

NPS UD Local Board briefing 4 March 2022

Feedback and comments from local boards at individual mapping briefings

Local board	Comment
Waitākere Ranges (Eryn team)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intensification around centres should also consider further investment into/plans for the centres themselves – example was given about Glen Eden and how it is a bit run down despite THAB is currently being enabled around the centre • Interest in the floodplains and flooding as a QM, acknowledging that these have not been mapped yet or translated into zoning/standard responses • Interest in SEAs and WRHA, acknowledging that although mapped, the exact zoning/standard response has not been confirmed for these QMs, particularly for the Single House zoned sites in the WRHA overlay • Interest in future process for updating the AUP as a result of future changes to the city e.g. to the RTN • Feedback that the use of scooters, bicycles etc. should be considered when determining the extent of the walkable catchment • General concerns about infrastructure capacity and investment requirements across the region as a result of intensification
Henderson – Massey (Eryn team)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Particular areas of interest including: Lake/streams in an area west of Ranui - Lake Palomino (Western Heights between Ranui and the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Act Area near the Babich Precinct) and ongoing protection through Single House zone and SEA overlay streams within the Opanuku Stream area (north of Border Road/Henderson Valley Road) and ongoing protections – mostly within Open Space – Conservation zone but there is one private property though this has SEA over it. • Recent flooding in Henderson Valley Road and southern parts of Swanson in areas not experiencing flooding in the past • Transport infrastructure issues/other infrastructure issues in various areas - non-existent, insufficient and/or aging • NW Bus lane improvements and how will this affect zoning – advised that WC are based on existing and planned (in RTLP) projects – this is in the RTLP but presume it's not shown because it's an express bus rather than a rapid transit service • How communication with local residents around the changes will be relayed in a way which is understandable to a layperson • Level of changes will create some concern with the community • Border issues with MDRS next to Waitakere Ranges Heritage Act Area – how will this be managed? • Big concern for the local board are inequity issues – majority of up zoning to occur in lower socio-economic areas with less QM's such as Special Character than that of central/isthmus local boards where there are more QM's that will temper the effects of the NPS-UD and MDRS • How the HMLB can voice their concerns – when will they be able to provide formal feedback?
Waitematā (Fiona team)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City Centre - should not use eastern edge of zone as WC start (e.g. get rid of the Port land) - could use Beach Rd as start for WC instead, and from Parnell centre - to St Stephens only (St Stephens Ave could be boundary) • We should be considering the requirement to include Perimeter blocks as an urban design solution • Wynyard quarter want to maintain the good outcomes achieved by Panuku over the years.

<p>Puketāpapa (Marc team)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are we able to highlight that there is no proper existing walkway between Orsova Place to Lynfield local centre? No through way to Lynfield local centre – only to reserve. Does this affect 200m walkability around the local centre? • Stoddard Road: Why is the part of Richardson Road zoned as THAB when there is no bus route going along there? • Three Kings town centre – walkable catchment: Presuming Kāinga Ora will feed into this/have a view on McCullough Ave properties being up-zoned? • Three Kings Precinct: Area under investigation – in order to do what? What is covered in the investigation? • Royal Oak town centre – walkable catchment: Housing to west of Pah Road – within the Puketapapa LB area - which is zoned THAB. Is this not good urban planning practice to have different zoning within the same block? In some instances, could the zoning - like in this example of Pah Road - be extended to the corner of the block for the sites fronting the main road? Taking into account the NPS-UD rules, how much are we allowed to extend the zoning ourselves for cases like the Pah Road THAB? • Why was Mt Roskill local centre assessed as a small local centre with high accessibility under policy 3(d) as it is part of the Dominion Road corridor. Should it be considered a town centre? • When will local board members get access to the GIS viewer? At what time? • In terms of high-quality character, does that include state houses which are at the end of their life, falling apart and unhealthy? There may be some heritage value here, but are they of a quality which should be retained for the future? This is stopping them from being redeveloped into anything else. Patches in the area include on Donald Crescent, McCullough Ave, and Foch Ave area (questionable as its infill housing has had an impact on what is happening there), May Road near school (state housing). • There might have to be special criteria for state-housing areas which have been deemed as heritage? • Lynfield local centre – why is the centre assessed as having high accessibility? • As it is an election year, with changes happening to all 21 local boards, for incoming board members it will be difficult to understand some of the conversations that we've all had up to now – how are they going to get these people up to date? These people will need good briefing when they come
<p>Upper Harbour (Eryn team)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure it is clear the initial consultation does not get confused with the submission period, matters raised in the initial consultation won't be considered as submissions; • Idiots guide to the viewer – could even put a video to go on the YouTube?
<p>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</p>	
<p>Albert-Eden (Fiona team)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 (d) Town centres local centres • Noting that NPS-UD is enabling 'at least' 6 storeys; Possibly more than 6 storeys • Discussion around criteria for refining boundaries of walkable catchments • Noted the intensive development already occurred at Allendale Rd (retirement home) and has provided good benefits to the community • Value of scar value balanced against intensification - noting Kingsland will be one of the most well-connected stations and how this should be weighted with preserving historic heritage values • How would discretions of applying qualifying matter/planning assessments be considered at a local board level • Site specific queries on precinct and areas under investigation - Epsom Precinct- Open Space issue with Mt Eden Bowling Club • Next steps for local board involvements (Emma Clarified) • Queried around interaction with ALR process

<p>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki (Marc team)</p>	<p>Questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ms. Henry raised a question about walkable catchments inquiring where the 800m threshold came from. She said that the 800m may not be considered walkable for some of this local board’s constituents. I explained international planning practise concludes that 800m or 10 minutes is considered walkable for the average person. 2. Ms. Henry also asked how the local board could use the NPSUD/MDRS to push for Auckland transport to reinstate/improve public transport links in these areas that are anticipated to intensify. I explained that Auckland transport determine the demand relative to the amount of development. I also explained that that is outside of what we look at in this body of work. 3. Ms. Henry also asked how the local board could use the NPSUD/MDRS to push for more open spaces, and their importance (and growing importance) to be retained/improved etc with housing intensification. I explained that Auckland Council’s Parks Department administer the councils open spaces and parks, and that this body of work does not have the ability to create new open spaces. 4. She also raised a question around infrastructure capacity/funding, and how that will be managed with all the additional housing coming in given the existing state of infrastructure in Glen Innes (and similarly, other areas) and the large amount of funding that would be needed for most of the suburbs in Auckland. I explained that infrastructure capacity and availability is a known problem. Funding for infrastructure improvements is addressed in the long-term plan and from central government funding allocation. Also add a more localised level any required improvements to receiving infrastructure networks is usually funded by the developer. I gave an example of A developer trying to connect to a new stormwater network and ensuring that the receiving network has the capacity for any new additional residential development. if it does not have capacity it may prevent the development from going ahead or the developer may choose to upgrade the network downstream to enable the development to go ahead. 5. Ms. Henry asked a lot of questions about different aspects of residential development in general which were all answered. <p>Conclusion</p> <p>There was nothing that I had to follow up on and go back to my local board with. Ms. Henry I was satisfied with all of the questions that I had answered. she will be reporting back to the other local board members tomorrow.</p>
<p>Papakura (Craig team)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papakura Local Board are concerned about intensification on peat soils particularly around Takanini • We have also identified a problem with the viewer – when zoomed in during the Teams presentation, it is very difficult to differentiate between brown changed zoning colour next to non-changing Rural- Countryside Living Zone. People couldn’t tell them apart at this scale when the viewer was displayed through the Teams call. It all looked urban. I have just taken some screenshots below of the Kaipara Road area although they have a better distinction than the Teams presentation view had.
<p>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu (Marc team)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed the importance of the Regionally Significant Volcanic Viewshafts and Height Sensitive Areas to Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board • Concerns expressed about the changes to Mangere Bridge under the MDRS as this area had previous protection under the old Manukau District Plan as a larger lot area and was zone Single House under the PAUP. • Concerns about the potential loss of Mangere 2 (Teo Lane and Tioro Lane) Precinct and Rosella Road Precinct to the MDRS provisions. • Raise concern that Local Board members need to be given training on how to use the NPS – UD viewer and an updated on the content of the AUP (Zoning, Overlays, etc). Only the Local Board chair and the Senior Local Board advisor

	<p>attended the presentation – I also understand they were also the only ones from Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board to attend the earlier presentation by Phill Reid).</p>
<p>Manurewa (Craig team)</p>	<p>Low attendance from the Manurewa LB. Just the chair and an advisor. And another advisor popped in towards the end. Overall they seemed to understand fairly well and were happy to see that their SCA remained intact and that there was likely to be a “zoning” response to protect those values and the SEAs.</p> <p>A couple of questions but nothing significant from them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They wanted to know if they could give feedback (when time to do so) that they wanted to rezone some Light Industry around Te Mahia Train Station to Mixed Use Zone. • Wanted to know what happens if walkability/accessibility is improved in the future. • They wanted to know if Notable Trees were also a QM – I couldn’t remember at the time so will send a follow-up email • Asked about view protection, were slightly surprised to see they only had one small Local Public View
<p>Kaipātiki (Eryn team)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question about requiring lifts above three storeys. Understand it is 4 or more. • Question about when the RLTP is being reviewed and updated. • Why is Northcote town centre classed as a small centre, when it is projected to grow when redeveloped in the coming years? Is the bus interchange/stops planned at the centre going to be RTN? Explanations given – footprint of the centre won’t change and size (shops/services) counted today not in future. Growth in numbers of shops/services could trigger a review if gets significantly more. • Concerned about area down Bentley Ave from Glenfield Centre where flooding occurs – should this be kept from intensification? HW have noted the issue and have an upgrade planned. • Concerns around loss of SCA in Birkenhead/Northcote Point. Evaluation process described. Are interested in the criteria for surveying and high quality. • Concerned about loss of tree canopy with coverage increases and redevelopment in MDRS areas.
<p>Hibiscus and Bays (Peter team)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about the provision of infrastructure. • Concern that coastal inundation shown wasn’t up to date.