

Key Messages For People Providing Feed Back

The Council will pay more attention to our response to their survey if you express them in your own words. Some suggested key points are set out below. Council only has limited scope to moderate the Governments push for intensification, so your feedback will be most effective if it focuses on Council's specific questions.

Responses To Specific Questions On Feedback Form

Walkable Catchments and Intensification

- o We think the proposed walkable catchments for the CBD, metropolitan, centres (e.g. Albany) and rapid transit stops (1200m, 800 m and 800m respectively) are sensible — they will help focus intensification on areas where it is appropriate.
- o We do not support Council's proposal to apply Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone in areas up to 400m from town centres, or 200m from local centres. We think such zoning should be undertaken on a case-by-case basis to reflect the context of the surrounding area. This may be appropriate in some areas, but not in others which would lose their neighbourhood feel if they were surrounded by a large band of high density housing.
- o We also recommend that decisions around Local Centre Zones should be deferred until the Unitary Plan review in 2025 to allow adequate research and consultation. We note that there is nothing in the law of NPS that requires these changes right now.

Special Character Areas

- o We do not support Council's proposal to include just the "identified" (blue) special character areas as a qualifying matter. All existing special character areas should be a qualifying matter.
- o Council's proposed new rules for identifying those "special character areas" which meet the Governments "qualifying matters" exemptions are too narrow. The existing special character areas should all be retained, including all in Mission Bay and Kohimarama. They are areas of high character value with an important historical heritage. They should be protected to ensure the area keeps its distinctive character and unique history.
- o We do not support Council's proposed residential special character areas. We think there are more areas that should be identified as a qualifying matter ie, all special character areas, not just a subset. These areas have been identified as contributing to the existing character that makes specific suburbs unique and attractive. Why throw this away?

Infrastructure Constraints

- o We support Council's proposal to include areas in Auckland with long term significant infrastructure constraints as a qualifying matter, meaning that infrastructure should be taken into account as a limitation on increased housing density.

General comments

1. Encourage Council to do only the minimum required at this point and save any other changes for the 2025 Unitary Plan review process.

- o Instead of rezoning all low density zones to MHU which allows unlimited number of dwellings per site, change the MHS zone to conform with the Government requirements. This would meet the Government requirement to allow 3 dwellings per site, but would not open the door to much greater intensification than the Government envisaged.
 - o Keep as much of the Special Character Areas as possible
 - o Defer upzoning areas close to local centre zones until this can be properly researched and consulted during the 2025 Unitary Plan Review
2. Encourage Council to mitigate the loss of trees and gardens that will result from the upzoning
- o If zoning changes will reduce the “leafiness” of suburbs, then Council must do something to mitigate this loss. This could include creating more neighbourhood parks, create more significant ecological areas (SEAs) or other measures to compensate for an increasingly hard urban landscape.
3. Urge Council to work with Government to fine-tune the requirements to make them more practical.
- o Provide an exemption for areas of special character. These areas, currently defined in the Unitary Plan, affect only around 8,000 dwellings compared to the 1.8M new dwellings that the changes are expected to enable. Leaving them as they are would have no tangible impact on the Government’s goals for making more land available, but would preserve some of the character of our suburbs for future generations.
 - o The Unitary Plan will be reviewed in 2025 anyway. Council should urge Government to allow implementation of the contentious portions of the NPS-UD to be deferred until they can be properly researched, reviewed and consulted on as part of that review.