer as many questions as possible. But we may not be able to get through everything, but we'll do our best. And please do remember to be respectful and not rude we will need to pass by questions and not respond to those that are of that nature. So joining us tonight, we have our chair of Planning committee, Councillor Chris Darby. We also have Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore, Councillor Christine Fletcher, and Councillor Pippa Coom - so a big, welcome to all of you tonight. From an officer's point of view here in Council myself, Auckland wide planning manager, joined by Ryan Bradley senior Planner, Ross Moffatt senior planner and Tian , senior planner. So we'll look to be able to answer questions and cover our basis for what you may ask us tonight. Session will go for around about 90 minutes. I think it'll probably be about 20 minutes of presentation material and then we'll look to be able to start to go through the questions that you send through to us.

Phill Reid (MC)

Now, I'd like to hand over to Ryan Bradley. Ryan, as a senior planner, has been the lead for us in relation to the intensification provisions within the plan and he also will try his hand at being able to present on some of the other matters, such as qualifying matters and other things as well. So over to you, Ryan. And reminder to everybody to put any questions that they've got through the Q and A function throughout the

presentation and we'll look to go through those and then I'll assign folks to answer those for you over to your Ryan. Thank you.

Ryan Bradley

Great. Thanks, Phil, and welcome, everyone. Thanks for coming along tonight. The agenda for this evening. First of all, this process is probably going to be about 20 minutes, I would guess. And what we first would look at is an overview and a background on where these proposed changes for anticipation have come from. We're going to look at the key parts of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, the first one being policy one about a well-functioning urban environment. Then policy three, which is a really key one around intensification. We also look at the medium density residential standards. These aren't actually from the National Policy Statement. There are really new that has been brought in by the government late last year when they amended the Resource Management Act, but they are one of the intensification directions that we have to follow. Then we'll look at qualifying matters under policy four, and these are basically reasons why we could reduce the otherwise required intensification required by the government. Then we'll just have a quick look at the open light rail corridor and why it's shown differently on the maps and then we'll look at the next steps in this process and then there'll be time for questions.

Ryan Bradley

So background to this, the evolution of the central government education directions. So 2016 was the first version of the initial Policy Statement on Urban development capacity. In 2020, the government revise basically did an overhaul of the National Policy Statement and it is now much more directive for councils and that's particularly the tier one Council. So Auckland, Hamilton, Tauranga, Wellington and Christchurch, where the greatest focus of education is there are a lot of directive, policies, objectives and policies in the National Policy Statement towards those tier one councils. So this 2020 version of the National Policy Statement introduced the idea of a well-functioning urban environment and it's got the intensification directions and policy three that are for specific areas also has the qualifying method, as I mentioned before, and it also talks about car parking minimum removal. So that was mandated by the government that we removed the minimum car parking requirements and that has already happened and isn't going to be the focus of our discussion tonight. The government then late last year also amended the Resource Management Act as an addition to the National Policy Statement. The main change there has been has an effect on Auckland unitary plan is the introduction of the medium density residential standards which we'll cover later on.

Ryan Bradley

So the Council has basically been working to implement these directives from the government over the last couple of years. So the National Policy Statement on Urban Development is about addressing the fundamentals of land supply, development capacity and infrastructure provision. And it requires councils to plan for growth ensure delivery of the well functioning urban environment and remove overly restrictive

barriers to development to allow growth up and out and locations that have good access to existing centers, services, and public transport networks. So that first policy on well functioning urban environments. That's the policy, I'm not going to read it out in full, but basically Policy one defines what a well functioning urban environment is and basically says all Council plan decisions need to enable a variety of homes and sites for businesses, have good accessibility, support competitive land and development markets, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and be resilient to climate change. And this policy will be implemented into the regional policy statement, part of the initial plan. So it's a high level overarching part of the initial plan. And so work is underway at the moment to see how well the existing regional policy statement addresses these matters and what changes we need to make to that part of that certification.

Ryan Bradley

Policy Three, so this is really the main meeting part of the national policy same on urban development. Policy Three is the main directive policy for Intensification, and there are four sub parts to it A to D, and each is focused on a different specific area where Intensification is required by the government. So Policy 3A is around the city center or the city center itself, and it requires us to allow as much development capacity as possible. Now, city center zone already provides a very significant amount of capacity, but there will probably be some changes to the rules plan to enable even more capacity in the city center. The second part is about Metropolitan centers, so those are listed there. There's ten in Oakland. And what the national policy statement requires is that the planning rules in each plan enable at least six stories to occur inside these Metropolitan centers. So most of our Metropolitan centers already provide for this, but there may be a few tweaks to make sure that the use plan enables that.

Ryan Bradley

So Policy three C is where the big changes start happening and this is related to walkable catchments around the city center, around the ten Metropolitan centers that you saw earlier and around rapid transit stops, which I'll talk about later and around how they're defined. But what it requires around a walkable catchment of those is at least six stories again, so very few areas currently provide for this plan. So this will be some significant changes to zoning in these areas to enable six story buildings to occur. It's important to note that these three directors I've just been through, policies ABNC are all mandatory. So we're not really seeking feedback on these specific policies, but we are seeking feedback on the next part, which is around how we've defined the walkable catchments. So walkable catchments have been determined by Council, so this is something we do want to get feedback on. So the Council determined first of all, that a 15 minute's walk was what we decided would be a walkable catchment around the city center itself. So that's around 1200 meters. Not exactly 1200 meters, but that's about the distance. And then for our Metropolitan centers and existing and planned rapid transit stocks, looking at around 800 meters. So the circle on the map you see there, this is just an example. But that circle shows 800 meters as the profiles. Obviously no one can walk in that exact direction. We are all constrained by roading and footpath networks. So the inner kind of shape there, that's in Orange, that is a GIS analysis of how far you

walk from the edge of that center zone there 800 meters using the existing networks of roads and footpaths and so on. So that's our second kind of way of focusing.

Ryan Bradley

And then the third way is we've used environmental factors. So beyond that, Jos calculated 800 medication. We also look at things like topography. So whether a steep Hills and so on, that might reduce the distance of people would be prepared to walk. So each of these walks has had that analysis done correct. So what does rapid transit means? So we talk about the rapid transit stop. So we put up the ten minutes and centers which were just before they're fairly obvious, the rapid transit stops. So the NPS, the national policy statement itself defines it as frequent, quick, reliable and high capacity. And they're largely separated from traffic. So go on their own route. So rail or busware essentially. And so in the old corporate context, we've defined it as basically all of the train stations except for the only Hunger branch line and busway stations.

Ryan Bradley

So it doesn't include standard bus stops or ferries. And also note that the walk attachments in the last slide talked about have been around existing and planned rapid transit stops. So the existing stops are fairly obvious, the ones that you see now. The planned ones mean that stops that are funded in the regional land transport plan over the next ten years and also have enough certainty around the location of the station that we know exactly where it will be so we can define a catchment from it. So within these walkable catchments, the Council proposes to use the terraced housing and apartment building zone to enable six stories. So currently the zone enables five stories. So we do need to make some changes to the zoning and we're going to look at amending the zone rules to enable six story buildings. So currently we're testing typical site sizes to see whether you can build six story buildings in these areas based on all the various stamps we have like height of boundary and other centers like that. So that's ongoing work and that will be available in August when we release plan change. So we've covered policy three C, which is the big one around walkable catchments. And that has a lot of change enabling six story buildings in areas that previously would not have enabled anywhere near that last policy or last branch of policy.

Ryan Bradley

Three is policy 3D, and that is around what relates to the smaller suburban centers around Auckland. So the neighborhood centers, the local centers, and the town centers, and what it requires is within adjacent to those centers, building heights and density commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services. So that's fairly broad and open to interpretation. So we only got this on the 21 December last year when this came through and some of the changes that government made. So we haven't had a lot of time to look at this. But we have tried to classify the suburban centers to determine which sensors have the most services and activities and therefore, which sensors would have the most anticipation around them. So we use three factors to do that. First of all, the sensor hierarchy. So, as I said before, there's three types of zones, neighborhoods in the zone, local center zone and town center

zone. Neighborhood center zone is very much your standalone dairies or petrol station, or it might be a collection of two or three shops on the corner. The local center zone is for bigger, but still fairly small local shops so it might be a collection of, say, 15 to 20 shops. And the town centers are largest, not quite as big as Metropolitan centers, but places like Birkenhead or Greenfield or places like that, they do have quite a number of shops and other civic activities as well. And so we've used the centers hierarchy to classify them then we've also looked at the size of the center itself, so that's a footprint of the various centers can be quite different for some of them. So, for example, in the town centers could be as small as I think, 20 years or as big as 28 years around that number. So there's quite a big difference in the center. So we've used the size of them to classify them and also their accessibility, how many people are able to access them. And so we try to use these as basically proxy to figure out which centers have the most access to the highest levels of services and utilities so that we can figure out which centers get intensification around them. So the outcome of this process is coming to the chase is basically the areas where we're not going to do any integration under this policy within any center itself. And that's because our current rule in each plan already allows quite generous heights and densities within the center zones and then adjacent to any neighborhood center. We're not proposing any intensification. And that's because, as I said before, the neighborhood centers are very small things like a dairy or a petrol station we didn't think it was appropriate to enable a lot of density around centers as small as that. And then the next two of the local centers that have been classified as small accessibility or the town centers with low accessibility. So that's basically those ones that meet the standards because there's not enough activities or services and they're quite remote. But you know the little Asterixis down the bottom, we're saying no intensification around these centers. But the medium density residential standards which I'll talk about later still applies to the residential land around these centers. So there still will be some intensification around these centers, just not under this particular policy. So the centers that are going to be upset with this policy will get the terrace housing and apartment building zone for residential sites adjacent to the center. And so that's the five storey version of the territory housing and building zone.

Ryan Bradley

And so what we're looking at is for the smaller centers with the lesser services that still meet the threshold, we're talking about a 200 meters catchment around those would get up zoned to the apartment building zone and then the largest town centers with high accessibility would be that zoning around 400 meter catchment around. So the outcome of this policy 3D zoning is that there's no anticipation under policy 3D for any of the centers out in the rural areas or on the Islands in the north and in the south are eleven centers each that have up zoning around them and the center of all permissions around 22 center that gets the tourists out in the pump building zone applied around them.

Ryan Bradley

Now I referred to the median digital residential standards. Now these are something that come in outside the national policy statement so that you're not technically part of the national policy statement. They're part of the Resource Management Amendment Act that came through late last year. So the previous policy, three directions that I've just been talking about in the national policy statement are quite specific

areas. They talk about the centers for public transport areas and the local catchments around them, whereas the medium density residential standards are not as focused and they enable a level of intensification over most of Auckland's residential areas.

Ryan Bradley

So as I said they were added in late last year through amendments to the Resource Management Act. They include a whole lot of mandatory objectives, policies and standards that we have to add to the unitary plan to the residential zones and it applies widely, as I mentioned before, to all relevant residential zones in the auction context, in the inch plain context, that means that tier sells in an apartment building zone, mixed housing, urban zone, suburban zone and the single house zone. And the key points of this medium density residential standard is that it enables without getting a resource buildings of up to three stories and three dwellings per site. You can get more than three dwellings per site but that's where you would need to go through the results consent process. So that's quite different to the existing rules in Auckland in the single house zone where you're enabled one dwelling per side. But it is very similar to the existing mixed housing urban zone that we have in the Unitary plan. So the medium density residential standards not exactly the same, but very similar to those of the mixed housing urban zone. And as I said, the Council was now required to amend all the residential zone rules to comply with this medium density residential standard across suburban Auckland.

Ryan Bradley

For example, if a height in a zone is 8 meters, the medium density residential standards require it to increase to 11 meters plus 1 meter for a roof form. There are exceptions to this, so exemptions for the medium residential industry standards, residential maintenance and small settlements around all things. So these are the ones towns and villages around the usual print. Where a more relaxed standard might already apply so if the height is already 14 meters or something, we don't need to do anything we leave it at 14 meters. And finally is where a qualifying matter applies and I'll talk about those shortly.

Ryan Bradley

So qualifying matters are basically a filter on the otherwise required intensification that I've just been talking about. So all those intensification policies under Policy three of the national policy statements and the median density residential standards, they can be amended if there is a qualifying matter that applies to it. So the effect of a qualifying matter is it means we can modify the national policy statement Policy three, building heights and densities, and we can modify the medium density residential standards. However, it's not an automatic deletion of this intensification, it just means they might be subject to lesser intensification depending on what the qualifying matter is.

Ryan Bradley

So some qualifying matters create limitations for sites or neighborhoods and some prevent reverse sensitivity effects. So those are things such as locating next to industrial areas and so on. So at the moment, we're still assessing the best way to include these within the plan, the qualifying methods, the best way to map them, whether we use zones overlays or new mapping techniques or a combination of them all. So the qualifying matters, as they are in the Resource Management Amendment Act I listed here and I won't go through them all. But basically A to I are the ones that the government has mandated are qualifying matters. There's also output for J, which is where the Council can include any other matter that makes high density as provided by the medium density residential standards or Policy three inappropriate in an area. So some examples of the A To I matters that the government has already mandated things in the Inch plan that if you know, the English plan, might be familiar with things like significant ecological areas, sites and places of significance to mana whenua or view shafts and so on. So these are things that would modify the amount of intensification that would be otherwise required in an area.

Ryan Bradley

So it may completely remove it if that's what the qualifying matter requires or it may just amend some of it. So it might just reduce the density and the height would still remain. We might reduce the heights and other things might still remain. Now, it's important to note that we are not seeking feedback on the qualifying matters A to I required by the government because they are mandated and we can't change those. But we are seeking feedback on under J, the matters of the Council has identified as qualifying matters. So back in July 2021, the plan committee did identify a number of additional matters under J, we did some further investigation some of them didn't actually end up affecting identification. And important thing to know is the Council identified qualifying life methods have to go through a much more intensive evidence based process than the A to I methods. So we have to do a site by site analysis to be able to prove that these qualifying matters worthy of being such.

Ryan Bradley

One of the things we're still looking at and this is not a government endorsed qualifying matter, but it's something we're looking at including under J is significant long term infrastructure constraints. So not something that the government has put down as something that would be or should reduce intensification. But it's something that Council does think is worth investigating and it is currently an issue and probably will be into the future. So we're looking at things like transport, wastewater and storm water and the potentially potential to map those as qualifying methods and also working with mana whenua, we're looking at additional qualifying matters that we will regulate in the future.

Ryan Bradley

So one of the most prominent Council identified qualifying matters that's been in the media a lot as the special character areas. These basically are the old parts of Auckland that have built character value. They're currently in the plan identified with an overlay for the special character area overlay, but with the

government directions to increase housing in density with the local catchments, some of the areas where we're showing local catchments or other types of intensification, such as the medium density residential standards, these are overlapping with areas of special character areas sorry, special character overlay. Unfortunately, the government has not included special character as a qualifying matter. So this is a Council initiated qualifying matter. So we're proposing to include qualifying matter and that would mean it would reduce the heights and housing density to ensure that the character of these areas is retained. So the Council has done a site by site analysis exercise and we've looked at all the existing special character overlay areas and around 25% of these areas have been found that they wouldn't meet the standards of a qualifying matter. And if you look on the GIS viewer, you'll see that the special character areas are the two colors, the blue ones are the ones that we are saying do meet the standards and should be retained as a qualifying matter and the red areas are the ones that are not meeting the standards for qualifying matter.

Ryan Bradley

Okay, so pulling this all together on left hand side we've got the NPS on urban development, the national policy on urban development and it's specific areas that it requires us to have intensification around. On the right hand side we've got the more widespread intensification required under the medium density residential standards across all the residential zones. So those are two directives coming down from the government. They've then given us the option of qualifying matter that might constrain the intensification, which is what we just talked about. And then there'll be a utopian response, whether that is a change of zoning or change of rules yet to be seen but in a lot of cases it will be a change of zoning as I mentioned walkable catchments we're looking at changing the zoning to the terrace housing apartment building zone example. So that basically covers what we want to talk about all the intensification provisions, directions from the government.

Ryan Bradley

Just a couple of extras Auckland light rail. So currently the light rail corridor is showing in the GIS viewer as unchanged from the existing unitary plan zones. So if you look at the rest of Auckland, it'll have the medium density residential standards applied to it and other intensification whereas this corridor doesn't have those applied to it. So the implications of light rail are significant for the Council. If we knew where the stations were there would be significant intensification including buildings and more high densities along that specific route compared to areas that didn't have light rail. But at this time we don't have the detail on the specific route and costs for the light rail project and more work is required. Therefore we've shown this area still under investigation on the map. But by August the plan is that we will have a zoning response in that area.

Ryan Bradley

So the next steps in this process, currently we're in the public engagement which is going to the 9 May, we got ongoing engagement with mana whenua which will be reported back to the planning committee in

May on the feedback that we get during this time and then we'll be talking to our local boards in June and then it goes to the planning committee on the 4 August for the proposed plan change seeking that it will be notified and we are looking to notify that plan change on the 20 August this year and that will be open for public submission. So this is not the only opportunity you have to give feedback. This is just an initial opportunity. There'll be another chance in August, formal signature.

Phill Reid (MC)

So thank you Ryan. And just to acknowledge there's, quite a density of information that's come through. Just to thank those that have sent questions through, we've probably had in the order of about 20 so far and some of you are quite a technical nature and some quite broad. So we'll cover our bases and come to you on those. But firstly just to turn to our elected members and see if there are any observations so far on your experiences. We've had a number of discussions on this particular NPS and the Amendment Act that went through. So over to you, and then we'll move to the Q and A question.

Deputy Mayor Bill Cahsmore

If I may, Phil and Ryan if that's okay, a very quick overview. So your Auckland Unit plan enables for considerable uplift and development potential for Auckland, both in Brownfields and Greenfields. And although it was contentious at the time, it was basically accepted by the majority of Aucklanders and it's proven to actually be delivering its worth and most of our development we're seeing is around close proximity to rapid transport networks, train stations and so forth. The Parliament and I use that word intentionally because both all the major parties, with the exception of act, agreed to this intensification piece, the medium and density residential in particular, that's caused a little bit of controversy. What Auckland Council is trying to do is one, meet the requirements of the act, as we must do, but also do so in a manner that reflects our communities desires and outcomes. To deny intensification completely means we will spread from Wellsford to Hamilton, which would be an economic and productivity nightmare. So a degree of intensification has to happen. We need to respond to the government's legislation and we need to do it in a manner that is Proactive positive in the best interests of the vast majority of Aucklanders. And that's what we're trying to do here. Hence this early piece of consultation. And as Ryan said, there will be further consultation coming forward in a couple of months time. So, yeah, looking forward to the discussion and the questions that have come through tonight. Thank you so much, everyone, for your participation. This is an important piece of work for all of Auckland. Thanks, Phil.

Chrys Fletcher

Chrys Fletcher here. I just wanted to add to what Bill has said and to say some of us actually made submissions, personal submissions on this. In addition to the Council submission that was presented by the Mayor and Chris Darby, there is a matter of frustration amongst some of the electorate members that we are going through this. That there is as Bill has said, we've got 30 years supply under the Unitary Plan, there are 900,000 potential sites that could be used. So at a time when Auckland is having negative net migration, this is actually somewhat frustrating. However, I want to acknowledge the work that officers

have done. We can't fight this completely. So what we're trying to do is come up with a responsible response, evidence based response to the government's requirements on this. And so I just acknowledge the officers really look forward and will really appreciate your submissions on it. And I think we've just got to try and work forward in a constructive way, but be strong advocates to central government for what we are wanting to do to perhaps modify some of the impact that this might have on the Auckland that we love.

Phill Reid (MC)

Thank you, Councillor Fletcher.

Chris Darby

Kia ora tāto ko Chris Darby aho I am chair of the planning committee. I think the deputy Mayor and Councillor of Fletcher have covered it pretty well. Look, the NPSUD is across the line as of August 2020. It's been amended by the legislation, which unfortunately we didn't get to contribute at the early stages like we normally do on national policy statements and other policy changes that come out of government. But look, so that's history. Now we have to respond, and the Council is responding responsibly to the NPSUD and the medium density residential standards that came out via the Enabling Housing Supply Act. So, look, parts are contentious, but there are many parts which Council supported in its submission. But look, as I said at the outset, we need to move beyond those differences and get the very best for Auckland in our response. Auckland's response. This is our first up response. And moving towards August 20, we'll have our final response and it'll be tested by the hearings process. So I welcome your participation here today. The questions, the feedback, it's all got to come in and hopefully refine this into a form that is going to endure the hearings process and support greater housing opportunities right across Auckland.

Pippa Coom

My name is Pippa Coom, I'm the Councillor for Waitemata and Golf. Thank you Ryan for the presentation. It was very clearly outlined, and I always learn something new when I go through the presentation and I've joined these webinars now from the beginning. And thank you, importantly for everybody who has joined us this evening. I think it's just a point that I would really like to emphasize is that we're in an engagement process that's not required by the legislation, but we're doing this as pre notification engagement. And so this is a really important step for us to be able to get feedback and to hear whether we've got it right in terms of the preliminary response and from the range of questions. I know there's a whole lot of different views on whether this is the right approach and how we need to respond to the legislative requirements. And I think it's also important just to separate out what we have to do and where we have some discretion. And that's what we're trying to work out so that we have the best possible intensification for Auckland and design done well. And as has been mentioned, this is preliminary engagement as we go towards notification in August. So do welcome all of the feedback and hearing all

of the viewpoints. So thanks to the team, and I look forward to hearing the responses to the many questions that have come through. Back to you, Bill Kia ora.

Phill Reid (MC)

Yes so probably just to reiterate the words preliminary response. So given the scale of change that's occurring to Auckland and the broad nature of changes right across the entire document into the maps for the unitary plan. The need to actually go out and raise awareness and understanding about what this means is the background for why we've embarked on this preliminary response. Don't mistake it for being a draft plan change. By no means is it a draft plan change, but we do hope that it actually starts to raise awareness so that when we enter into that statutory phase in August, everybody is better prepared to be able to actually make submissions that hit the Mark and are not on some of these matters that we have no discretion to change. So yes, this is one of those things where it is a national policy statement that we have to give effect to. And this is one of the first instances of where the actual RMA is the primary piece of legislation has been amended to actually insert bulk and location controls and heights and those sort of things into the legislation itself. So it's unprecedented and it is a very strong approach which has been taken.

Phill Reid (MC)

So what we'll be able to do now and going through these questions is talk to some of these areas of discretion that we've got and assist you with being able to be better prepared for when we get to that phase in August. But we also want to try and make sure that as a preliminary response, it is clear to everybody that there is a lot of room still to move on this. And so we're very welcoming of all of the perspectives that come through. And there are indeed some questions that will go through today, particularly some of the site specific ones which will take on board and may well be able to incorporate into the August version when we notify it. So going back up through the Q and A questions, the first question is one that I'll point through to Ryan and relates to walkable catchments.

Phill Reid (MC)

So the question is why walkable distances measured from the edge of the city and not from the city center? A ten minute walk to the edge of the city can easily turn into a walk of over half an hour once you get to the center of the city.

Ryan Bradley

Yeah, that's a very good question. That's a fair point. It's something that basically we'd be wanting feedback on in terms of what you think a fair walkable catchment is. We have gone from the edge of the centers basically, because once you get to the edge of the center, that's where you will start getting into the retail, the offices, the civic facilities. But to get right into the heart of the CBD might take you another

ten minutes or so. That's a fair point that you could put into your feedback if you like, and that's something we would consider.

Phill Reid (MC)

The next one I've got here is in a heritage context. So why is there pepper potting? On what basis was it determined that multiple properties in the same street were unchanged, and a few including high quality heritage houses, were rezoned. So what we'll often have is different qualifying matters that are intersecting with each other on the maps. And so often there'll be situations of where special character in the area based approach that's been taken treats an entire block in the same way. But then there'll be other qualifying matters that are at play which could actually cause for rezoning to occur. And easy examples of that are in the coastal fringe areas where you will see that there is an intersection of things such as the coastal erosion layer and inundation layer with the special character area overlay, particularly the areas that are identified as red. So that's some of the background as to why it looks like that. That by no means is what it would look like come August, because of course there will need to be a planning sort of oversight of that. We need to have defense boundaries, whether that be to the zones themselves or to the overlays as well. So there'll be an exercise and looking to avoid that situation of pepper potting and spot zoning.

Phill Reid (MC)

And the next question, which is some of the broader concern that we've actually faced through this, is why are our most beautiful and leafy heritage areas going to be destroyed by allowing massive apartment towers on sections which are already very small. So it's probably important to reflect again on the context of this legislative environment that we're working within and the MPs itself. So the policy three provisions that Ryan spoke to that set that at least six story or five story outcome for around our local and town centers, and then three story outcome for other areas is a base point that you start from, and you can only then reduce those where there is in existence a qualifying matter. And so what we've been doing is a huge amount of work to actually go through on those qualifying matters that aren't what we call the A to G matters or the nationally important matters to be able to pick up on those and reflect those matters of local importance. And so for special character, we've done a lot of work on that.

Phill Reid (MC)

There are other qualifying matters, such as infrastructure constraints, that we're doing further work on to be able to see whether we can bring that through and meet that evidential bar from a site by site perspective. So there is no means an intention to actually remove the leafiness and the character, if you like of our suburbs. But we need to work within the system and ensure that we can actually present something as a plan change that can go through the hearings process and survive. We need to have the evidence that's where the work is going.

Phill Reid (MC)

Next question down is a car parking questions. So, Ryan I might put this one to you. So where will people park their cars if car parking is not a requirement of apartment towers that will be permitted in St. Mary's Bay. There is already restricted parking in this area, so there is no room for extra density.

Ryan Bradley

Right. So let's say in terms of the car parking minimums that have been removed, what that means is that developers not forced to provide car parking. It doesn't mean they are not allowed to provide car parking. So it's really up to whoever's developing the site to choose. If they think that it's necessary to put car parks on their site, they can do so, but they're not required to. But I guess the bigger picture around that question is that essentially it's for a longer term shift from everyone driving their cars everywhere to be more based on public transport, cycling and walking. That's the intention. But obviously we're not there yet and it might take a while to get there. But in the interim, what we're doing or what the government has required us to do is take away any mandatory requirements to require people to put in car parking and developments. And it's basically up to the developer to choose.

Phill Reid (MC)

Thanks, Ryan. I'll take the next one, which is what is the timing around the Regional Policy Statement changes to implement Policy one which for everybody relates to what is called the well functioning urban environment of the National Policy Statement. Will this be before or at the same time as the medium density residential standards Plan change in August? If at the same time will Council try to settle the RPS provisions or Regional Policy Statement provisions first? Okay. So within the construct of the Amendment Act, there is a limitation in relation to the Regional Policy Statement changes to our plan for whether they can be included within what's called the intensification planning instrument. We will need to progress the Regional Policy Statement changes as a traditional schedule one change. Our intention is to progress it in tandem by notifying it at the same time. So those changes that we see are necessary within the RPS to recognize the well functioning urban environment position that's in Policy one, we would notify at the same time. Now in terms of the hearing structure and how that's approached by the hearings panel, that would have to be a point of discussion for whether or not hearing topics that relate to the RPS are scheduled first and whether or not there are indeed needs for interim recommendations like what was done for the independent hearings panel for the unitary plan process.

Phill Reid (MC)

So that's something which is a live issue. The intention is, though, that from a participation perspective that we can run things as joint hearings in order for participants to be able to get involved in the hearings and not be forced to appear before separate panels and separate locations at separate times on matters that are very similar to each other. So there will certainly be a perspective of trying to meet both the efficiency requirements of moving through the hearings process recommendations, whilst at the same time trying to address all of the needs of the participants as well.

Phill Reid (MC)

And the next question is in relation to the Henderson train station. So what accessibility requirements are in walkable catchments? Henderson train Station's lift is often out of order, which cuts me off from Henderson Town Center. And this one's for you, Ross.

Phill Reid (MC)**Ross**

The walkable catchments, the measurement is reasonably arbitrary in the sense that we're looking at an 800 meters distance from Metropolitan centers like Henderson, and we've taken account of some of the fixed factors like topography and barriers that exist on the route. Unfortunately, we're not able to take account of things that are broken or not open, or that the conditions of foot paths in the street environment might not be up to scratch, which we would expect. And that is an ongoing challenge which we need to address through capital works programs and improvements to street environments, which is of course core business for us, and particularly Auckland transport. So we're certainly aware that some routes are not so accessible as others for everybody and their accessibility needs, but it's just simply an ongoing matter we need to address when we're dealing with walkable catchments. But we do have to set a limit for what is walkable within what we're trying to achieve with intensification areas. Hope that helps answer that question. Thank you.

Phill Reid (MC)

Thank you Ross. Now over to you, Ryan. Our next question is why are ferries not included as rapid transit?

Ryan Bradley

Yeah, I might just maybe bring in Tian on this one, but my recollection is that they're basically not frequent enough. They could be. They're listed as a means of public transport and the definition of the NPS, but I don't think. I think it's the frequency of the service. Is that right to you?

Tian

No. When the government put in the definition for rapid transit service, it specifically mentions road or rails. So it's excluding ferries because it's not actually defined as a rapid transit service under the NPSUD.

Phill Reid (MC)

And the next one, Tian probably plays off this one which is, on planned rapid transit stops what is Council using as a measure of frequent? Do you know the answer to that one?

Tian

Yes, I think it's based on a similar to the regional land transport plan, which is based on a 15 minutes frequency between 07:00 A.m. And 07:00 P.m. On Mondays to Fridays. And that's what frequent is based on.

Phill Reid (MC)

Okay. And the next question here I'll take, which is if there is a property with a height sensitive area or volcanic overlay and it is rezoned to terrace housing and apartments, how high can the new terrace housing and apartments be built? Which takes priority? The overlay or the zoning now within the unitary plan? Unless there are particular provisions that replace each other, then both of the provisions apply so there's a site by site assessment which is needed from a resource consent point of view. So the often restricted discretionary activity status, which goes with the height sensitive area, will mean that there are assessment criteria that need to be considered above and beyond what are within the zone. So the resource consent planner will need to look at the specifics of the design and what those assessment criteria are saying in order to guide them through. This is a frequent situation of where you have different layers within the plan that are not necessarily marrying with each other, which will often trigger the need for consent and why it is appropriate that resource consent as a site specific assessment are used to carry out that work.

Phill Reid (MC)

The next one I'll point to you Ryan, which is with medium density residential standards, what considerations have been made for sunlight on adjacent properties?

Ryan Bradley

The medium density residential standards include their own height boundary requirements which all meters plus a 60 degree plane. So in terms of the council's ability to do anything more than that, that's basically the minimum that we have to put in that zone unless there is a qualifying matter specifically for the area. But if it's generally just a sunlight issue, I think basically we can't do anything more than what the residential standards have. And I think there's outdoor living space. There's a whole lot of requirements that I didn't go through in the presentation. But the minimum density residential standards include things like this is the minimum height for the residential areas. This is the minimum height to boundary minimum yards and so on. The Council can't go and reduce those unless we have a qualifying method that we can base it on.

Phill Reid (MC)

Okay, next question I'll take, which is existing one and two floor houses which can be made accessible are being replaced with three or six plus story with smaller maneuvering areas, stairs and no parking. What is being done to address accessibility? So again, as Ryan said there are controls that we've got to incorporate unless there is a qualifying matter. We then need to look at what other jurisdictional boundaries that we've got in the unitary plan to be able to address other matters. So the act does provide for us to incorporate other rules and standards into the plan, provided that they are not on the same matter that is within those medium density residential standards. But in doing so, what we need to do is make sure that we're still within the jurisdiction of the RMA itself and bringing those rules and standards in. And this was a matter of debate that actually occurred through the proposed unitary plan process, where as a Council, there was a proposal to incorporate universal access provisions into the plan. They were found by the independent hearing panel to be outside of the jurisdiction of what could be incorporated within the unitary plan and were more appropriately addressed through the building code and future reviews of the building code.

Phill Reid (MC)

So Council has since that point been advocating to central government to try and seek universal access provisions through subsequent reviews of the building act and the building code.

Phill Reid (MC)

Moving on down what is mandated as far as site size, MHU rules say you can subdivide down to 300 square meter sites. Does that mean I can now subdivide my 1200 square meter site, which was a single housing into four sites and build three dwellings on each 300 square meter site? So some of these newer questions that come through, I haven't figured out a good person to respond to that one.

Ryan Bradley

I can respond to that one if you like Phil. Basically, as of now, you can't do anything because the rules haven't yet changed. But let's say that the rules did change exactly as you described there. The medium housing urban zone has a minimum size of 300 meters or vacant subdivision. So that's where you're just subdividing a vacant site. But you can actually get more intensive development than 300 meters square sections you can actually go down to there is essentially no minimum density in that zone. So what happens is you design your proposal for the number of dwellings you want and prove that it can work with all the other standards that we have in the plan. And then you can subdivide around a consented development like that. So minimum size that you're referring to are only for vacant site subdivision. You can actually go smaller if you've got a design development on the site.

Phill Reid (MC)

Thank you, Ryan. Next one to the topic of special characters. So why has Council not chosen to preserve existing special character areas? Presumably these were already well thought out by Council. So for it not

to now continue, that seems strange. So I'll take this one. So as mentioned in the presentation, special character needs to come through as a qualifying matter under that H category which necessitates the site by site justifications, which then led to the site by site assessments that have occurred. And it's important to note that those site by site assessments of the special character buildings is the first that's occurred in decades. And so obviously, as additions and alterations and redevelopments and demolitions have occurred through time, there are some areas which have retained the values as reflected on the objectives and policies of special character in some areas that have not retained those values. So the scoring system was used to be able to differentiate those that are still strongly contributing towards those objectives and policies in those areas that are not doing that to the same extent. And so there's two approaches that have been taken. One for a special character where it exists within the walkable catchment areas where we're calling on a 75% of the area to be scoring a five or six in that individual site assessment, as opposed to in the broader suburbs where special character exists we're calling on a 66% threshold of the area, achieving that score of five or six. Now, this actually relates to the justification requirements that we've got and what is actually going to be able to withstand challenge through the hearings process and be supported by the technical evidence from our Heritage team. So that's the advice that we put through the committee to set this policy approach that we've got at the moment. But we're obviously open to hearing from everybody about whether that policy approach should be set slightly differently. So we welcome everybody's feedback on that one.

Phill Reid (MC)

Next question on flooding. Brian, I might put through to you, which is why were floodplains and stormwater management areas not included as qualifying matters, or will this be an additional matter identified through further investigation by Council?

Ryan Bradley

Yeah, I'm not sure on the exact answer to this. I'm not sure if we already have included them or we are planning to. I know we are definitely planning to if we haven't included them already. And I know that they are a matter that we can consider because in the qualifying matters, one of the matters that you can consider is any matter of national significance in the Resource Management Act. And there is a part of that section on national significance that talks about managing significant risks from natural hazards. So flooding would definitely come under that. But Tian probably can help with that and give us the false amount.

Phill Reid (MC)

Yes.

Tian

So just in relation to that, flooding is definitely a risk that is being looked after as a qualifying manner that's mandated by the government as a matter of national significance. However, with flooding, there is a lot of intricacies with the whole storm audio network. So we are still in the process of working out how to completely understand that. What to include, and what not to include. So that's why for the purposes of this initial consultation, we haven't included any mapping on that yet because we're still working through the final details of that. But rest assured, flood claims will be covered as part of a qualifying letter.

Phill Reid (MC)

And thank you, Tian. Next question I'll take again on special character. Why is the special character area basis at a cut off of 75%? On what basis was that chosen? So just to reiterate, 75%, is the threshold as applicable for special character areas that are within walkable catchments. So the background of that, once you've done your site by site justifications and arrived at the conclusion that there are strongly contributing values present in the area, is the need to actually consider that against the purpose of the NPSUD itself. And of course, the purpose has actually got within a very strong relationship to transit orientated development around our RTN stations and around our centers. And so there is an emphasis towards providing an enabled opportunity for development. And that is why in those locations that do exhibit those opportunities, that the threshold is set at a higher number being a 75% number compared to the 66%.

Phill Reid (MC)

Okay, next question I'll read out without knowing who to guide it to. So standards are now more guidelines now and are not set in concrete like the building codes. Why are the planning standards so loose now, especially with urban intensification increasing? How will the infrastructure cope if all sites are a free for all on intensification? Any takers or I can chip in on that one.

Ryan Bradley

Yeah, I can never go. Essentially, the standards in the plan are not supposed to be loose. They are rules in the plan that if you were going to breach one of the rules, you have to have a valid reasons for improving the effects on the environment will be less than minor and go through a whole resource consent process. So it's not intended that they are loose standards, but really that's a matter for each consent as it goes through. And I'm not sure exactly what you're referring to, but maybe something's gone through that you're not happy with. But the final part of the question around infrastructure, that is a very fair question and that is something that wasn't included in the A to I matters of the government as a qualified matter, but it is something that the Council is investigating at the moment, how we can include areas that have very poor and permanent basic restrictions on infrastructure like wastewater and transport storm water, how we can use the qualifying matter parts of the national policy Statement to basically reduce intensification required in some of those areas. So it is a very clear question on how infrastructure will cope. Currently it isn't included as a matter, but Council is looking to do so. It won't be

for all areas. It will just be for the areas that are not well served by infrastructure at the moment and have some real constraints to improving their infrastructure.

Phill Reid (MC)

Thank you, Ryan. I'll take this next one, which is what rights does a property owner have to challenge a development where a three level apartment block can be erected on the Northern boundary and completely block light? So just probably to reiterate council's position in relation to this. So we did submit to select committee in relation to what these medium density residential standards were in the bill, and we did seek quite significant change to reduce some of the impact for these types of Amenity issues. We weren't successful on some of these matters. And so some of these medium density residential standards, such as the height boundary control of 4 meters and 60 degrees on the boundary, are in that primary legislation as I said, and therefore unable to be changed. So yes, if individuals are going forward with the development, which is not contravening any of the other rules across the unitary plan and as in accordance with these medium density residential standards, there is no need for them to have a resource consent. So therefore it's just straight to building consent. And there is no ability through the planning approaches anyway for there to be any objections from neighbors.

Phill Reid (MC)

So what we need to be able to do is work with those parts of the system that provide discretion. And unfortunately this particular matter is not one of those.

Phill Reid (MC)

I might take the next one as well actually which is, is Council or the New Zealand government going to compensate landowners who see material value lost. So this is the same as everything else within the RMA since 1991 that there is no real liability associated with planning law. There are no rights of the ability to sue either Council or the government for loss of value associated with the planning controls that come in. So the system provides for an opportunity of having your say. And so it's also one of the reasons why we feel it's really important to raise awareness about what is going on and have this preliminary response approach in order for people to understand the implications of this moving forward to August, so that your submissions can actually be on point on the matters which there are discretion for. But on those matters that there is no discretion for, that do result in real material loss of value to properties. Unfortunately, that is not something which the system provides for any compensation on.

Phill Reid (MC)

I'm hogging stuff, but the next question is about trees, Ryan so I might take this one. Has the Council considered and raised with the government that the result of these changes is in direct conflict with the new climate change initiative, ie, removing trees to make way for buildings and remove overlays where they existed to protect garden zones and leafy suburbs versus climate change, ask for more money to

plant more trees. Costs could be saved by maintaining protection on leafy suburbs and allowing density in areas with infrastructure to support it. So again, for the viewers, a bit of context on this one. So through the changes that were made to the RMA through 2010 and I think 2013, the restriction on council's ability to protect trees became quite strong. So what we're left with now within urban areas is either a notable tree schedule or individually listed tree protection mechanism, or if there are areas of significant ecological value for those areas to be mapped. So in relation to going back to some of the legacy plan provisions that we had in relation to special character that also accommodated some of the landscaping values associated with buildings, those things are now more difficult to be able to protect given the restrictions that are on Council for general tree protection.

Phill Reid (MC)

In answer to the question relation to the advocacy approach, I think we're now up to four letters that have come from our Mayor through to Minister for the Environment seeking for improvements to the system in order to be able to better protect our urban tree Canopy. So there has been a fair deal of advocacy going on both within the existing system and through into the new system in order for us to get what we see as a better regime in order to be able to protect our urban tree canopy as we design our way through intensification and we see urban tree canopy as a valid matter to take into account for design. But at this point in time we're quite constrained in our ability to do that. One other note, we did advocate for the inclusion of sort of tree courts or deep soil planting areas on properties through the select committee process, but the landscaping and outdoor living court controls that came through with medium density residential standards are not the same.

Phill Reid (MC)

Next question on precincts. I might point this to you Ryan. So will we get to see proposed changes for precincts as part of the feedback process or will that not come until notification?

Ryan Bradley

Yeah, unfortunately that's not going to be ready until notification because as you probably know, each precinct is quite complicated and there's quite a number of them to go through and make sure that they comply with the medium density of residential standards. So unfortunately we haven't been able to get that done in time for this consultation, but it will be part of the plan change when it goes out in August and that can be submitted on at that stage.

Phill Reid (MC)

I wonder if you might pick up on the next one which I'll read out for you, which is what is the minimum site size area for a six story apartment? Our suburb has 200/300 square meter sites. You can't make such a site work without amalgamation and developers simply can't make small sites work.

Ryan Bradley

Great question. I would need to just double check the buildings and I think there is a minimum site size, but I think that again is for vacant site subdivision I believe. I don't think in town, correct me if I'm wrong there is a minimum site size for a building to be subdivided around on a site that's zoned terraced housing apartment building. I can think of an example in takapuna of 450 square meter site that has a nine story building on it. So it is possible. But if you right it would be easier on large sites. But as I understand there's no requirement to have a larger site to be able to put those buildings on. Obviously you still have to meet your height boundary and all those other standards that which make it difficult for smaller sites to get a taller building.

Tian

Yes. So just in terms of that, as part of the enabling six stories in walkable catchments, we have been looking at enabling it for a typical residential site. So the standards are height relation to boundary standards that are currently being looked at for sites that are 16 meters wide and about 44 meters deep. And that is what a typical site would be to enable a residential apartment development that doesn't necessarily mean that it has to be that size to enable it, but that's kind of the general size that is looking at when we look at typical sites and preparing for the relationship boundary and to enable that kind of level development.

Phill Reid (MC)

Now, just to call out for further questions to come through, I'm about to read out the last one that's in our chat. So do plug into the Q and A what your questions are, and I'll be able to keep going after this one.

Phill Reid (MC)

So the next question I'll take, which is the relationship of infrastructure to rates. So squeezing more houses in when infrastructure assets, roading, et cetera is decaying now, how much extra Council rate grab is this predicting? Okay, so the construct of the NPSUD and the Amendment Act is one that we've got to follow, so we've got to give effect to it and we've got to incorporate these medium density residential standards, unless, as we heard earlier, there are qualifying matters in play. So from a planning perspective, we must follow through on this. It's a requirement in law for us to do it. Ultimately that will result in a shift in what the property rights are for people across Auckland and which then potentially creates some shifts in terms of the valuations that are ascribed to properties. So, as did happen through the whole proposed unitary plan process, there were some locations in Auckland where there was significant uplift in values of properties associated with the changes that we made there.

Phill Reid (MC)

But it is a follow on process that occurs that then gets taken into account through finance teams within Council to be able to look at things such as development contribution regimes under the Local

Government Act and feeding through into the long term plan for how infrastructure can be maintained and changed in line with what the planning approaches that comes from this process.

Phill Reid (MC)

Right now, we've got a couple of extra questions that have come through. So how do you control boundary effects? For instance, a single house zone next to a six storey apartment would surely be impacted by the scale, intensity and height of what is occurring next door. So do we have a taker for that one? Silence, alright so I'll jump in. So within the existing unitary plan, we do have controls which are at zone edge where we've got that significant drop off. And I think it's between the terrace housing apartment building zone and the single house zone. It is one of those things that we need to keep doing work on. So as we're needing to actually rebuild the terrace housing and apartment building zone and rebuild the mixed housing urban zone in particular, given the medium residential standards, these sort of issues are being worked through.

Phill Reid (MC)

So we need to be able to visualize that change in built form and what some of those implications are, and then look at whether or not we are able to incorporate these additional standards and just a reminder earlier that we can only incorporate those additional standards when they are on a matter which is not already covered by the medium density residential standards themselves. So we need to actually sort of run that rule over it to check whether we can actually do those sorts of things. Next question for the single house zone going forward, will there still be a minimum 600 square meter lot size?

Ryan Bradley

Yes there will be, the single house zone will still be in the unitary plan because it applies to areas that are not impacted by the medium density residential standards. So these are the essentially the small towns around the edge of Auckland. So places like Walkworth and Helensville, Omaha, those sorts of places have a single house zone, so we need to retain it for those and the rules we're not proposing to change those at all through this process we're doing right now. But whether the single house zone remains in the urban area, something we're still working through. And I said in the presentation, we're still working through the best mechanism to be able to take account of these qualifying matters, remembering that everything that is residential is supposed to go to the medium density residential standards, we can amend those, and we might just end up keeping the zone mixed housing urban, but amending some of the controls on it. That would be enough to take account of the qualifying matter rather than take it all the way back to the single house zone. So essentially it's something that's been worked through. And so at this stage for the urban area of Auckland, I can't really give you an answer, but I can say that zone will still be in the plan because it applies to areas outside what we're looking at now.

Phill Reid (MC)

Thank you, Ryan. Just an announcement in relation to the site by site information for the special character assessments. So the team are looking to load all of that information up. So if you do have questions about how individual properties were scored, you can find all of that. Findings report is now available on the akhaveyoursay.nz/housing site. So do go through to that and look for that material to familiarize yourself with how your property or other properties in your street have been assessed. And we obviously welcome feedback in relation to any anomalies that you may identify in relation to that.

Phill Reid (MC)

I'll take this next question. So reading it out, a number of properties have been zoned two storey single dwelling when qualifying matters such as coastal erosion only apply to a very small part of some of these properties. For example, a property which is not waterfront but has a walkway to the beach is not zoned for further intensification, whereas the neighboring properties which don't have a walkway are allowed to be intensified. So again, these are the sort of pieces of feedback that we really do need to hear about. So obviously there needs to be quite a lot of automation to the way in which we prepared the maps, given the scale of the number of sites that we've got across the city and many of these qualifying matters that are value based matters, or in this case, hazard based matters that aren't familiar with site boundaries and cut right through properties and sometimes just touching edges of properties.

Phill Reid (MC)

So this in itself can create quite a lot of anomalies. There'll obviously need to be an exercise like what I spoke about earlier in relation to Pepper potting of going through and actually looking at whether or not where there are instances of properties only just being touched by a particular matter of restriction, whether that necessitates the property as a whole having a qualified matter applied over it or not. So we welcome feedback in relation to that.

Phill Reid (MC)

Next one, which is what is the difference between mixed housing suburban zone and mixed housing urban zone to apply the MDRs rules when single zone applies MDRs rules, which only allow to build one development on site. But what's the difference for MHS and MHU? So do you have a taker for that one?

Ryan Bradley

Yeah, I can take that one. So currently the mix housing suburban and mixed housing urban zones are very similar in the unitary plan, and the main difference is the height in mixed house urban its two stories, mix housing urban is three stories. But once you incorporate the median density residential standards into both those zones, your right they become very similar. And so that's again something we need to work through as to whether the mixed housing suburban zone has a role in the urban environment of Auckland or the urban Metropolitan area of Auckland. As I said, single house zone. And it will be for the mixed housing suburban zone. There are settlements outside of the main urban area that still need to use that

zone. So it will stay in the plan. But as for how it applies to metropolitan Auckland it may or may not continue to be a zone in that area because you're right, that will be extremely close, those two zones.

Phill Reid (MC)

And again, just an invitation out to the audience. We've again reached the end of the questions that are coming through. So please do follow through with further ones and we'll do our best to answer for the next sort of five or so minutes before we go into a wrap up.

Phill Reid (MC)

Right. It's just come through. So why is coastal erosion and coastal inundation layers being considered as a qualifying matter? Well, to actually start from a natural Hazard's perspective. So within section six of the RMA, it is a matter of national importance and to be able to address natural hazards. So coastal erosion and coastal inundation are these types of matters. Coastal erosion is a data set is something that's only just come through in the last six months or so to start to be updated on people's lims and be available through the main Council GIS system, but it's through this process actually being brought through as a new qualifying matter. Again, we welcome feedback in relation to that. For those of you involved in that type of science, coastal inundation layers have been with the unitary plan for some time and again relate to a hazard.

Phill Reid (MC)

So we see that there is an importance to reduce the extent to which there is an exposure of new development to these natural hazards and not to create that greater risk.

Phill Reid (MC)

Next one is will, infrastructure considerations include things such as local schools and access to open spaces. If St. Mary's Bay allows apartment buildings, where will the kids go to school? So Tian, Ryan, Ross?

Ryan Bradley

Sure, I can jump in on that one. So the Council obviously doesn't provide schools as part of it. The activities that we do, we do provide open space and we do provide other infrastructure. But schools are provided by the Ministry of Education and we work closely with them when we're looking at planning for growth areas. So as part of this, they'll be very aware of the areas we're looking to intensify and they'll be looking at potentially acquiring land for new schools in these areas. I would say that one kind of issue for them will be it's probably easier for them to do in the walkable catchments and the specific areas where we've intensified. It's going to be more difficult for them for the intensity residential standards where it's quite widespread and there's no knowing exactly which areas will be taken up first and how fast over time. So it is a challenge for the Ministry of Education, but it's not something that we have direct control over.

But we do always work with the Ministry of Education and other infrastructure providers when we're looking at the growth of Auckland.

Phill Reid (MC)

Thank you, Ryan. Next one in relation to the city center, what impact has the Council anticipated with CBD office workers and residential interest in the CBD decreasing due to flexible working and work from home? Future trends. So chime in on this one, Ryan, but just as an initial answer within the policy three setting that was explained earlier in relation to the city center and its walkable catchment and its intensification within it, and then in relation to the Metropolitan centers and then in relation to policy 3D for the local and town centers, there's a hierarchy of intensification opportunity being provided both in and around those respective centers. Now, councils had to arrive at some policy settings in relation to that, in particular things such as the walkable catchment distances and in relation to the local town centers, those that actually have that intensification occur and to what extent out from those centers that intensification occurs. So those viewers may have some perspectives on whether or not changed circumstances means that some of those policy settings should change and potentially greater emphasis be provided to more localized living that comes from flexible working at the moment, there's a very hierarchical approach with the city center seen as the primary focus point for us as a tier one city in New Zealand. Right now, maybe the last couple of questions here.

Phill Reid (MC)

So is development contribution going to increase to address the issues we are facing with infrastructure? So again, that's going to have to be something which is worked through as part of the local government act processes for the LTP. So there'll need to be that separate debate in relation to that. Do correct me if I'm wrong, councilors, but I think the existing provisions for development contributions were just recently set or being set, so it'll be a few more years before it is reset again. So it will be the benefit of seeing where all of this work lands.

Phill Reid (MC)

Okay, now I might just call out the last question. So is central government offering to upgrade all of Auckland's infrastructure at its cost, given that Council will have no idea where to plan to provide new infrastructure to service growth anymore? Yeah, that's probably a political question that I'll leave. It could be that some of our councilors wish to address that one in our wrap up, but I might just call it quits there in relation to the Q and a day, we will keep checking what comes through in relation to the Q and A and the comments, and we'll do our best to ensure that we take a record of that and where we do have a record of who you are looking to get back to you in relation to that.

Phill Reid (MC)

So I just like to thank everybody for a lot of really insightful questions. And hopefully this session has actually also supported you all to understand the construct that we're working on, this policy setting that we've got, what we've been doing, what we've yet to do, those things that we are able to change and the invitation that is out to everybody to get involved in this process now, lift your understanding and be more effective when it comes to August and the formal opportunity to be involved in the plan change process. So a big thank you to Ryan, Tian and Ross over to our elected members. I'm sure there's some observations that you formed from all of those questions. So over to you for any insights.

Chris Darby

Thanks a lot, Excellent Chris Darbys here planning chair and thanks all. Hey look some good inquiry there tonight and our team will relish that. We've recorded it. It all goes into the mix. No doubt you'll be confirming that feedback as well through the channel that's been provided to you, the have your say channel. But look, this is a participatory process. We garner that feedback. It's important. And so whatever your thoughts are, however extreme or otherwise they might be in your eyes, please put it in the feedback because it is really valuable and it helps us build towards that plan change. The government mandated plan change for 20 August. Look, I don't have a lot more to say other than really expressing on behalf of Council, the planning committee members, real appreciation for immersing yourself in this discussion. We've had tremendous feedback over the last couple of weeks and week to come. The participation has been extremely high, which just signals that this is of great interest to offer this as it should be. And we're delighted to see this level of response. A couple of questions there that Phil maybe couldn't have answered. Well, one on the DC policy, we are in the process of reviewing the development contributions policy that comes under the Finance Committee, which is chaired by Councillor Desley Simpson.

Chris Darby

But all the councilors are on that, along with the Mayor and independent māori statutory board members and there is a determination to see a review that eventually sees the beneficiary pay, rather than all the ratepayers of Auckland be subsidizing the infrastructure. And that includes community infrastructure to support really well functioning communities across Auckland as they develop. So the answer to that one is yes, we are moving towards that. And some recent changes in infrastructure growth charges for water reflect exactly that. And by 2025, the so called IGCs or infrastructure growth charges will recover 100% from the beneficiary, the developer, and they will pay and not all the other water users. So that's a bit of a trend or a direction that we're following. And the last one, I'll just briefly campus the question of will the government come to town and pay for the infrastructure? Look, government is in part, but there are some political discussions that we are having the deputy mayor's involved with those, along with the Mayor and myself. It's an ongoing conversation. If I can put that diplomatically, I'll close there. I want to thank you all our team, Phil, particularly leading this tonight. I really appreciate that. It's terrific work. And for those that have been on the call, the non Council people, our participants here today, our teams have hardly had time to take many weekends or periods off since Christmas. This has been a very compressed period of

intense work, and we've got a lot more to do as well. It's our preliminary response. It will be informed by further work and your feedback, and there's a lot further to go on this one. Back to you, Phil. Thank you.

Phill Reid (MC)

And just a reminder of some of the important takeout points. So do go to [akhaveyoursay.NZ\housing](https://www.govt.nz/your-say/housing), and please let us know what improvements we can make to this policy position that we're taking. And again, a reminder about the time frame. This period of engagement is running through until the 9 May. So please do go through. We've had over 80,000 hits on the maps to look at the implications. We've had now up to about 1600 pieces of feedback that have come in and the direct inquiries that have been coming in via email as well. We're up to over about 200 of those so there's a lot of interest out there far more than any other plan change that's been made to the unitary plan, just acknowledging the huge interest that is out there in this and thanking everybody for the involvement and please do get involved in the further events to come. Thank you.