

## Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
<b>Citywide Spatial Framework</b>									
<b>Key changes</b>									
CSF1	Corridors	BMU - Large Format Retail	Comment	Effectiveness of corridors will depend on how mixed use environments are defined and provision for retail and large format retail in corridors.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	Text	This relates to the ALL AREA PLAN issue for large format retail. Recommend changing the outcome name for 'large format retail' to 'bulky goods' which is more appropriate given the narrow definition applied to that outcome. Amend text in section 3 and section 4: corridors to make it clearer that the mixed use outcome could include large format retail where the outcome is located in corridors, subject to urban design considerations and consideration of its relationship with centres.	Accept
CSF2	Centres	C - Classifications	Object	Concerns/comments about the centres classification.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	Both	Two internal council workshops with officers were held on 28 May and 8 June to address this matter. Key recommendations are to change: Glen Innes to a town centre. Sylvia Park to a principal centre. Mt Wellington / Penrose corner to a local centre. Otahuhu to a town centre. Remuera to a town centre.	Accept
<b>Key themes - support</b>									
CSF3	Centres	C - Classifications	Support	Support intensification around centres and/or corridors with public transport connections.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	None	No change	Accept
CSF4	Centres	C - Classifications	Support	Strong and lively centres is supported. Comments range from general support for the vision of lively centres to identifying problems with centres due to lack of attention and loss of diversity. A wide range of centres were mentioned: Avondale Balmoral Blockhouse Bay Eastridge Ellerslie Kingsland Kupe Street Lynfield Mission Bay Mt Albert Mt Roskill Mt Roskill South Onehunga Otahuhu Panmure Sandringham St Heliers St Johns Stoddard Three Kings	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	None	No change	Accept
CSF5	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Comment	Support retention of Mt Albert library on public land where it is easily accessible. It is a key part of the community.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Strong and Healthy Communities	None	The citywide maps do not show a relocation of the Mt Albert library. This comment is likely to be in response to the St Lukes private plan change. Forward to ACR Policy for information. No change to map required.	Refer / Delegate
CSF6	Open Space/ Community Facilities	H - Cultural	Comment	Protection and/or enhancement of volcanic cones and features and views to volcanic cones is supported.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	None	No change	Accept
CSF7	Open Space/ Community Facilities	General	Support	Support protection and enhancement of waterways and the coast, including water quality. Concerned about poor water quality and state of existing waterways and the coast. Some comments refer to specific locations.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	None	Oakley Creek is mentioned on a number of occasions and has been identified in the heritage feedback as a feature to take into account during the prioritisation and assessment of heritage landscapes. No change required.	Accept

## Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
CSF8	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Ecological corridors	Support	Support urban forests, corridors, enhanced biodiversity. Some comments refer to specific locations.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	None	No change required.	Accept
CSF9	Open Space/ Community Facilities	H - Cultural	Support	Volcanic cones are significant - impact of/access by vehicles and livestock should be reduced. Impact of vehicles in the Domain was also mentioned.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	None	This is a management issue, refer to ACR Policy for information	Refer / Delegate
CSF10	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Open Space	Support	Improvements to Manukau Harbour / Onehunga foreshore access sought.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	None	The Quality Natural Environments map shows the Onehunga Bay foreshore access as a project for the next 10 years. A green link is shown along the Manukau Harbour, and a walkway is shown on the Lifestyle Choices map as aspirations for 2050.	Accept
CSF11	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Open Space	Support	Support greening the city, including protection, increasing the number of, and enhancement of green spaces/open space. Some comments refer to specific locations.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Lifestyle Choices	None	No change required.	Accept
CSF12	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Open Space	Aspiration	Support opening up and re-vitalising the inner city waterfront.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Lifestyle Choices	None	No change required.	Accept
CSF13	Transport	Walking and cycling	Support	Support promoting and improving cycling and/or walking (and cycleways and walkways). Specific locations mentioned e.g. St Heliers - downtown, along rail corridor from Eastern Suburbs, Remuera Road, Tamaki Drive, Tamaki River, Asquith Avenue, along rail corridor from Avondale, Hobson and Judges Bay	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	Forward to Transport Strategy for information	Refer / Delegate
CSF14	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Support	General support for rail, for improvements to rail services and rail stations - includes electrification, Parnell rail station, Avondale relocation, St Johns station, Tamaki station, Remuera station, Onehunga link, Carr Road, Otahuhu station, Khyber Pass, Mt Albert station, Avondale - Southdown, Support new rail station at St Johns, the hospital and extension of rail network to the airport, light rail.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	Refer to Eden/Albert area plan report for a minor change to the text about the Mt Albert rail station. Refer to the Newmarket/Parnell area plan for comments about the Parnell Rail Station. This matter is still being considered by Council.  Forward comments to Transport Strategy and ARTA for information	Refer / Delegate
CSF15	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Support	General support for public transport improvements across city.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	Forward to Transport Strategy and ARTA for information	Refer / Delegate
CSF16	Transport	Roads	Support	Support State Highway20 Waterview extension tunnel.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	Council's resolved position is to support the Waterview tunnel and the area plans and the citywide strategy maps have been developed on this basis. The New Zealand Transport Agency has recently revised the alignment of the connection which now involves a different alignment and reduced tunnel component, however, this is open for comment until the end of July 2009. Timing of Council's position is required in June, therefore retain current provision for tunnel. No changes to FPF. Forward to Transport Strategy for information	Refer / Delegate
CSF17	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Support	Support improvements to bus infrastructure and/or services. Includes Dominion Road rapid transit corridor.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	Forward to Transport Strategy and ARTA for information	Refer / Delegate
CSF18	Transport		Support	Support wharf/ waterfront transport.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	Forward to Transport Strategy and ARTA for information	Refer / Delegate
CSF19	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Support	Support integration of public transport services (includes bus interchange at St Johns).	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	Forward to Transport Strategy and ARTA for information	Refer / Delegate
CSF20	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Support	Support for / concern about lack of across town improvements including specific suggestions for new routes.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	Forward to Transport Strategy and ARTA for information	Refer / Delegate
<b>Key themes - issues</b>									
CSF21	General	General	Question	Detailed comments around growth data and impacts on planning for infrastructure	General	General	None	These comments request further information around the growth data and impacts this will have on planning for infrastructure. This will be important to finalise in the position papers.	Next Phase

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
CSF22	Corridors	C - Classifications	Comment	Comments around corridor classification and definition: Support Great South Road corridor Identify a corridor connection between Auckland City and Pakuranga Highway and Ti Rakau Drive Add Carrington Road as a corridor for intensification Support Dominion Road as a corridor Identify Ellerslie-Panmure Highway as a corridor as it is identified in the Liveable Arterials Plan, Regional Arterial Road Plan, and is an important link to other roads Identify Neilson Street as an economic corridor Delete corridor over Newmarket centre	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	None	Regarding a corridor between Auckland City and Pakuranga Highway and Ti Rakau Drive, there is no intensification shown on the area plans between Panmure and Manukau City's boundary, or between Sylvia Park and Manukau City's boundary to support showing an extension to the corridor in this location.	Decline
CSF23	Corridors	C - Classifications	Comment	REFER ABOVE	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	None	Carrington Road may be a local corridor, but the intensification of uses along it do not support it being identified as a mixed use corridor.	Decline
CSF24	Corridors	C - Classifications	Comment	REFER ABOVE	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	None	Ellerslie Panmure Highway does not have intensive uses along it that support it being identified as a mixed use or business corridor. Ellerslie Panmure Highway is also subject to a proposed viewshaft.	Decline
CSF25	Corridors	C - Classifications	Comment	REFER ABOVE	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	None	Neilson Street is currently shown as being within an economic corridor. It is not identified specifically as a 'business corridor' and there are many outstanding questions around transport in this area. In the next phase when a precinct plan is prepared the question of a business corridor in this area should be considered.	Next Phase
CSF26	Corridors	C - Classifications	Comment	REFER ABOVE	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	None	The corridor over Newmarket shows the connection between centres along the route and should not be entirely removed from over the centre. The centre nomination overrides the corridor.	Decline
CSF27	Centres	C - Classifications	Object	Object / concerned about St Lukes being identified as a town centre / it doesn't meet the definition of a town centre	Eden/Albert	Quality Built Environment	None	There were a number of comments about the role of St Lukes and the view that St Lukes is not a town centre. The citywide spatial framework is a vision for what the city could look like in 2050. It is considered that the St Lukes Shopping Mall is best incorporated into a town centre rather than being located as it is on its own. With a focus along Morningside Drive, sufficient space in public ownership will be provided to alleviate any concerns regarding a private town centre. As stated in the Eden/Albert area plan text, Council will support the development of improved amenity along Morningside Drive which will involve work to create a high quality public realm. No change is recommended to the town centre status of St Lukes.	Next Phase
CSF28	Centres	C - Growth of Centres	Object	Concerned about the expansion and growth of St Lukes and its impact on the neighbourhood and on other local centres	Eden/Albert	Quality Built Environment	None	This has also been identified in the heritage feedback and will be taken into account during the review of residential heritage and identification and prioritisation.	Next Phase
CSF29	Centres	C - Classifications	Object	Don't support a centre focussed on St Lukes Mall. Prefer a centre focussed on Morningside.	Eden/Albert	Quality Built Environment	None	Two internal council workshops with officers were held on 28 May and 8 June to address this matter. No change is recommended to the town centre status of St Lukes. The area plan identifies links between St Lukes and Morningside. Details of the location and layout of St Lukes are to be determined by a future precinct plan.	Next Phase
CSF30	Centres	C - Classifications	Minor change/correction	The regional classification project identified an appropriate range of functions for town centres. It might be useful for the draft framework to identify which of these functions need to be added to St Lukes and Sylvia Park to enable them to operate as town centres	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	None	This is an important issue that needs to be worked through at the proposed workshop with Sylvia Park, and at precinct plan stage.	Next Phase
CSF31	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Ecological corridors	Comment	Need much stronger focus on biodiversity. Need to control weed problems and loss of species.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	None	The heritage team is working on a biodiversity strategy (possibly as a position paper) which will address some of these concerns.	Next Phase

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
CSF32	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Open Space	Aspiration	Support for Waka Ama and other water sports to be shown	Citywide Spatial Framework	Lifestyle Choices	None	The FPF states that "current gaps in the provision of social infrastructure, disparities in where facilities are located, and new facilities to meet future demand, all need to be planned for and provided by the council and other agencies". There has been no work undertaken on identifying exactly where and what those social infrastructure gaps will be in the future. However, these comments will be referred on to ACR Policy to help in preparing their policies to address such issues in the future. Copies of the feedback relating to specific facilities has been forwarded for consideration in the LTCCP consultation process.	Refer / Delegate
CSF33	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Aspiration	Support community facilities, sport and leisure facilities. Many comments support more facilities, maintenance of facilities, and a range of facilities in their area. Includes pools (except Otahuhu - see below)	Citywide Spatial Framework	Lifestyle Choices	None	This also relates to the Strong and Healthy Communities map. The FPF states that "current gaps in the provision of social infrastructure, disparities in where facilities are located, and new facilities to meet future demand, all need to be planned for and provided by the council and other agencies". There has been no work undertaken on identifying exactly where and what those social infrastructure gaps will be in the future. However, these comments will be referred on to ACR Policy to help in preparing their policies to address such issues in the future. Copies of the feedback relating to specific facilities has been forwarded for consideration in the LTCCP consultation process.	Refer / Delegate
CSF34	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Aspiration	Support a pool in Otahuhu / concerned it has not been included in FPF (mention also about LTCCP by some)	Citywide Spatial Framework	Lifestyle Choices	None	Otahuhu pool is not identified in the draft LTCCP. There is significant support for the provision of a swimming pool in Otahuhu. This issue is best addressed through the LTCCP and copies of relevant feedback have been forwarded to the address for feedback on the LTCCP. These comments need to be forwarded to ACR Policy for consideration also.	Refer / Delegate
CSF35	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Comment	The strategy will not produce desired effect without public and private spending on social and physical infrastructure focused within or adjacent to centres and corridors planned for intensification	Citywide Spatial Framework	Lifestyle Choices	None	This also relates to the Strong and Healthy Communities map. The FPF states that "current gaps in the provision of social infrastructure, disparities in where facilities are located, and new facilities to meet future demand, all need to be planned for and provided by the council and other agencies". There has been no work undertaken on identifying exactly where and what those social infrastructure gaps will be in the future. However, these comments will be referred on to ACR Policy to help in preparing their policies to address such issues in the future. Copies of the feedback relating to specific facilities has been forwarded for consideration in the LTCCP consultation	Refer / Delegate
CSF36	Transport	Park n Ride	Aspiration	Support for existing and new park and ride facilities - Orakei, St Johns, Meadowbank, Glen Innes, St Heliers wharf, Sylvia Park, Tamaki, Panmure, Three Kings, Onehunga, Otahuhu	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	Forward comments to Transport Strategy for information.	Refer / Delegate

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
CSF37	Transport	Roads	Aspiration	The need to better provide for heavy vehicle access to industrial sites and particularly the container port. Suggestions include improved connection to State Highway 1 (Highbrook /Mt Wellington interchanges), improved local east-west connections e.g. Neilson Street, and the potential for a motorway link between State Highway 1 and State Highway 20 (within Auckland or Manukau) - support and against	Maungakiekie	Transport Choices	None	Improvements to Neilson Street have been proposed by Council particularly at intersections and to improve the capacity of this road through consideration of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)/ freight priority lanes). While some works have been implemented, the majority of works have been deferred beyond the 10 year LTCCP process. In conjunction with this the need to improve local east-west connectivity is being considered through Council's designation review. Further, the New Zealand Transport Agency are investigating a state highway link between State Highway 1 and State Highway 20 although this is only at an issues paper stage. Council's current position is to provide this connectivity improvement is through the existing South Eastern Arterial (SEART)-Neilson Street corridor but as an economic development / freight connection in preference to a motorway link. Upgrading of the current Onehunga State Highway 20 interchange in the future may also help to assist with heavy vehicle movement on Neilson Street. The issue of improved connectivity has multiple implications which cannot be resolved through area plans. It is therefore, recommended that these issues be considered by Transport Strategy.	Refer / Delegate
CSF38	Transport	Roads	Aspiration	Support Eastern Corridor and roading improvements in Eastern Bays / Panmure. Two comments were received in opposition: 242/3 454/5	Eastern Bays	Transport Choices	None	Issue was considered prior to notification of FPF. Working Party requested discussions with Transport Strategy to change the map and/or text to recognise the importance of some routes for a variety of transport modes	Accept in part
CSF39	Transport		Aspiration	Localised transport issues and operational issues e.g. congestion, timetabling, access problems, train horns, parking, bus lanes, integrated ticketing, frequency of public transport, pedestrianise Queen Street, service vehicles, transport integration, cost of public transport, bus services, bus stops/shelters, heavy vehicle problems, upgrading, transport reliability, impact of traffic on area, roading improvements required, toll	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	Forward to Transport Strategy and ARTA for information	Refer / Delegate
CSF40	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Aspiration	Suggestions for additions / extensions / improvements to public transport system: suggestions about how to expand the rail system within Auckland city and into the wider region, expand the tram network, particularly around the Western Bays area, suggestions for across town transport linkages, interchange suggestions, improvements to public transport in southern Penrose business area.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	Forward to Transport Strategy and ARTA for information	Refer / Delegate
CSF41	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Aspiration	Desire for additional rail stations including - near Pak n Save on New North Road - between Carr Road and Stoddard - additional station in Parnell near museum - relocate Parnell station - re-open the Southdown station - relocate Oranga station to east side of May Road	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	Forward to Transport Strategy and ARTA for information  Refer to the Newmarket/Parnell area plan for comments about the Parnell Rail Station. Refer to Transport Committee.	Refer / Delegate
CSF42	Transport	Walking and cycling	Comment	Suggested improvements to cycleways and facilities: grab rails at traffic lights, there are differences between cycle routes shown on the area plan maps and those on the citywide maps, cycle parking at stations, cycle lockers at interchanges, route improvements, Western Bays poorly serviced and this needs to be improved.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	Forward to Transport Strategy and ARTA for information	Refer / Delegate
CSF43	Transport	Walking and cycling	Comment	Concern about safety for cyclists, including concerns about cycle lanes and bus lanes being shared.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	Forward to Transport Strategy and ARTA for information	Refer / Delegate
CSF44	Transport	Walking and cycling	Object	Object to proposed improvements to cycle network / parts of existing network	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	Forward to Transport Strategy and ARTA for information	Refer / Delegate

## Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
CSF45	Transport	Roads	Object	Concerns about the impact of AMET1 / new alignment on private property	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	This is related to the designation for AMET1 and property ownership issues. Forwarded comments to Transport Strategy for consideration during the next phase of developing AMET1.	Refer / Delegate
<b>Minor changes</b>									
CSF46	Transport	Roads	Minor change/correction	State Highway 20 near Onehunga is in the wrong place	Citywide Spatial Framework	Concept Map	Map	Check against the transport choices map for the location of the route and to ensure consistency between the maps.	Accept
CSF47	Transport		Minor change/correction	Show improved transport connections at following locations: - Great South Road - Great North Road - Ellerslie Panmure Highway - AMET1 - the improved transport connection should be shown as continuing south along Mt Wellington Highway with an arrow on the end near Sylvia Park or Penrose/Waipuna intersection on the map (refer Tamaki area plan map for reference) - Central Connection - connection to the North Shore	Citywide Spatial Framework	Concept Map	Map	These arrows are intended to illustrate a broad concept around improving transport choices across the isthmus, particularly between the eastern and western parts of the city. They are not intended to show specific routes. The arrows need to be changed to avoid confusion about what they intended to show.	Accept
CSF48	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Minor change/correction	Dominion Road is a 10 year priority and should be listed in the legend as such.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Concept Map	Map	This project is currently identified in the LTCCP and can be shown on the concept map as such.	Accept
CSF49	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Officer generated change	It is not clear whether the transport improvements are supposed to be public transport or roading or both	Citywide Spatial Framework	Concept Map	Map	Refer to comment above	Accept
CSF50	General	General	Minor change/correction	The bibliography refers to the 2004 Water Asset Management Plan and 2001 Metrowater AEE which have been superseded by new documents. The ACC Stormwater Asset Management Plan 2008 and Watercare's Asset Management Plan 2008 should also be considered and referenced	General	General	Text	Update the bibliography	Accept
CSF51	General	General	Minor change/correction	The key infrastructure section and key moves section does not recognise the importance of infrastructure to support growth in particular information communications technology services	General	General	Text	Amend section 2.8.7 to expand the issue from broadband to Information Communications Technology and make reference to its importance not just to business but also to education and lifestyle. However, the key moves section already makes reference to 'infrastructure' in a general sense and it would not be appropriate to make specific reference to different types of infrastructure in this section.	Accept
CSF52	General	General	Minor change/correction	Section 2.8.6 gives inadequate consideration to the role transmission infrastructure has in meeting electricity supply. References to energy conservation are not sufficient to address the electricity supply issue. Issues relating to transmission infrastructure and growth management should be added. It is vital that documents that support intensified development in Auckland City adequately provide for key infrastructure to support this growth.	General	General	Text	After the first paragraph in section 2.8.6 add "In order to cater for population and economic growth within Auckland city it is important to provide for the key infrastructure required to support this growth. In doing so care has to be taken to ensure that this infrastructure does not have adverse effects e.g. visual effects on nearby residential areas."	Accept in part
CSF53	General	General	Minor change/correction	The FPF maps should show Transpowers assets as required by Policy 12 of the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission.	General	General	None	The National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission requires territorial authorities to identify the electricity transmission network on their relevant planning maps prepared under the RMA, which the Future Planning Framework was not. Earlier in the FPF process it was agreed not to show utilities. It is also mentioned in the text to the area plans that the council will advocate to Transpower for high-voltage electricity transmission lines throughout the area to be placed underground. Therefore to show the transmission lines on the citywide maps would be inconsistent with what has been agreed to date and with what is shown on the area plan maps and mentioned in the text.	Next Phase
CSF54	General	General	Minor change/correction	The key moves table needs to be updated to reflect changes requested by council officers	General	General	Text	This change will improve consistency within the report	Accept

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
CSF55	General	General	Minor change/correction	Page 23 Table 2. Suggest that ticks should be added to under transport choices to: - promote the city as a world class destination - create a network of high quality centres.... - promote clusters of complementary economic activity... - facilitate access to regional parks.... Suggest removing first part of sentence 'link employment areas with road and rail systems'	Citywide Spatial Framework	General	Text	Agree with these changes	Accept
CSF56	General	General	Minor change/correction	The dark circle around the project numbers on the maps needs to be explained in the key	Citywide Spatial Framework	General	Map	This applies to all maps and will increase readability	Accept
CSF57	General	General	Minor change/correction	Page 22, section 3.1.4, third point, city-wide is spelt incorrectly	Citywide Spatial Framework	General	Text	Accept change	Accept
CSF58	Transport	General	Minor change/correction	Make reference to policy documents such as the liveable arterial plans in section 3.2.2, 5th paragraph: "the identification of corridors..."	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	Text	Accept change	Accept
CSF59	Centres	C - Classifications	Minor change/correction	Mission Bay functions as a dining and entertainment destination and needs to be recognised as such	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	Text	This centre is shown on the lifestyle choices map as being a dining precinct. Amend chapter 4 or quality built environment section of the FPF to clarify that no two centres are expected to be exactly the same and will have points of difference. E.g. The classification is a general guide to the overall scale and general role of centres, however each centre will be different.	Accept
CSF60	Residential	General	Minor change/correction	Amendments sought to recognise the ageing population and their needs, including amendments to sections 2.7, 2.6.3, 2.6.5, 3.2.4 and Appendix A	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	Text	Many of the recommended wording changes are very specific and relate to housing requirements for the ageing population such as residential care facilities and retirement villages, which is too specific for section 2.6.3, 2.6.5 and 3.2.4. Section 2.7 deals broadly with the economy and it is not appropriate to talk specifically about the ageing population in this section. The suggested changes to the key sites for residential growth would be inappropriate as this solely relates to the sites shown on the citywide maps. To address the general concern identified by these requests add to section 3.2.4 : House our growing population well, a reference to the ageing population e.g. "sustainable housing choices are supported by providing a range of housing types to cater for changing housing needs, such as changing needs at different life stages, and by encouraging the location of jobs...."	Accept
CSF61	Residential	H - Residential	Officer generated change	The colour differentiation between development eras is hard to see	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	Map	This is a minor change that would increase readability of the maps.	Accept
CSF62	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Minor change/correction	Amend 3.6.2 to say "Enabling a range of activities to occur to sustain the provision of such facilities in a way that contributes to community cohesion and enables the long term retention of such facilities"	Citywide Spatial Framework	Strong and Healthy Communities	Text	Amend to say "Recognise that the provision of community facilities contributes to community cohesion and that enabling a range of activities could support the long term retention of such facilities."	Accept
CSF63	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Minor change/correction	Motat is not well defined along with Western Springs College, The Auckland Performing Arts Centre (TAPAC), and Westpoint Theatre	Citywide Spatial Framework	Strong and Healthy Communities	Map	Add a tourist destination symbol over Motat 2	Accept
CSF64	General	General	Minor change/correction	The AkActive programme is spelt incorrectly in the legend of the Strong and Healthy Communities map	Citywide Spatial Framework	Strong and Healthy Communities	Map	This is a minor change to correct a spelling error	Accept
CSF65	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Question	Question whether some private schools are missing from the map	Citywide Spatial Framework	Strong and Healthy Communities	Map	Update maps to show any omitted private schools	Accept
CSF66	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Comment	Schools will need to be able to intensify to accommodate growth	Overall area plans	Strong and Healthy Communities	None	This should be considered in preparing position papers for the district plan.	Next Phase

## Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
CSF67	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Comment	Need flexibility to use school facilities for extended hours including for community use	Overall area plans	Strong and Healthy Communities	None	This should be considered in preparing position papers to feed into a district plan.	Next Phase
CSF68	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Comment	Need recognition of value of privately held social infrastructure e.g. private schools have a disincentive to provide infrastructure due to development contributions?	Overall area plans	Strong and Healthy Communities	None	This should be considered in preparing position papers for the district plan.	Next Phase
CSF69	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Ecological corridors	Comment	Comments / concerns about relationship between ecological corridors and transport routes	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	Text	Amend paragraph 3.5.3 to identify there could be opportunities to look at providing ecological corridors along such routes depending on feasibility studies and working with relevant parties e.g. New Zealand Transport Agency. Amend the definitions of green links, urban forest node and ecological corridors to indicate that the vegetation used along these corridors would have to be appropriate and could be removed by designating authority if works were required.	Accept
CSF70	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Ecological corridors	Minor change/correction	The urban forest corridor along State Highway 20 rail needs to be wider to cover both sides of the rail corridor	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	Map	This is needed to correct a minor error.	Accept
CSF71	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Ecological corridors	Officer generated change	The colour differentiation between green link connection arrows and urban forest (ecological) is poor.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	Map	Make urban forest (ecological) bolder, and reduce boldness of green link connection arrows so they are more legible	Accept
CSF72	Open Space/ Community Facilities	General	Officer generated change	The remnant stream in the legend looks different to remnant streams on the maps	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	Map	This is needed to correct a minor error and make the maps more legible.	Accept
CSF73	Open Space/ Community Facilities	General	Minor change/correction	Initiatives to improve water quality for aquatic life will have significant implications for the storm water network and this must be considered in future planning	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	Text	Add to section 2.8.5 an example of green solutions that could be used to enhance water quality.	Accept
CSF74	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Open Space	Minor change/correction	Purchas Hill has not been shown as a park on the maps	Citywide Spatial Framework	Lifestyle Choices	Map	Purchas Hill has been acquired by council for open space. Adding some green around the volcanic/geological feature symbol would make it clear that there will be a reserve in this location. Recommend making change. This change will apply to all citywide maps showing parks and to the area plan map.	Accept
CSF75	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Open Space	Minor change/correction	Due to mapping overlaps an area of the domain needs to be changed to active recreation instead of environmental/heritage	Citywide Spatial Framework	Lifestyle Choices	Map	This will apply to all citywide maps showing parks. It is needed to correct a minor error.	Accept
CSF76	General	General	Minor change/correction	The incorrect lifestyle choices map was included in the draft FPF document. The updated version has removed (Otahuhu, Avondale) from after the item in the legend saying 'citywide pool development'	Citywide Spatial Framework	Lifestyle Choices	Both	Ensure that either the correct map is inserted into the document, or re-correct the map and re-insert it into the document	Accept
CSF77	General	General	Minor change/correction	Section 3.4.2, rephrase fourth bullet point so it reads as an opportunity - "There is an opportunity to provide a more integrated public transport system to get people to major events and places with improvements to leisure destinations from where people live and work."	Citywide Spatial Framework	Lifestyle Choices	Text	Proposed sentence doesn't read clearly. Change to "There is an opportunity to provide a more integrated public transport system to get people from where they live and work to major events and places, and to leisure destinations."	Accept
CSF78	General	General	Aspiration	Amendment sought to recognise the role of tertiary education in sections 2, 3.3.2, 3.3.4, and to recognise the Grafton Campus as a tertiary education facility on the Economic Development Map. Reference is made in section 2 to the role of higher education within the CBD.	Newmarket/Parnell	Economic Development	Both	Amend the economic development map to include a tertiary education facility marker over the location of the Grafton campus (85-151 Park Road, Grafton). Amend section 2.7 to include reference to the role of the tertiary sector. Make amendments to section 3.3 to refer to tertiary education.	Accept
CSF79	Transport	General	Minor change/correction	Page 41 section 3.7. City is spelt incorrectly. Amend 7th line to "better public transport, and roads that are more cyclist and pedestrian friendly:"	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	Text	Amend spelling of city on 5th line of introductory paragraph. Add 'and pedestrian' to 7th line of introductory paragraph after 'cyclist'.	Accept



## Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
CSF80	Transport	General	Minor change/correction	Section 3.7.2 Amend 2nd bullet to: "...the dispersed areas where residents live and work, also results in dispersed travel patterns" Amend 3rd bullet to: "Working populations in the city's centres will put more people close to the public transport and make it easier for people to walk or cycle to work, shops, school" Amend 5th bullet to: "there is a need to look at opportunities to ensure that improving the vehicle capacity of arterial roads will improve the amenity of local neighbourhoods and town centres." OR "Improving the capacity of arterial roads by looking at all transport modes will assist in maintaining the amenity of local neighbourhoods and town centres." Amend 6th bullet point: remove "necessary" Amend 7th bullet: "... different transport modes, including reducing the over-reliance on car based commuter travel."	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	Text	Section 3.7.2: Amend 2nd bullet to "Auckland city's topography and settlement patterns, in particular the dispersed areas where residents live and work, results in dispersed travel patterns and does not easily support an efficient public transport network." Amend 3rd bullet to: "Increasing the living and working populations in the city's centres will put more people close to public transport and make it easier for people to walk or cycle to work, shops, schools, hospitals and parks." Amend 5th bullet to: "Improving the capacity of arterial roads by looking at all transport modes will assist in maintaining the amenity of local neighbourhoods and town centres." Amend 6th bullet to remove the word 'necessary' Leave 7th bullet as it is as it changes the focus from general comments about car based transport to focussing on commuter transport.	Accept
CSF81	Transport	General	Minor change/correction	Section 3.7.3: Change fourth sentence to "The map shows where there may be opportunities to look at providing interchanges to enable people....."	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	Text	In order to recognise that the location of interchanges is not certain, change the word 'can' to 'could' so the sentence will read: "The map shows where interchanges could be developed to enable people to switch their mode of travel."	Accept
CSF82	Transport	General	Minor change/correction	Section 3.7.4 AMETI: amend second sentence "improved roads to access" to "improved street network improvements to access" This paragraph also needs to note that the project will be ongoing beyond 2020. CYCLE NETWORK EXTENSION: Explain that the Transport Choices map does not show detail of community cycling and walking connections, which are shown on area plan maps TRAVEL PLANS: should include mention of school travel plans	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	Text	Section 3.7.4: AMETI: accept recommended text CYCLE NETWORK EXTENSION: Add the following sentence at the end of the paragraph "More detail about community cycling and walking connections are shown on the area plan maps in Chapter 4." TRAVEL PLANS: Amend paragraph to: "Travel plans for businesses and educational facilities The council works closely with the Auckland Regional Transport Authority to introduce travel plans to businesses, tertiary institutions and schools....."	Accept
CSF83	Transport	General	Minor change/correction	Section 3.7.5: amend second bullet to "Increasing the people carrying capacity of the city's road network and making improvements to the city's road network by, in strategic locations, such as building an additional Waitemata Harbour"	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	Text	Amend second bullet point in section 3.7.5 to: "Making improvements to and increasing the people carrying capacity of the city's road network in strategic locations, such as by building an additional Waitemata Harbour crossing, improving the Ellerslie-Panmure corridor following completion of AMETI, and improving roads in the east of the CBD."	Accept
CSF84	Transport	General	Minor change/correction	Page 7, s1.5, Connect Communities, second bullet - Add the word choices to "improve transport connections and choices to the CBD and across the city."	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	Text	Amend and apply correction to Table 2: Key moves for Auckland as well.	Accept
CSF85	Transport	Walking and cycling	Minor change/correction	Legend should say "existing and future REGIONAL cycle network"	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	Map	This will match with what is shown on the Lifestyle Choices map.	Accept
CSF86	Transport	Roads	Minor change/correction	Taxis are an important mode of transport that are missed out in the Transport Choices section	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	Text	Amend section 3.7.2 bullet 4 to say "There is a need to secure new transport corridors and hubs (such as rail, bus stations, cycle facilities and taxi ranks) in the right places."	Accept
<b>Parked feedback</b>									
CSF87	General	General	Parked feedback	Concept map needs to be bolder and more exciting e.g. creative industries in Western Bays	Citywide Spatial Framework	Concept Map	Map	There has been no additional feedback during FPF consultation on this	Decline
CSF88	General	General	Parked feedback	There is a disconnect between the transport map and intensification - Roskill, Hillsborough, Eastern Bays, Eden Albert, CBD fringe	Citywide Spatial Framework	General	Map	Add a key bus/arterial network route through Parnell. Recommend adding a key bus/arterial route along New North Road as ARTA have proposed New North Road as a type of Quality Transit Network.	Accept
CSF89	General	General	Parked feedback	There are stormwater issues at the back of Mt Albert. The area should not therefore be intensified	Citywide Spatial Framework	General	None	This issue was considered in developing the area plan. The stormwater issues are not considered by Environmental and Utility Management to be a long term limitation, however the area plan has shown limited intensification in this area with much of Owairaka being shown as single dwelling	Accept in part

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
CSF90	General	General	Parked feedback	Stormwater tunnel under Mt Roskill. Sewerage. Note the benefits of this e.g. cannot fix subcatchments until this unlocks development potential	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Quality Built Environment		This issue is discussed in the area plan summary for Mt Roskill / Hillsborough	Refer / Delegate
CSF91	Centres	C - Classifications	Parked feedback	Pt Chevalier has scope to be a town centre not just local.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	None	This issue was parked while waiting for the community's response during FPF consultation. No change is recommended to the local centre status of Pt Chevalier.	Decline
CSF92	Centres	C - Classifications	Parked feedback	Discussion around classification of St Lukes and Mt Albert as town centres, and what criteria were used	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	None	The place of centres within the centres classification has been reviewed in light of feedback. No changes are recommended to the town and local centre status of St Lukes and Mt Albert.	Decline
CSF93	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Ecological corridors	Parked feedback	Plan change 220 near Waikaraka Park. Supports green corridor strongly - not clear that it goes through Ann's Creek. Colours are hard to read. This is very important for access to coast and recreation. Ann's Creek should be part of a walkway to Hamlin's Hill and then Sylvia Park	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	Map	The green link (ecological) corridor colours around Ann's Creek are hard to read. The area plan shows connections between Ann's Creek, Hamlin's Hill and Sylvia Park. The citywide map corridors need to be made more legible.	Accept
CSF94	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Ecological corridors	Parked feedback	Creation of ecological corridor between bus station and Maungawhau	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	Map	It is unclear where this comment is referring to.	Decline
CSF95	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Open Space	Parked feedback	Is the coastal walkway funded or aspirational? Could be clarified better in the text	Citywide Spatial Framework	Lifestyle Choices	Text	This could be clarified further in the text	Accept
CSF96	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Open Space	Parked feedback	The Manukau foreshore east of Onehunga including the sports field needs to indicate a deeper recreational zone	Citywide Spatial Framework	Lifestyle Choices		These maps do not show 'new' aspiration and non-funded parks.	Decline
CSF97	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Open Space	Parked feedback	Consider 1994 study 'west city walks' is an example for a number of cross city walkways emphasised as 'premier walkways'	Citywide Spatial Framework	Lifestyle Choices	Map	ACR Policy provided this as background information during preparation of area plans.	Decline
CSF98	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Parked feedback	Dominion Road rapid transit connection to State Highway 20 rail route - should consider a rail station there	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices		In addition to being a parked feedback item, the concept of an additional station between the two shown was raised within the feedback. The two train stations have been selected due to surrounding land uses at town centre and business node. The Dominion Road location, or an alternative location between the two currently shown, would not have same benefits. A Mt Roskill station between Carr and Stoddard stations is not really efficient from a heavy passenger rail perspective. Dominion Road is likely to remain a road-based public transport system for some time, so the interchange with the potential Avondale-Southdown rail line could be accommodated by some Dominion Road buses diverting to Stoddard rail station, or some other arrangement. This issue could be re-considered within a future iteration/review of the spatial framework.	Decline
CSF99	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Parked feedback	Lack of vision in rail network. Should be fully integrated underground network, then charge for driving into CBD	Citywide Spatial Framework	Transport Choices	None	Future changes to the rail system could be considered in a future iteration/review of the spatial framework under the new Auckland Council.	Decline

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
<b>Heritage</b>									
<b>Heritage protection</b>									
H1	Heritage	H - Protection	Support	Council can best protect Auckland's heritage through Advocacy	Heritage	General	None	The Next Phase for heritage in the planning process is to:  Review all sites put forward through the FPF process or nomination to schedule process up to 11 May 2009 Group sites according to: A) already on schedule B) new sites/areas/landscapes Prioritise survey and evaluation of Group B Implement survey and evaluation Align group A and B for management methods in new plan	Next Phase
H2	Heritage	H - Protection	Support	Council can best protection heritage in Auckland City through Economic incentives or Funding	Heritage	General	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
H3	Heritage	H - Protection	Support	Heritage protection in the form of Education	Heritage	General	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
H4	Heritage	H - Protection	Support	Council can best protect heritage in Auckland City through Management Plans	Heritage	General	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
H5	Heritage	H - Protection	Support	Council can best protect heritage in Auckland City through the purchasing of property, objects or items	Heritage	General	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
H6	Heritage	H - Protection	Support	Council can best protect heritage in Auckland City with rules for private landowners	Heritage	General	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
H7	Heritage	H - Protection	Support	Support for the strategy of Green the city and protect heritage	Citywide Spatial Framework	General	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
H8	Heritage	H - Protection	Comment	Council can best protect heritage in Auckland City through Community consultation	Citywide Spatial Framework	Strong and Healthy Communities	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>									
H9	Heritage	H - Residential	Support	General support for further protection of Auckland's residential heritage	Heritage	Quality Built Environment	None		Accept
H10	Heritage	H - Cultural	Support	Further identification and protection of Auckland's iconic built form	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Built Environment	None	Currently underway with the review of the built heritage schedule.	Accept
H11	Heritage	H - Residential	Aspiration	Protect the residential heritage of Point Chevalier	Western Bays	Quality Built Environment	None	The Next Phase for heritage in the planning process is to:  Review all sites put forward through the FPF process or nomination to schedule process up to 11 May 2009 Group sites according to: A) already on schedule B) new sites/areas/landscapes Prioritise survey and evaluation of Group B Implement survey and evaluation Align group A and B for management methods in new plan	Next Phase
H12	Heritage	H - Residential	Aspiration	Protect the heritage of Parnell - residential heritage and shopping	Newmarket/Parnell	Quality Built Environment	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
H13	Heritage	H - Residential	Aspiration	Recommendation of streets and local areas to be reviewed for residential heritage value - alternative detail list has been created	Overall area plans	Quality Built Environment	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
H14	Heritage	H - Residential	Aspiration	Retaining the residential heritage of Morningside/Sandringham/St Lukes	Eden/Albert	Quality Built Environment	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
H15	Heritage	H - Residential	Aspiration	Protection of Auckland's residential heritage of Auckland Villas and Bungalows	Overall area plans	Quality Built Environment	None	The Next Phase for heritage in the planning process is to:  Review all sites put forward through the FPF process or nomination to schedule process up to 11 May 2009 Group sites according to: A) already on schedule B) new sites/areas/landscapes Prioritise survey and evaluation of Group B Implement survey and evaluation Align group A and B for management methods in new plan	Next Phase

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
H16	Heritage	H - Residential	Comment	Maintain current residential heritage zones (residential 1 and residential 2)	General	Quality Built Environment	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
<b>Heritage Landscapes</b>									
H17	Heritage	H - Landscape	Aspiration	Auckland Domain considered to be a heritage landscape	Newmarket/Parnell	General	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
H18	Heritage	H - Landscape	Aspiration	Gribblehurst Park considered to be a heritage landscape	Eden/Albert	General	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
H19	Heritage	H - Landscape	Aspiration	Volcanoes considered to be heritage landscapes - Mt Albert, Mt. Eden, One Tree Hill, Mt Richmond, Mt. Roskill, Three Kings specifically referenced	Citywide Spatial Framework	General	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
H20	Heritage	H - Landscape	Aspiration	Other areas of open space considered to be a heritage landscape, including harbours and beaches	Citywide Spatial Framework	General	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
H21	Heritage	H - Landscape	Aspiration	Views considered to be a heritage landscape	Citywide Spatial Framework	General	None	Take into account in discussion on building heights.	Next Phase
H22	Heritage	H - Landscape	Aspiration	Western Springs and Meola Reef considered to be a heritage landscape	Western Bays	General	None	The Next Phase for heritage in the planning process is to:  Review all sites put forward through the FPF process or nomination to schedule process up to 11 May 2009 Group sites according to: A) already on schedule B) new sites/areas/landscapes Prioritise survey and evaluation of Group B Implement survey and evaluation Align group A and B for management methods in new plan	Next Phase
H23	Heritage	H - Landscape	Aspiration	Oakley Creek considered to be a heritage landscape	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Quality Natural Environment	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
H24	Heritage	H - Landscape	Aspiration	Retain the heritage of local shops and centres: Grey Lynn, Grafton, Kingsland, Mt Albert, Parnell and Newmarket, Remuera, St. Heliers, St. Lukes, Westmere, West Lynn, Mt. Eden and Sandringham specifically referenced	General	Quality Built Environment	None	Take into account in decisions on centres and intensification.	Next Phase
H25	Heritage	H - Residential	Aspiration	Specific non-residential streets considered to be heritage landscapes	Overall area plans	Quality Built Environment	None	Take into account in decisions on centres and intensification.	Next Phase
<b>Natural Heritage</b>									
H26	Heritage	H - Natural	Comment	Supports natural heritage protection in example site(s) that are noted as being particularly important for their values	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	None		Accept
H27	Heritage	H - Natural	Support	Supports general natural heritage protection and scheduling of ecological sites	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	None		Accept
H28	Heritage	H - Natural	Comment	Supports geological heritage protection in example site(s) that are noted as being particularly important for their values	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	None		Accept
H29	Heritage	H - Natural	Comment	Ensure roads do not compromise Oakley Creek's natural values or reinforcing natural values associated with Oakley Creek	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Quality Natural Environment	None	The Next Phase for heritage in the planning process is to:  Review all sites put forward through the FPF process or nomination to schedule process up to 11 May 2009 Group sites according to: A) already on schedule B) new sites/areas/landscapes Prioritise survey and evaluation of Group B Implement survey and evaluation Align group A and B for management methods in new plan	Next Phase
H30	Heritage	H - Natural	Support	Support protection and enhancement of waterways	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	None	Refer to comment above	Next Phase
H31	Heritage	H - Natural	Fundamental flaw	The maps do not have enough of a biodiversity focus and don't provide any concrete measures to protect flora and fauna	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	Text	While there are no specific biodiversity programmes in the FPF, the maps serve to identify locations where this type of activity will be concentrated. Funding for specific projects will be addressed in other plans	Decline

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
H32	Heritage	H - Residential	Comment	Changes in residential/heritage area	Overall area plans			The Next Phase for heritage in the planning process is to:  Review all sites put forward through the FPF process or nomination to schedule process up to 11 May 2009 Group sites according to: A) already on schedule B) new sites/areas/landscapes Prioritise survey and evaluation of Group B Implement survey and evaluation Align group A and B for management methods in new plan	Next Phase
H33	Heritage	H - Cultural		Should the Maori sites of significance symbol change?	Overall area plans	Quality Natural Environment	None	There was no feedback from the engagement to support this request, so no change to be made.	Decline
H34	Heritage	H - Natural	Comment	Fieldwork carried out during April and May 2009 has identified other natural areas within the isthmus that are not part of the 'Sites of ecological significance (scheduled)' or 'other potential sites of ecological significance'. The fieldwork is continuing, and includes collection of environmental management data such as key habitat zones within the currently scheduled sites, areas which should have priority for weed and pest management, and potential sites for restoration and stream daylighting. To ensure the Quality Natural Environment map reflects biodiversity outcomes for the isthmus over the next 30 years, it is important to include this new information.	Citywide Spatial Framework	Quality Natural Environment	Map	These maps are iterative, and it will be possible to add new (more accurate) information at some future date. Public feedback on the existing map supports the integration of this type of data, and a better consideration of indigenous biodiversity and weed threats.	Next Phase
<b>Overall area plans</b>									
<b>Key changes</b>									
OAP1	Business/Mixed Use	BMU - Large Format Retail	Aspiration	Identifying additional areas suitable for large format retail	Overall area plans	Economic Development	Both	There is a difference between area plan definition and provision for large format retail and any Citywide strategy provision and definition for large format retail. This issue is also linked to the LGAAA appeals. Recommend changing the outcome name for 'large format retail' to 'bulky goods' which is more appropriate given the narrow definition applied to that outcome. Amend FPF text in section 3 and section 4: corridors to make it clearer that the mixed use outcome could include large format retail where the outcome is located in corridors, subject to urban design considerations and consideration of its relationship with centres.	Accept
OAP2	Open Space/Community Facilities	OS - Ecological corridors	Object	Locating 'urban forest/ecological corridors' adjacent to rail and state highway corridors	Overall area plans	Quality Natural Environment	Text	Ontrack's preference is for low vegetation such as flaxes and ferns on the edge of the rail corridor and object to what the FPF is proposing here in terms of an urban forest. Recommend wording to state that there are opportunities to look at providing ecological corridors along such routes depending on feasibility studies and working with relevant parties e.g. New Zealand Transport Agency, Ontrack. A change could be made to the definitions of green links, urban forest node and ecological corridors to indicate that the vegetation used along these corridors would have to be appropriate and could be removed by designating authority if works were required. This issue is also identified in the Citywide feedback under the Quality Natural Environment strategy.	Accept
<b>Key themes - support</b>									
OAP3	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Support	Locating intensification around transport hubs, centres and shopping areas.	Overall area plans	Quality Built Environment	None	A majority of the submitters that raised this as an issue were responding to a specific question on this topic on the website. The issue also supports the Citywide key moves of developing lively centres, housing our growing population well and connecting communities and is also raised in the Citywide feedback.	Accept
OAP4	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Support	Support for public transport initiatives.	Overall area plans	Transport Choices	None	Refer on to Transport Strategy for their information	Refer / Delegate

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
OAP5	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Open Space	Support	Support for initiatives listed under the outcome of greening the city.	Overall area plans	Quality Natural Environment	None	Refer on to ACR Policy and Heritage for their information.	Refer / Delegate
OAP6	Transport	Walking and cycling	Support	Support for improved pedestrian and cycle environments.	Overall area plans	Transport Choices	None	Refer on to Transport Strategy for their information	Refer / Delegate
<b>Key themes - issues</b>									
OAP7	Urban Design	UD - Urban Design	Aspiration	The need for the quality of buildings to be improved throughout the city and the use of quality building materials.	Overall area plans	Quality Built Environment	None	The FPF already has this as a goal - Section 4.1.5. The options to explore this in more detail will be looked at during the next phase and in position papers on urban design as well at the District Plan stage.	Next Phase
OAP8	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Aspiration	The need to provide for/access to green areas/open space in conjunction with new developments.	Overall area plans	Quality Built Environment	None	The FPF states that "current gaps in the provision of social infrastructure, disparities in where facilities are located, and new facilities to meet future demand, all need to be planned for and provided by the council and other agencies". There has been no work undertaken on identifying exactly where and what those social infrastructure gaps will be in the future. However, these comments will be referred on to ACR Policy to help in preparing their policies to address such issues in the future.	Refer / Delegate
OAP9	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Aspiration	The need for more public transport initiatives such as extending the rail network and the use of water transport as well as improvements to public transport services.	Overall area plans	Transport Choices	None	Refer on to Transport Strategy and ARTA for their information.	Refer / Delegate
OAP10	Residential	R- Sensitivity to building heights	Aspiration	The view that residential intensification should not be mixed in with heritage dwellings but should be of a similar character and scale to what is existing in the area.	Overall area plans	Quality Built Environment	None	This issue will be considered during the next phase and in position papers on urban design as well as during the development of heritage landscape provisions. This will also feed into future District Plan provisions.	Next Phase
OAP11	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Aspiration	The need to provide for community facilities in conjunction with intensification.	Overall area plans	Lifestyle Choices	None	The FPF states that "current gaps in the provision of social infrastructure, disparities in where facilities are located, and new facilities to meet future demand, all need to be planned for and provided by the council and other agencies". There has been no work undertaken on identifying exactly where and what those social infrastructure gaps will be in the future. However, these comments will be referred on to ACR Policy to help in preparing their policies to address such issues in the future. Copies of the feedback relating to specific facilities has been forwarded for consideration in the LTCCP consultation process. This issue is also identified as part of the Citywide feedback in relation to the Strong and Healthy Communities strategy.	Refer / Delegate
OAP12	Transport	Walking and cycling	Aspiration	The need for improvements to cycling infrastructure around the city.	Overall area plans	Transport Choices	None	The area plans have identified areas where it would be beneficial to have improvements to cycling infrastructure but the delivery of these cycling improvements is not an FPF matter. This issue will be referred on to Transport Strategy.	Refer / Delegate
OAP13	Business/Mixed Use		Object	Mixed use definition should include a mix of activities from site to site.	Overall area plans	Economic Development	None	The National Trading Company requests that the mixed use definition be expanded to also include a horizontal mix of activities which is included in the current district plan provision. They also consider that having residential accommodation in every commercial building except at the ground floor is a narrow concept and would not work well for large format retail. The requirement for a vertical mix of activities is a core aspirational component of the mixed use outcome in the Future Planning Framework. The potential differences in type and mixture of uses required should be explored in position papers to be developed. No changes to FPF.	Next Phase
<b>Minor changes</b>									

## Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
OAP14	Transport		Minor change/correction	Pg 50, 4.5 Transport Environment - Second sentence - refer to pedestrian / cycle active modes objectives as well. Amend third sentence to "the arterial road network provides both efficient vehicle and freight movements and a legible public..." Amend fourth sentence to "Cycling and walking provision is also a priority with both a citywide network together with the provision of more local..." Amend last sentence to "additionally" the interchanges between modes of transport are important to recognise and have been..."	Overall area plans	Transport Choices	Text	This serves to clarify this paragraph in the FPF document.	Accept
<b>Parked feedback</b>									
OAP15	Transport	Roads	Parked feedback	When traditional sites get subdivided into small sites, allow one access way to 3/4 rear properties to maintain existing street frontage and character.	Overall area plans	Quality Built Environment	None	This issue will be considered further during the next phase and will be addressed in position papers on urban design as well as during the translation of FPF outcomes into a district plan.	Next Phase
OAP16	Transport	Walking and cycling	Parked feedback	Noted the difference in some improved pedestrian connections following streets, while some are shown in a general sense connecting particular areas.	Overall area plans	Transport Choices	None	This difference is intentional and the definition of this outcome explains the three different circumstances where this applies.	Accept
OAP17	Centres	AS - General	Parked feedback	Confusion over town centre delineation and location of town centres on map.	Overall area plans	Economic Development	None	This is not an issue as it was not clearly understood through the public engagement process.	Accept
OAP18	Heritage	H - Cultural	Parked feedback	Should the Maori sites of significance symbol change?	Overall area plans	Quality Natural Environment	None	Checked with Pae Herenga Tangata group and they have no concerns with the koru symbol being used. No feedback from the engagement on this matter, so no change to be made.	Decline
OAP19	Transport	Roads	Parked feedback	Can we look at incorporating measures to ensure slower speed, safer road environment?	Overall area plans	Transport Choices	None	Refer on to Transport Strategy for their information	Refer / Delegate
OAP20	Urban Design	UD - Urban Design	Parked feedback	Concerned that intensification will lead to high rise slums- can we affect urban design?	Overall area plans	Quality Built Environment	None	This issue will be considered further during the next phase and will be addressed in position papers on urban design as well as during the translation of FPF outcomes into a district plan.	Next Phase
<b>Avondale/Blockhouse Bay</b>									
<b>Key changes</b>									
ABB1	Transport	Roads	Object	Whether the improved connectivity outcome should be deleted from Heron Park?	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Transport Choices	Both	There is significant opposition to the improved connectivity outcome through Heron Park and only one feedback in support. Reasons in favour of deleting the outcome from the map include the amount of opposition from local residents and the need for any impacts of the revised State Highway 20 Waterview plans to be considered. In addition, further detailed master-planning and engagement would be required to explore options for improving accessibility to and safety and surveillance within the park before any decision was made. Recommend deleting the outcome from the map but retaining the aspiration "Heron Park is more accessible" in the text.	Accept
ABB2	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Object	Whether it is necessary to reduce the extent of the low rise apartments/terraces outcome?	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Quality Built Environment	Map	Feedback recieved expressed concern about the low rise apartments/terraces outcome. However, most relate to the need for good urban design rather than objecting to any particular location for low rise apartments/terraces outcome. The exception is the Robertson Road area, in which there was concern that the low rise apartments/terraces outcome would detract from views to the Waitakere Ranges and residential heritage. Feedback recieved acknowledge that there is less intensification provided for in this area compared with the Liveable Communities Plan, a change which they support. The area does meet the locational criteria for low rise apartments/terraces, but is at the outer edge of the pedestrian shed to the new rail station location. Compliance with the locational criteria needs to be weighed against the heritage/views of the area which are sensitive to increased building height. Recommend that the small area of low rise apartments/terraces on the western side of Blockhouse Bay Road and the eastern part of Robertson Road north of the rail corridor be changed to Single Dwelling Small Site outcome.	Accept

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
ABB3	Business/Mixed Use	BMU - Transition issues	Object	Whether the residential to business transition area adjacent to the Lansford Cres employment area should be amended?	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Economic Development	Both	Concerns have been expressed about the interface between the Residential to Business Transition area on the southern side of Wolverton Road and the residential area behind, and about increased traffic from the Residential to Business Transition area between the rail corridor and Wolverton Road. While these issues would need to be addressed in the next phase, it is recommended that the southern side of Wolverton Road be changed to Live Work as this outcome sends a clearer signal about business activities needing to be compatible with residential uses. In addition to amendment to map, text amendments are required to replace the 5th bullet point under Be Economically Competitive with "Lansford Crescent is a high density employment business area and expands to the south of the railway, with live work development on the southern side of Wolverton Road."	Accept
ABB4	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Question	Should the key road passenger transport route be deleted from Rosebank Road?	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Transport Choices	Both	The outcome was included to reflect the fact that the Rosebank 2030 business precinct plan refers to the need to improve public transport services on the Peninsula. Recommended no change to map but an amendment to the text to include the following explanation of the aspiration: "while Rosebank and Patiki Roads are predominantly a freight route, the council will advocate for improved bus services to serve the Rosebank Business Precinct as employment density within the Precinct increases." Will require a further consequential change to the text to delete "Patiki, Rosebank" from Connect communities, 2nd paragraph, 2nd bullet point.	Accept
ABB5	Key Site	KS - Additional change	Comment	Whether the Highbury Triangle site should have a mixed use outcome applied to the entire area to provide greater flexibility?	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Quality Built Environment	Both	The current draft masterplan for the site may be amended or a different development option pursued, so there is a need for flexibility. The site also meets the criteria for a mixed use outcome. The area is, however, quite height sensitive and feedback has been received expressing concern about the extent and/or height of development provided for on the Triangle in the current version of the Area Plan. Height would need to be carefully addressed in the next phase. Recommend changing to Mixed Use on the map and making a minor correction to the key site boundary so that it adjoins Great North Road. Amend the text by replacing the aspiration in Develop lively centres, 2nd item, 3rd bullet point with "Highbury triangle in Avondale provides low-rise apartments and terraces, mixed use development and community facilities." Address height in next phase.	Accept
<b>Key themes - support</b>									
ABB6	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Support	General support for enhanced public transport to service the area, including the emphasis on rail, improvements to the bus/rail interchange and provision of a park and ride close to the station.	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Transport Choices	None	These comments are supportive of the Area Plan outcomes.	Accept
ABB7	Transport	Walking and cycling	Support	A large number of comments were received in general support of the improvements to the pedestrian and/or cycle environments.	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Transport Choices	None	These comments are supportive of the Area Plan outcomes.	Accept
ABB8	Business/Mixed Use	C - Growth of Centres	Support	Support for rejuvenation of the Avondale town centre.	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Economic Development	None	These comments are supportive of the Area Plan outcomes.	Accept
ABB9	Heritage	H - Natural	Support	A large number of comments were received in general support of the "Green the city and protect our heritage" outcomes (including enhancing waterways, particularly Te Auaunga-Oakley Creek, and improving open spaces). Retention of the Avondale racecourse was also referred to by a number of submitters.	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Quality Natural Environment	None	These comments are supportive of the Area Plan outcomes.	Accept
<b>Key themes - issues</b>									



### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
ABB10	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Aspiration	Whether the area plan text should be amended to refer to the need for a swimming pool/indoor recreation facilities in Avondale/New Windsor?	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Strong and Healthy Communities	None	The Future Planning Framework intentionally includes a generally worded aspiration in relation to community facilities (along with references to any projects that are included in the LTCCP). Accordingly, recommend no change. Copies of relevant feedback have been forwarded to the address for feedback on the LTCCP.	Refer / Delegate
ABB11	Transport	Roads	Question	Whether it is necessary to make any change to how State Highway20 Waterview is depicted on the map or the aspiration in relation to advocating for the tunnel option in the text?	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Transport Choices	None	Most of the feedback support the tunnel option (or more generally an option that protects Te Auaunga-Oakley Creek). At this stage, there is no revised council position in light of the Government's decision and New Zealand Transport Agency's announcement of the preferred option (partially tunnelled, partially cut and covered and partially at grade). Therefore, it is premature to amend the FPF. Recommend no change at this stage but to keep under review. Forward to Transport Strategy for information.	Decline
<b>Minor changes</b>									
ABB12	Transport	Walking and cycling	Minor change/correction	Can we add two additional improved pedestrian and/or cycle environment outcomes - from Holly Street to Heron Park and from Trent Street to Harbutt Reserve?	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Transport Choices	Map	Reasons for suggested amendments are explained in the feedback. Recommend adding both suggested outcomes. .	Accept
ABB13	Transport	Roads	Minor change/correction	Can we make minor amendments to the text as follows: Connect communities, 2nd item, 1st bullet point - add "(long term)" at the end; 5th item - add "tunnel" before "portal"	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Transport Choices	Text	Minor clarifications to text. Recommend making changes.	Accept
ABB14	Key Site	KS - Additional change	Minor change/correction	Can the netball courts and suburbs rugby club area be identified as a key site (this would mean splitting it from the racecourse and surrounds key site)?	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Quality Built Environment	Both	The Avondale racecourse and surrounding land on Racecourse Parade and Elm Street is identified as a key site. However, recommend that this key site is split into two (land owned by Jockey Club vs. Peninsular hotel/Suburbs rugby/netball/Racecourse Parade/3 Guys sites). The area plan text should continue to refer to the relationship between the racecourse and the land on Racecourse Parade and Elm Street and signal that the whole area would need to be considered when either key site was being redeveloped. In addition to changing the key site boundaries on the map, recommend adding "(likely through a small number of separate but related plans)" after the words "master planned" (in Develop lively centres, 2nd item, 2nd bullet point.)	Accept
ABB15	Business/Mixed Use	AS - General	Minor change/correction	Should the circles within the ancillary retail and services outcome along Rosebank Road be deleted?	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Economic Development	Map	Recommend making change to map in order to be consistent with the Rosebank 2030 business precinct plan.	Accept
<b>Parked feedback</b>									
ABB16	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Parked feedback	Is the topography of the western edge of the Stoddard key site too steep to support the low-rise outcome?	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Quality Built Environment	Map	Recommend that the area of low-rise be reduced slightly to the far sides of Valonia and Roseville Streets (excluding Westminster Street), due to topography and distance from the centre.	Accept
ABB17	Transport	Parking	Parked feedback	Whether the area plan should include an aspiration that Geddes Tce has angle parking to accommodate developments around the train station?	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Transport Choices	None	Parking is an issue that will be addressed in the next phase.	Next Phase
ABB18	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Parked feedback	Whether New North Road should be shown as a key road passenger transport route?	Avondale/Blockhouse Bay	Transport Choices	Map	This is part of a wider issue in relation to a disconnect between the Citywide Transport Choices map and intensification that was raised in the context of the Citywide Spatial Framework. Recommend applying the key road passenger transport route outcome to the small section of New North Road within the Avondale/Blockhouse Bay area plan in order to be consistent with amendments to the Citywide Spatial Framework and the Eden-Albert and Western Bays area plans.	Accept
<b>Eastern Bays</b>									
<b>Key changes</b>									
EB1	Transport	Park n Ride	Aspiration	Want more park and rides	Eastern Bays	Transport Choices	Both	A park and ride was proposed for St Johns subject to feedback. One of the main themes of the support for the St Johns rail station was that it would increase the parking available as both Glen Innes and Meadowbank were full during the day. It is recommended that the park and ride symbol be reinstated on the proposed St Johns rail station site.	Accept
<b>Key themes - support</b>									

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
EB2	Area specific category	AS - General	Comment	Supporting improving the waterfront including boardwalks, solving of congestion problems, maintenance of Tamaki Drive, development of The Landing and a wharf at St Heliers	Eastern Bays	Transport Choices	Both	Accept support	Accept
EB3	Transport	Walking and cycling	Comment	Support for walking and cycling improvements	Eastern Bays	Quality Built Environment	Map	Accept support	Accept
<b>Key themes - issues</b>									
EB4	Centres	C - Growth of Centres	Support	Happy to see small expansion of local centre at St Heliers	Eastern Bays	Quality Built Environment	None	Accept, no action required	Accept
EB5	Centres	R- Sensitivity to building heights	Object	Wishing to keep existing building heights in St Heliers and Mission Bay, including comments about keeping the area the same and keeping village atmosphere in St Heliers, restricting height on Kupe Street	Eastern Bays	Quality Built Environment	Both	Low rise apartments outcome is 2-4 storeys, will carry forward these comments (about a preference for height at the lower end of the scale) to the District Plan stage	Next Phase
EB6	Residential	AS - General	Comment	Need for infrastructure to be upgraded to cope with intensification, particularly stormwater and schools	Eastern Bays	Quality Natural Environment	None	Council has a programme of works that is phased to cope with projected growth	Accept
EB7	Transport	Roads	Comment	Reinstate the Eastern Corridor	Eastern Bays	Transport Choices	Both	Refer to working party	Refer / Delegate
<b>Minor changes</b>									
EB8	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Minor change/correction	Low rise apartments/terraces outcome at 78 Melanesia Road, entire block should be single dwelling traditional site outcome	Eastern Bays	Quality Built Environment	Map	Accept	Accept
EB9	Area specific category	AS - General	Minor change/correction	Pg 62 develop lively centres second item second bullet point should be Auckland City Council	Eastern Bays	Quality Built Environment	Text	Accept	Accept
EB10	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Minor change/correction	Proposed has been missed from some mentions of the St Johns rail station	Eastern Bays	Transport Choices	Text	Rewrite so that all references to St Johns rail station indicated that it is proposed Avondale has eg.	Accept
EB11	Area specific category	AS - General	Officer generated change	The 1st paragraph of Challenges and Opportunities mentions town centres which should be changed to local centres.	Eastern Bays	Quality Built Environment	Text	Accept	Accept
EB12	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Minor change/correction	245 Kepa Road should be zoned for low rise apartments/terraces	Eastern Bays	Quality Built Environment	Map	Both sides of Kepa Road within 400 metre walking distance of Eastridge should be shown as low rise apartment/terraces outcome.	Accept
<b>Parked feedback</b>									
EB13	Residential	Parking	Comment	Hawera Road - driveway access is dangerous and it is a narrow street with car parking on both sides	Eastern Bays	Quality Built Environment	None	Not a matter for the area plans. However, parking and accessway issues will be considered in the development of the District Plan.	Next Phase
EB14	Transport	UD - Urban Design	Comment	Disabled access is only the legal minimum. District Plan needs to look at providing a better level of disabled access. Particularly in Tamaki Dr as is a regional recreation destination.	Eastern Bays	Quality Built Environment	None	Noted to consider during the development of the District Plan. Will need to investigate the extent to which this can be addressed in the District Plan (versus as a Building Act matter). This will be looked at during the next phase.	Next Phase
EB15	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Comment	Kohimarama - concerned with having height on flats. Eastern Bays has right topography to have height on hillside.	Eastern Bays	Quality Built Environment	None	The preference for lower heights, especially along Tamaki Dr will be carried forward to consider at the District Plan stage. It is also anticipated that height around the the centres on the 'flats' in Eastern Bays will be toward the low end of the ranges identified in the local centre and low rise/terraces outcomes. Acknowledge that Eastern Bays does have the right topography for height on hillsides but other factors outweigh this. Kohimarama flats are closer to public transport, retail and community facilities than the slopes. Increased density on the slopes would encourage car trips as residents would find public transport inconvenient as they are too far away to walk.	Accept in part

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
EB16	Centres	Roads	Comment	Kepa Road - extension of mixed use between Kupe Street and Eastridge. Concerned about the impact of traffic on narrow Kepa Road. Mentioned there was a wide verge that could be used for on street parking.	Eastern Bays	Quality Built Environment	Map	Kepa Road has a good bus service with a bus every 10 minutes or so. Site is close to shops, community facilities and is on a regional arterial road, so satisfies locational criteria for mixed use. Kepa Road could also be a site for a live/work outcome, with the proviso that the amenity of this outcome at this location would have to be of a high standard. Parking issues will be considered as part of development of District Plan rules. Only one feedback comment received mentioned this issue. FPF Working Party is concerned about impact on views and traffic. Agreed to change to live work on basis that it was only two storeys.	Accept in part
EB17	Open Space/ Community Facilities	Walking and cycling	Comment	Glen Atkinson-Fern Glen Road to Dingle Dell show informal connection between parks	Eastern Bays	Quality Natural Environment		This connection is not at an area plan level.	Decline
<b>Eden Albert</b>									
<b>Key changes</b>									
EA1	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Object	There should be adjustments to the amount of low rise apartments/terraces located west of Mt Albert centre along Carrington Road.  Braemer Terrace especially, some mention of around Braemer Park and Seaview Terrace.	Eden/Albert	Quality Built Environment	Both	There has been some opposition to intensification of the area west of the Mt Albert local centre. Some are opposed to any intensification while others object to only specific parts. Feedback has also been received supporting this intensification.  It is agreed that the boundary should be adjusted for Braemer Terrace so that both sides of the road have the same outcome. There is minimal intensification on Seaview Terrace (it includes only the corner property on Carrington Road), this loose boundary should remain though this could possibly be amended at a later more detailed District Plan stage if considered appropriate. Around Braemer Park along Carrington Road "low rise apartments/terraces" should be retained as it meets the locational criteria. No further change is recommended.	Accept
<b>Key themes - support</b>									
EA2	Centres	C - Classifications	Comment	General comment on St Lukes i.e. "improve St Lukes", "support focus on Morningside Dr".	Eden/Albert	Economic Development	None	These have been noted.	Accept
EA3	Open Space/ Community Facilities	AS - General	Support	Support the outcomes described in Eden/Albert "Green the city and protect our heritage"	Eden/Albert	Quality Natural Environment	None	Noted.	Accept
EA4	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Ecological corridors	Support	Supports ecological/urban forest corridors.	Eden/Albert	Quality Natural Environment	None	Noted.	Accept
EA5	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Support	Many people support the retention of the library and believe it should be easily and directly accessible.	Eden/Albert	Strong and Healthy Communities	None	A lot of people appear concerned that the library may move and may not be publicly accessible. The Area Plan proposes neither of these things so no change is required. Two people have suggested it be moved to Rocket Park.	Accept
EA6	Open Space/ Community Facilities	H - Natural	Support	Support identification of Gribblehurst Park as an ecological site of significance	Eden/Albert	Quality Natural Environment	None	Noted.	Accept
EA7	Open Space/ Community Facilities	H - Natural	Support	General support for protection of waterways in this area (no specific waterway mentioned).	Eden/Albert	Quality Natural Environment	None	Noted.	Accept
EA8	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Open Space	Support	Support improvements to open space lighting and safety	Eden/Albert	Quality Natural Environment	None	Noted.	Accept
EA9	Centres	AS - General	Support	A number of people have agreed that Mt Albert centre is rundown and needs to be improved/renewed.	Eden/Albert	Economic Development	None	Noted.	Accept

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
EA10	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Support	Support the improved public transport approach proposed.	Eden/Albert	Transport Choices	None	Noted.	Accept
EA11	Transport	Walking and cycling	Support	General support for new/improved cycle and pedestrian connections. One person was against cycle lanes using main roads citing Mt Albert Road as an example.	Eden/Albert	Transport Choices	None	General support noted, exact method of improvement to be decided on a case by case basis.	Accept
EA12	Transport	Roads	Support	People support the tunnelling of State Highway20 Waterview, 1 person was against wanting trenching with the savings put towards public transport.	Eden/Albert	Transport Choices	None	General support noted, tunnel retained on area plan.	Accept
EA13	Transport	R - Residential Intensification	Support	Support development around key public transport infrastructure such as train stations and want to see investment in this infrastructure.	Eden/Albert	Quality Built Environment	None	Noted.	Accept
EA14	Open Space/ Community Facilities	H - Natural	Support	Support for the protection and enhancement of Oakley Creek and its surrounds.	Eden/Albert	Quality Natural Environment	None	Noted.	Accept
<b>Key themes - issues</b>									
EA15	Centres	C - Classifications	Object	These comments were concerned about a town centre with a focus on a private shopping mall.	Eden/Albert	Economic Development	None	It is considered that the St Lukes Shopping Mall is best incorporated into a town centre rather than being located as it is on its own. With a focus along Morningside Drive, sufficient space in public ownership will be provided to alleviate any concerns regarding a private town centre. As stated in the text, Council will support the development of improved amenity along Morningside Drive which will involve work to create a high quality public area.	Decline
EA16	Centres	C - Classifications	Object	These comments reflected a belief the Morningside/St Lukes town centre should be deleted with a local/town centre instead focussed on Morningside.	Eden/Albert	Economic Development	None	As discussed above this would not help integrate the existing shopping mall into the surrounding area. Any centre focused only on Morningside would continue to be dominated by the shopping mall. In addition, as also mentioned below, the employment area near Morningside is a scarce resource and needs to be protected.	Decline
EA17	Centres	C - Classifications	Object	These people are all primarily concerned the Morningside/St Lukes town centre will dominate the Eden/Albert area and/or intensify traffic. They also state that it doesn't meet the criteria for a town centre.	Eden/Albert	Economic Development	None	The Morningside/St Lukes town centre will most likely dominate the area, however it is considered that the shopping mall in its present state already dominates the area and will most likely continue to do so into the future. The intention of the town centre is to better incorporate the shopping mall into the surrounding community through the creation of a more external focus and transition from a shopping mall through to more main street and low rise residential activities into the surrounding residential. It is also intended to improve connections to the train station and a range of other uses. While the centre would not operate on a strictly traditional format, it will have a range of uses, have public open spaces (such as Sainsbury Reserve on the corner of Sainsbury Road), provide public services (such as the library and Citizens Advice Bureau on the corner of Cornwallis Street) and be a focus for public transport.	Decline
EA18	Business/Mixed Use	C - Classifications	Object	Should the employment area around Morningside be changed to Mixed Use? And therefore form part of the Morningside local/town centre.	Eden/Albert	Economic Development	None	Tied to the change sought above. This land is currently under-used with many empty sites/properties. Given the proximity to the Morningside centre, Morningside station and New North Road should this be used for Mixed Use activity.  This was retained as employment due to the shortage of business zoned land (especially for non-office activity) and the need to retain areas for these uses, it is recommended that this continue. The area has also already been studied for an office park/business node and was found to be too small (it scored well on most other factors).	Decline

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
EA19	Business/Mixed Use	BMU - Transition issues	Object	Should the transition residential to business opposite St Lukes shopping centre be deleted and the existing residential zoning retained?	Eden/Albert	Economic Development	None	No reason is given by most feedback providers for this concern to over time (the FPF doc specifies this could be 15+ years) change this area to a business use. The few that have given reasons say this area on Morningside Drive is a nice residential area. This area is currently zoned residential 7b and already has some commercial uses occurring in some of the houses. The environment is not ideal for residential - it faces St Lukes shopping centre and has considerable traffic immediately outside, and business 4 zoned land behind it - and would be better in the long-term to have a more commercial focus. It is recommended that the transition residential to business outcome be retained.	Decline
EA20	Residential	General	Comment	Should all currently residentially zoned streets be retained as residential?	Eden/Albert	Quality Built Environment	None	A number of feedback forms have requested that existing residential streets be retained as residential. While none of these have mentioned specific residential areas or the specific type of residential they want retained, it is assumed that they mean the streets/areas around St Lukes shopping centre and retention of similar outcomes to the current zoning. This area is currently predominantly residential 6 or residential 7 and is largely shown on the area plan as either low rise/terraces, single dwelling small site. This outcome is consistent with these feedback requests. Some properties are shown as transition residential to business and this is dealt with above.	Decline
EA21	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Object	Should the land directly surrounding the St Lukes shopping centre be retained as residential zoning?	Eden/Albert	Quality Built Environment	None	As stated above, much of the area does retain a residential outcome except for a small area presently owned by Westfield, and the area opposite the shopping mall on Morningside Dr. For the reasons previously stated it is recommended that this be declined	Decline
EA22	Residential	H - Residential	Support	Support the retention of the residential character and/or heritage values of the Morningside/Sandringham/St Lukes area.	Eden/Albert	Quality Built Environment	None	The 'relief' sought by this feedback is a little unclear. While phrased as support, it could be meant as opposition to any changes to the existing zoning in the areas mentioned. The reasoning for any changes has been previously outlined, and any matters relating to heritage value will be further assessed.	Refer / Delegate
EA23	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Object	Objections to the Low rise apartments/terraces outcome on the small block between Walters Road and Sandringham Road.	Eden/Albert	Quality Built Environment	None	These objections relate to concern about the potential loss of the character of this area. This matter has already been raised and is being assessed, however until this work is completed it is recommended that this remain low-rise/terraces.	Next Phase
EA24	Centres	R- Sensitivity to building heights	Object	Concern about height around Mt Eden village.	Eden/Albert	Quality Built Environment	None	This feedback is concerned about the scale of buildings around the Mt Eden Village centre and the impact on the character of the area. It is considered that the outcomes shown won't have an impact on the character of the centre, subject to appropriate controls on interface design to be drafted at the District Plan stage.	Decline
EA25	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Object	Concern about intensification around Balmoral and Sandringham Reds	Eden/Albert	Quality Built Environment	None	The primary reason given is the effect on the character and heritage of Balmoral. The heritage value will be reviewed, but it otherwise fits the locational criteria for intensification and is a current area of change.	Decline
<b>Minor changes</b>									
EA26	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Aspiration	Some people have specifically requested an upgrade of the Mt Albert rail station, a few further mention it as part of the centre upgrade.	Eden/Albert	Transport Choices	Text	Mention of this in the text makes sense. ARTA plan to upgrade all stations, though there is no timeframe specifically for Mt Albert at the moment. Upgrades are also mentioned for some specific stations in other area plans.	Accept
EA27	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Object	Concern about the "suppression" of bus routes on New North Road.	Eden/Albert	Transport Choices	Both	This is part of a wider issue in relation to a disconnect between the Citywide Transport Choices map and intensification that was raised in the context of the Citywide Spatial Framework. The lack of a "key road passenger transport route" along New North Road did not mean less buses; however, given that this could be misleading and that ARTA have recently proposed that this be a form of Quality Transit Network, it is recommended that the "key road passenger transport route" outcome be applied along New North Road.	Accept

## Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
EA28	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Aspiration	More intensification on New North Road between Asquith Avenue and Mt Albert centre	Eden/Albert	Quality Built Environment	Map	This should be extended over the currently zoned Business 1 site that has previously had a petrol station on it. Low rise is more appropriate than mixed use to mirror the residential activity on the other side of the road.	Accept
EA29	Open Space/ Community Facilities		Officer generated change	The Oakley Creek route near the south-western corner is incorrect.	Overall area plans	Quality Natural Environment	Map	The route of this waterway should follow the boundary of the area. This should also be the case for the adjacent Avondale/Blockhouse Bay area.	Accept
EA30	Open Space/ Community Facilities		Minor change/correction	Meola Creek should be extended to the eastern most corner of the ESRC site.	Eden/Albert	Quality Natural Environment	Map	Meola Creek does appear at the surface around this point. It is therefore recommended that the waterway be extended slightly.	Accept
EA31	Key Site	KS - Additional change	Minor change/correction	These pieces of feedback talk about further development on the Unitec site, including residential.	Eden/Albert	General	Map	While it is not considered appropriate to show where on the Unitec site further development should occur without further detailed work in conjunction with the landowner, it is recognised that further development could, and probably will occur on the site. It is therefore recommended that the entire site should be shown as a key site to indicate that any masterplan should include the entire site and its links to Mt Albert centre as well as Pt Chev centre.	Accept
EA32	Residential		Officer generated change	Low rise/terrace border just west of Kingsland.	Eden/Albert	Quality Built Environment	Map	The low-rise outcome west of Kingsland centre extends over some current residential 1 sites due to the "blobby" nature of the plans. While this can't completely be corrected given the scale of the map, it can be amended in part.	Accept
EA33	Open Space/ Community Facilities		Minor change/correction	Meola Creek route by Mt Albert Grammar School should go through park not along the edge.	Eden/Albert	Quality Natural Environment	Map	Meola Creek was incorrectly shown as running along the edge of the park when it runs through the middle.	Accept
EA34	Residential		Officer generated change	Low rise/terrace borders around Balmoral.	Eden/Albert	Quality Built Environment	Map	A couple of the borders of the low-rise/terrace outcome extend a little too far through blocks, it is recommended that this be corrected, in particular on Wiremu Street and Rocklands Avenue.	Accept
EA35	Key Site	KS - Additional change	Minor change/correction	Change name to MASC (Mt Albert Science Centre) as ESR (Institute of Environmental Science and Research) is not the main owner.	Eden/Albert	General	Map	It is unclear who the main owner/occupier of the site is. It is recommended that the name be changed to match that of Council's current reference name, which is the more general "Horticultural & Food Research Institute".	Accept
EA36	Specific Use	AS - General	Minor change/correction	Add hospital symbol onto Buchanan Clinic site.	Eden/Albert	Strong and Healthy Communities	Map	The Auckland District Health Board has requested that the rehabilitation clinic on Carrington Road (opposite Unitec) be shown as a hospital. It is recommended that this be accepted.	Accept

Maungakiekie									
Key themes - support									
M1	Centres	C - Growth of Centres	Support	General support for revitalisation of the Onehunga town centre and affording Principal Centre status to it.	Maungakiekie	Quality Built Environment	None	Onehunga is proposed to remain as a principal centre in the hierarchy of centres presented in the City Wide Spatial Framework.	Accept
M2	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Support	General support for rail improvements in the area including the Onehunga rail line, new stations particularly in the Onehunga town centre, and rail links to the airport.	Maungakiekie	Transport Choices	None	While the implementation of these facilities is ultimately the responsibility of Ontrack / ARTA land use change in Onehunga is dependent on these facilities.	Accept
M3	Transport	Park n Ride	Support	General support for park and ride facilities along side train stations although some concern was expressed that the amount of parking would be inadequate.	Maungakiekie	Transport Choices	None	The need for park and ride facilities alongside rail stations / transport interchanges has been a common theme raised across many area plans. The Maungakiekie area plan identifies an aspiration to establish a park and ride close to the Onehunga rail station. This feedback has been passed on to Transport Strategy to assist with future park and ride policy development.	Refer / Delegate
M4	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Open Space	Comment	Multiple points with respect to enhancing the Manukau Harbour experience either by improving its ecological values, access to the foreshore or provision of additional open space and recreation opportunities.	Maungakiekie	Quality Natural Environment	None	The Maungakiekie area plan identifies enhancement of the Onehunga Bay foreshore, ecological corridor provision alongside the Manukau Harbour and improved pedestrian and / or cycle connections. It is considered that these elements identified in the area plan give effect to this feedback.	Accept

## Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
M5	Transport	Public transport (buses, ferry, rail)	Support	General support for location of a passenger ferry service proximate to Onehunga port.	Maungakiekie	Transport Choices	None	The area plan has identified this as an aspiration dependant upon feasibility of this use establishing being evaluated.	Accept
<b>Key themes - issues</b>									
M6	Transport	Roads	Comment	The need to better provide for heavy vehicle access to industrial sites and particularly the container port. Suggestions include improved connection to State Highway 1 (Highbrook /Mt Wellington interchanges), improved local east-west connections and the potential for a motorway link between State Highway 1 and State Highway 20 (support and opposition). Issues around road connectivity between Mt Wellington and Onehunga have also been raised.	Maungakiekie	Transport Choices	None	Improvements to Neilson Street have been proposed by Council particularly at intersections and to improve the capacity of this road through consideration of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)/ freight priority lanes. While some works have been implemented the majority of works have been deferred beyond the 10 year LTCCP process. In conjunction with this the need to improve local east-west connectivity is being considered through Council's designation review. Further, the New Zealand Transport Agency are investigating a state highway link between State Highway 1 and State Highway 20 although this is only at an issues paper stage. Council's current position is to provide this connectivity improvement is through the existing South Eastern Arterial (SEART)-Neilson Street corridor but as an economic development / freight connection in preference to a motorway link. Upgrading of the current Onehunga State Highway 20 interchange in the future may also help to assist with heavy vehicle movement on Neilson Street. The issue of improved connectivity has multiple implications which cannot be resolved through area plans. It is therefore, recommended issues be considered by Transport Strategy.	Refer / Delegate
<b>Minor changes</b>									
M7	Residential	H - Residential	Object	Objection to Low-rise apartment outcome as applied to the area around Forbes Street / Normans Hill Road and Quadrant Street.	Maungakiekie	Quality Built Environment	Text	The area around Normans Hill Road has been identified for low rise apartments/terraces due to its proximity to the Royal Oak town centre and the advantages the location proximate to Jellicoe Park provides for amenity and recreation. Having reviewed this outcome, it is concluded that a large proportion of sites within the Grey Street, Quadrant Road, Normans Hill Road triangle and the eastern side of Normans Hill Road north of Grey Street display the attributes necessary to qualify for a Single Dwelling Traditional site outcome. The subdivision pattern within this area largely reflects the traditional pattern. Further the area is at the outer extent of the 10 minute walk to Royal Oak centre and is considered a borderline candidate for the low rise apartment/terraces outcome. For this reason it is recommended the outcomes be changed. For the Forbes Street area it is recommended that the outcomes remain as recommended.	Accept
M8	Transport	Public transport (buses, ferry, rail)	Minor change/correction	Indicate in the text the desirability for the Avondale-Southdown line extension be tunnelled beneath Onehunga Bay Reserve to protect this reserve.	Maungakiekie	Transport Choices	Text	Agree the change clarifies a reason for the desirability of tunnelling in this location. The following wording should be added under the "connect communities" heading: " <i>That the Avondale Southdown rail line is tunnelled through the Onehunga town centre to reduce impacts on the Onehunga Bay Reserve and the amenity within the town centre.</i> "	Accept
M9	Transport	Walking and cycling	Minor change/correction	Identify the need for improved pedestrian / cycle connectivity in vicinity of Campbell Road to Wheturangi Road.	Maungakiekie	Transport Choices	Map	Agree with change. Similar to two other points to the south on Campbell Road to Cornwall Park.	Accept
M10	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Aspiration	That low rise apartments/terraces be shown at the Ellerslie end of Campbell Road given proximity to Great South Road.	Maungakiekie	Quality Built Environment	Map	The change is supported as it meets the location criteria.	Accept
M11	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Comment	Support for identification of medium rise apartments along Manukau Road corridor particularly on the east side south of Greenwoods corner all the way to Royal Oak.	Maungakiekie	Quality Built Environment	Map	It is considered that the low rise outcome (as opposed to medium rise mentioned in the feedback) should be applied along the eastern road frontage of Manukau Road, to reflect current (residential 7a) zoning and development and to mirror the predominant height of the built form on the western side.	Accept
M12	Specific Use	AS - General	Minor change/correction	Include sites owned by Dilworth Trust Board within Education outcome identified in the area plan.	Maungakiekie	Strong and Healthy Communities	Map	The feedback requires minor amendments to the area plan map. The change moves to include school owned property so is appropriate.	Accept

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
M13	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Open Space	Minor change/correction	Grotto Street reserve has since been named Hochstetter Pond.	Maungakiekie	Quality Natural Environment	Text	Reference to Grotto Street reserve needs to be changed to Hochstetter Pond.	Accept
M14	Transport	Roads	Minor change/correction	Maungakiekie Avenue shown on the area plan should be changed to Wheturangi Road.	Maungakiekie	Transport Choices	Map	This is correcting an error.	Accept
<b>Parked feedback</b>									
M15	Residential	R- Sensitivity to building heights	Parked feedback	4 level residential areas should be smaller "bulk" buildings (i.e. smaller building footprints)	Maungakiekie	Quality Built Environment	None	There are many methods to achieve this which will be explored in the next phase (district plan development). This will be addressed through the District Plan rules.	Next Phase
M16	Heritage	H - Cultural	Parked feedback	Historic buildings: Masonic Hall etc in precinct around Onehunga Primary (next level of detail)	Maungakiekie	Quality Built Environment	None	This needs to be considered in the heritage work on the district plan review. Comment to be forwarded to the Heritage team.	Refer / Delegate
M17	Transport	Roads	Parked feedback	Concern regarding freight movement along Gavin Street from industrial (south). Perhaps need to "stop street" to avoid impact on residential area (or chicanes)	Maungakiekie	Transport Choices	None	There are potentially several methods to address this issue. This is largely a road management issue and not necessarily an area plan objective. This should be referred to Transport Safety and Operations.	Refer / Delegate
M18	Transport	Public transport (buses, ferry, rail)	Parked feedback	Why isn't the location of the Ellerslie racecourse railway station identified?	Maungakiekie	Transport Choices	None	The desirability of opening this station for events has been raised in the Ellerslie Liveable Communities Plan. Opening of this station was identified as a community aspiration through the Ellerslie's Future Framework, however, ARTA have not identified this as a priority given the closeness of this station to the Greenlane station. However, the opening of the station to coincide with events is not opposed.	Decline
M19	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Parked feedback	Rockfield Road and above: Could handle more intensification (residential). Also northern end of Campbell Road (both sides)	Maungakiekie	Quality Built Environment	Map	Part of the eastern end of Campbell Road has been recommended for a change to low rise apartments/terraces as above. The Rockfield Road area is not considered sufficiently served by public transport services in the future to warrant a low rise apartments/terraces outcome	Accept
M20	Residential	H - Residential	Parked feedback	West of Jellicoe Park: character / heritage still intact here (Normans Hill Road / Quadrant) Drop zoning in this area?	Maungakiekie	Quality Built Environment	Map	This comment reflects the issue of intensification vs. retention of existing character. This area meets the locational criteria for low rise apartments / terraces. However, recognisable character elements are also apparent. There has been additional feedback received on this item and it has been recommended as a change.	Accept
<b>Mt Roskill/Hillsborough</b>									
<b>Key changes</b>									
MRH1	Business/Mixed Use	KS - Opposition to key site	Minor change/correction	Comments received at two Maungakiekie Community Board events relative to the effects on the Onehunga and Royal Oak town centres of identifying the land on the corner of Pah and Mt Albert Roads (Mt Roskill / Hillsborough Area Plan) particularly where a significant retail component is established on this site.	Maungakiekie	Quality Built Environment	Both	This site is large and proximate to the Royal Oak town centre and therefore it is considered to qualify as a key site as development may be catalytic to the progress of Royal Oak centre as a whole. Presently, however, there are few employment opportunities within the walkable catchment of Royal Oak and the centre is proposed to support predominantly residential development with a retail service core. To ensure the site is prioritised for employment use, it is considered appropriate that the site be changed to an employment outcome with a key site notation with the exception of land fronting Mt Albert Road being identified as mixed use.	Accept



### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
								Some of this land fronting Mt Albert Road is already zoned Mixed Use and this outcome would be more complementary to the mixed use identified on the northern side of Mt Albert Road. Mixed use of the remainder of the site may be feasible, however, a cautious approach to this needs to be taken to ensure retail uses do not detrimentally effect the Royal Oak retail core or Onehunga town centre. An employment outcome over the majority of the site supports this cautious approach, while also recognising the need for employment activities within the Royal Oak centre periphery as a first priority.	
<b>Key themes - support</b>									
MRH2	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Support	The feedback indicated general support for enhanced public transport in the area. There was particularly high level of response in regards to the rail line and associated stations, but also the key road public transport routes. A handful of comments sought additional key road public transport routes along May Road, Carr Road, Pah Road, Boundary Road and Dominion Road Extension.	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Transport Choices	Both	In the large part, these comments are supportive of the aspirations to improve public transport provision in the area. The additional bus routes suggested by the public are noted, and while these have not been identified as key road passenger transport routes, they will each play an important role in the bus network. These comments will be forwarded onto Transport Strategy and ARTA for their information.	Refer / Delegate
MRH3	Transport	Walking and cycling	Support	The comments indicated support for the improved pedestrian and/or cycle environments. A small number of comments noted concern about these routes and a number of people suggested additional locations where this outcome should be added.	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Transport Choices	Map	In the large part, these comments are supportive of the Area Plan outcomes. The few concerns that were expressed related to the exact location of these outcomes, which is considered a matter for the next phase. Only one comment asked for the removal of outcome, as it relates to Arkells Reserve. This is considered an important connection between the residential properties to the north of Richardson Road and the reserve and it is therefore suggested that this outcome should remain. Many of the additional routes that were suggested relate to connections shown on the Citywide map, and therefore no changes are recommended. One of the more local connections has been suggested as a minor change. The full list of suggestions will be provided to Transport Strategy for their information.	Refer / Delegate
MRH4	Key Site	AS - General	Support	The redevelopment of the Three Kings Quarry was a theme within the feedback. The comments largely reinforced the need for good urban design outcomes, provision of connections from Three Kings quarry to the town centre and the importance of relationship of the site to adjacent open space and the commercial hub at Three Kings, and have therefore been classed as supportive of the Area Plan text. A much smaller number of comments were opposed to redevelopment of the quarry, suggesting that the land should be retained for open space and expressing a concern about the potential for eight storey development at this site.	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Quality Built Environment	None	The feedback generally supports the text, by highlighting the need for good connections to the town centre, open space and good urban design outcomes. The details of the built form will be developed during the master planning process for the site. While the area plan has provided for development 'of up to eight storeys' this is stated as a maximum and in the context of protecting views to the cone. It is therefore recommended that the statement should remain in the text.	Accept
<b>Key themes - issues</b>									
MRH5	Key Site	KS - Opposition to key site	Object	The mixed use and key site outcomes along the southern portion of Maungakiekie golf course attracted a number of comments. People noted that the area should be retained as open space and clarification was sought about the location and type of commercial activities within this key site. Related to the concerns, one comment suggested providing for more southward growth as an alternative to across into the golf course.	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Quality Built Environment	None	It is considered that the provision of mixed use along Hillsborough Road is more appropriate than growing the centre to the south as it reflects the urban design principle of mirroring similar heights of development on opposite sides of key routes, and will ensure development is well located in terms of passenger transport. Additionally, the growth potential to the south of the centre is constrained by Lynfield Reserve. The location and types of commercial activities within the mixed use area will be developed within the next phase, within District Plan rules and master planning of the site.	Decline
<b>Minor changes</b>									

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
MRH6	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Question	Clarification was sought about the boundaries of the residential intensification in the May Road/Dominion Road block.	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Quality Built Environment	Map	One of the aspirations for this block is to provide for better relationships between the built form and Freeland Reserve. It is suggested that the shape of Low Rise Apartments/Terraces could be reworked to better reflect this objective by bringing this outcome in closer to both sides of the reserve. It is therefore suggested that the low rise area should become a wider shape, extending around the southern side of the reserve.	Accept
MRH7	Residential	H - Residential	Object	Concern with the low rise abutting Puketapapa-Mt Roskill along Roseman Ave, with one comment suggesting this should be acquired as open space and the other suggesting low rise should be kept south of this road.	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Quality Natural Environment	Map	It is suggested that the Low rise apartments/terraces outcome should be moved to the south of Roseman Avenue to provide a buffer between this outcome and Puketapapa - Mt Roskill. These properties are currently zoned residential 6a and it is suggested that the low rise apartments/terraces outcome here be replaced with single dwelling small site outcome.	Accept
MRH8	Transport	Roads	Minor change/correction	Add the 'Stoddard Road Tunnel Portal' notation to the maps (as per the other Area Plans).	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Transport Choices	Map	This correction would make the plan consistent with other Area Plans.	Accept
MRH9	Centres	C - Classifications	Minor change/correction	Relocate the neighbourhood shops at the corner of Frost and Mt Albert Roads further west to the corner of Mt Albert Road and Bremner Avenue	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Economic Development	Map	This is an error and would be a minor change to the map only	Accept
MRH10	Transport	Walking and cycling	Minor change/correction	Add to the improved pedestrian and/or cycle environment line along Frost Road, to connect the outcome over State Highway 20 with the one at the north of Mt Roskill Primary school.	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Economic Development	Map	Frost Road currently has two Improved Pedestrian/Cycle Environment outcomes. This suggestion would link these outcomes and is therefore seen as a logical addition.	Accept
MRH11	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Minor change/correction	Various text changes relating to public transport aspirations	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Transport Choices	Text	These are minor changes which would improve the quality of the text and make it more consistent with other Area Plans. The changes would be: Under 'Challenges and Opportunities' (Fourth paragraph, first sentence) - amend to "lacks adequate passenger opportunities transport services to cater for expected future growth". Under 'Be Economically Competitive' (Last bullet point) - amend reference to future rail station to proposed station (as used in other area plans). Under 'Connect Communities' (2nd item, first bullet point)- Bring "road..." up to the same line as Stoddard. Under 'Connect Communities' (2nd and 3rd items)- Remove duplication. Under 'Connect Communities' (6th item- 2nd bullet point) - add the word 'tunnel' before portal.	Accept
<b>Parked feedback</b>									
MRH12	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Parked feedback	Concern regarding the Low Rise Apartments/Terraces and associated Improved Connectivity outcome along the eastern side of Keith Hay Park.	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Quality Built Environment	Both	<p>The parked feedback item relates to the height of development in this area. Comments regarding the improved connectivity outcome have been combined with this item, given their interrelationship. The comments about the Low rise apartments/terraces outcome note the need to protect views into the reserve and traffic issues. The improved connectivity outcome was put on the map in order to support the redevelopment of the Low rise apartments/terraces. Feedback has questioned the need and practicality of the improved connectivity outcome. The issue of the height of development could on its own be dealt with through the development of the District Plan rules, however given the difficulty of achieving an improved connection in this location, it is suggested that the low rise and improved connectivity outcomes be removed.</p> <p>It is instead suggested that two smaller areas of Low rise apartments/terraces be provided at the northern and southern ends of the reserve, close to the schools, Key passenger transport route and expanded neighbourhood shops along Richardson Road and the train station and business node at Carr Road.</p>	Accept

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
MRH13	Urban Design	R- Sensitivity to building heights	Parked feedback	Have the area plans been consistent in terms of following the urban design principle that heights of buildings on one side of a road should generally be mirrored by heights on the other side?	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Quality Built Environment	Map	Two areas were noted for consideration during the public engagement phase. The first of these is at the Mt Roskill shops, where there is low rise apartments/terraces on the southern side of Mt Albert Road and single dwelling small site to the north. This area has been revisited and it is suggested that the low rise apartments/terraces outcome be pulled back to Mt Roskill Road on the southern side and to a similar distance from the centre on the northern side of the road. Having some low rise apartments/terraces on the northern side would provide an area of transition between the Local Centre and the single dwelling small site outcome. The details of the height of development would be considered at the District Plan stage, and would need to take into account the varying topography along the road.	Accept
MRH14	Urban Design	R- Sensitivity to building heights	Parked feedback	Have the area plan teams been consistent in terms of following the urban design principle that heights of buildings on one side of a road should generally be mirrored by heights on the other side?	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Quality Built Environment	Map	The second area is Sandringham Road, immediately north of Oakley Creek. It is suggested that the Low Rise Apartments/Terraces outcome could be mirrored on the eastern side to meet this urban design outcome in an area that meets the locational criteria.	Accept
MRH15	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Parked feedback	Dominion Road Rapid Transit connection to State Highway20 rail route – should consider a rail station there?	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Transport Choices	None	In addition to being a parked feedback item, the concept of an additional station between the two currently shown was raised within the feedback. The two train stations have been selected due to surrounding land uses at town centre and business node. The Dominion Road location, or an alternative location between the two currently shown, would not have same benefits. Dominion Road is likely to remain a road-based passenger transport system for some time, so the interchange with the potential Avondale-Southdown rail line could be accommodated by some Dominion Road buses diverting to Stoddard rail station, or some other arrangement. Recommend that the stations remain as currently indicated and that this issue be re-considered within a future iteration/review of the spatial framework. This feedback will also be forwarded to ARTA for their information.	Decline
MRH16	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Parked feedback	We should relook at intensification in the Pah Road/Manukau Road triangle due to character buildings	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Quality Built Environment	None	This issue was one that had been noted as one which was important to gain community feedback on. No comments were received opposing the low rise outcome, on the contrary a couple of comments were received showing support for further intensification here, either in the form of medium rise development or by extending the intensification further south down to Mt Albert Road. The character of this area will be studied as part of the residential heritage project.	Next Phase
MRH17	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Parked feedback	Questioned extent of low rise along Richardson Road especially the section opposite Akarana golf course	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Quality Built Environment	None	This issue was raised prior to an additional key road passenger transport outcome being identified along the full length of Richardson Road. This outcome further enhances the appropriateness of low rise apartments/terraces development along this corridor by assisting these properties to meet the locational criteria for low rise apartments/terraces.	Decline
MRH18	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Parked feedback	High rise along Walmsley, Underwood and Molly Green Parks is a fatal flaw because these aren't usable all year round.	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Quality Built Environment	None	These areas are considered to meet the locational criteria for low rise apartments/terraces and have good access to Owairaka, War Memorial and Keith Hay Parks.	Refer / Delegate
MRH19	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Parked feedback	Does not support intensification up to 4 storeys around parks	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Quality Built Environment	None	This comment was received in regards to Mt Roskill/Hillsborough but it could also relate to other Area Plans. More intense built forms are considered appropriate alongside reserves in order to enhance access and use of reserves, and to increase surveillance by residents whose properties look onto such areas of open space. While there are some exceptions, low rise apartments/terraces development has been located alongside parks where it meets the locational criteria. The District Plan will develop more detailed height provisions, and there may be some areas alongside parks where development should not go up to four storeys.	Decline

## Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
MRH20	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Parked feedback	There is a disconnect between the transport map for Roskill/Hillsborough, Grey Lynn and Eastern bays areas as intensification is not supported by transport	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Transport Choices	None	There are four key areas where it is suggested that this comment may relate to: growth along Richardson Road, May Road, Pah Road/Queenstown Road and alongside Keith Hay Park. The first of these is covered above in feedback item MRH17. While there is some growth identified along May and Pah/Queenstown Roads, which are not Key Road Passenger Transport Routes, these areas are all within reasonable distance from either the train line or a nearby Key Road Passenger Transport Route. It is also noted that although May, Queenstown and Pah Roads are not given the Key Road Passenger Transport Route status, they will be an important part of the bus network. The growth alongside Keith Hay Park is noted above in relation to feedback reference MRH12, and the suggested amendments here will ensure that growth is better located in terms of the Carr Road rail station and the Richardson Road Key Road Passenger Transport Route.	Decline
MRH21	Area specific category	R - Residential Intensification	Parked feedback	Issues regarding stormwater tunnel under Mt Roskill.	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Quality Built Environment	None	This issue will be addressed as 'next phase'.	Next Phase
MRH22	Open Space/Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Open Space	Minor change/correction	The public noted that the portion of Three Kings Reserve alongside Mt Eden Road was covered with the Town Centre Core outcome, and wanted to make sure that this area would be retained and not built on.	Mt Roskill/Hillsborough	Quality Natural Environment	Map	This part of the reserve was included as part of the town centre core to show its importance in the creation of a lively town centre. It is not intended that this area be built on as part of the centre and suggest that this would be better reflected and communicated if the area was shown as open space.	Accept

### Newmarket/Parnell

Key changes									
NP1	Centres	C-Classifications	Object	A Neighbourhood Shopping area is mapped at the top of Domain Drive/corner Parnell Road, when the existing centre is at the top of Ayr Street on the opposite corner.	Newmarket/Parnell	Economic Development	Map	Agree that Neighbourhood shops notation be moved further Ayr Street shops (part of Remuera/Meadowbank area plan).	Accept
NP2	Business/Mixed Use	BMU - Transition issues	Object	University seeks 8-24 Park Avenue be reclassified to Mixed Use from Medium Rise apartments	Newmarket/Parnell	Economic Development	Map	8- 20, 3-11 Park Avenue is currently residential use. These properties are not supported for mixed use due to existing residential nature. Retain as medium rise apartments. Existing neighbourhood shops fronting Park Road. 22-30 Park Avenue is currently a Childcare facility/carpark and meets Mixed Use criteria. Park Avenue is slowly being transformed from residential to more commercial nature. Park Avenue is approximately 60/40 multi-use commercial (including Medical school)/residential. Accept in part by providing Mixed use outcome for 22-30 Park Avenue	Accept in part
NP3	Specific Use		Object	Seeks removal of Hospital notation from 2-6 Park Avenue as it is no longer part of the Auckland hospital/Regional blood centre. The site is The Liggins institute and is used for Medical research.	Newmarket/Parnell	Economic Development	Map	'Hospital' notation is recommended to be removed from 2-6 Park Avenue as no longer a part of Auckland Hospital/Regional Blood Centre. Site is used for medical research. A specified use.	Accept
NP4	Business/Mixed Use	BMU - Transition issues	Object	Site 6 - 446 and 448 Parnell Road, 9 St Stephens Avenue, 8 Cathedral Place and 1a Brighton Road (Parnell Cathedral Precinct) - This is one of seven sites referred to in a landowner feedback item regarding Parnell Cathedral Precinct. The current outcome is 'single dwelling traditional site'. The outcome sought is 'mixed use' and 'key site' status.	Newmarket/Parnell	Quality Built Environment	Text	The St Marys Cathedral site is currently identified as "single dwelling traditional site" which doesn't clearly identify the special nature of this land use but is consistent with how other similar land uses have been reflected in the area plans. Adding "Key site" status may be interpreted as suggesting the site is suitable for masterplanned intensified land use, which is unclear at this stage given the heritage values of the site and its surround. Retaining the current area plan outcomes does not preclude the landowner from further exploring the future development of the site, or from more detailed consideration occurring through the District Plan process. It is recommended that there be no change to the map but that the text of the area plan, including relevant city-wide portions, be amended to reflect the particular characteristics of the cathedral and the importance of recognising iconic buildings of this scale within residential areas.	Accept

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
								Table 9 of Newmarket/Parnell area plan, under "Green the city and protect our heritage" after the growth era aspect, add in a new section: "The iconic Parnell Cathedral and the surrounding historic environment are protected".	
NP5	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Object	Low rise apartments / mixed use along railway line in Waipapa Valley is opposed - this area is the connection between Parnell and the Domain and should be master planned if mixed use low rise is proposed.	Newmarket/Parnell	Quality Built Environment	Both	Mixed use land is part of OnTrack assets and is designated for railway purposes. Area is close to Parnell town centre and is approximately 1.7 hectares. Prime land which may be sold off as surplus land for development. Recommendation: agree with feedback. Fits into definition of 'key site' outcome. Text change: add under sub heading "Develop Lively Centres" Ontrack site (Waipapa Valley) as a key site.	Accept
NP6	Transport	Walking and cycling	Aspiration	Need to have improved cycle ways/ protection for cyclists along Gladstone Road to Quay Street/ Tamaki Drive/St Stephens Avenue. Considers that road spaces are pedestrian and cyclist unfriendly, shared space concepts would work, Gladstone Road is a significant cycling route and should be shown with improved cycling and pedestrian environment.	Newmarket/Parnell	Transport Choices	Map	Future cycle network plan depicts Gladstone Road and St Stephens Road as part of the future cycle network	Accept
NP7	Transport	Roads	Correction	Citywide maps proposed to be changed to show passenger transport route along Parnell Road.	Newmarket/Parnell	Transport Choices	Map	Show Parnell Road as 'key road passenger transport route" for consistency with city wide maps.	Accept
<b>Key themes - issues</b>									
NP8	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Object	Opposes high density housing in following streets: Cowie, Sarawia, Maunsell, Titoki and Domain Drive due to existing congestion on Parnell Road. Apartment blocks of up to 8 storeys are inappropriate to local character and traffic and population increase will detract from amenities. Would reduce house values, block sunlight, affect historic character.	Newmarket/Parnell	Quality Built Environment	None	This area has been afforded a medium rise apartment outcome. Some concern over character buildings fronting Parnell Road. Outcome including height is consistent with plan change 196. Viewshaft concerns are noted, however the area plan is a broad, aspirational document and the impacts on ultimate development of a range of constraints (including viewshafts) will need to be addressed at a more detailed stage (District Plan development). Recommendation: retain Medium high rise.	Decline
NP9	Residential	R- Sensitivity to buildings	Object	Concerned about high rise zone on the Grafton Road Ridge - high rise on eastern side of Grafton Road would overwhelm the neighbouring street of Seafield View Road (currently residential 1), cause overshadowing, with poor access and in volcanic sight lines, protect heritage values and residential character, privacy effects, traffic congestion, noise, visual aspects.	Newmarket/Parnell	Quality Built Environment	Map	High rise on western side of Grafton Road is appropriate i.e. Phoenix Gardens. Some concern over the eastern side of Grafton Road, especially residential interface with current residential 1 zoning (urban design issue). Heritage assessment of area yet to be undertaken in Grafton. Careful consideration of height on eastern side of Grafton Road adjoining residential heritage area to address interface issue is part of the next phase. High rise not considered appropriate on the eastern side of Grafton Road. Recommendation: medium rise.	Accept in part
NP10	Transport	Public transport (buses)	Object	Proposed rail station at Parnell is far from shopping centre. Wants rail station near museum/cathedral with stops at Newmarket, Downtown, museum/cathedral. Moved to more central location, such as Cheshire Street, site advocated by 'Mainstreet Committee'. Parnell Mainstreet is lobbying for the new Parnell train station to be sited on the ONTRACK land at Cheshire Street. Parnell does need a new train station and it is good to see this officially included in the plan. However, contrary to assurances received from Council that it favoured a Parnell railway station located at Cheshire Street, the plan describes the new station "at the northern end of the Parnell town centre" and clearly shows the station located at Carlaw Park, as earlier favoured by ARTA. Parnell Mainstreet strongly objects to Council continuing to promote the Carlaw Park location as the desired site for Parnell's new station.  This location does nothing for the Parnell town centre it must surely need to serve. Parnell Mainstreet has shown that the Cheshire Street location offers greater public amenity by being closer to Parnell town centre for local workers and visitors.	Newmarket/Parnell	Transport Choices	None	Station was located at the northern end due to: Topography-grade issues with station being located further up the line; catchment area is closer to university and serves both sides of the rail line. Station at Cheshire Street limited to 'half catchment' i.e. half is Auckland domain. Also cross reference to CSF 14. Refer to Transport Committee.	Refer / Delegate

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
<b>Parked feedback</b>									
NP11	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Parked Feedback	Residential intensification around Virginia Avenue and Suffolk Street (west of Dominion Road) not appropriate. Keep as Single dwelling traditional site	Newmarket / Parnell	Quality Built Environment	Map	No feedback items referring to this matter. Change to Single dwelling small site/town house	Accept in part
NP12	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Parked Feedback	Medium/high density apartments below Newmarket viaduct is not appropriate. Environmental concern with respect to noise and would need greater insulation. Extend commercial area into this area.	Newmarket / Parnell	Quality Built Environment	None	Medium rise apartments is consistent with plan change 196-Newmarket structure plan.	Decline
NP13	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Parked Feedback	Possible change to Single dwelling small site/townhouse for Seccombes Road area	Newmarket / Parnell	Quality Built Environment	None	Predominant housing remains single dwelling traditional site. There are some townhouses/terraces. However, community input on this suggestion was sought during the engagement phase, as this area is in an area of change. No feedback items received.	Decline
NP14	Business/Mixed Use	BMU - Interface issues	Parked Feedback	Need a category which describes 100% commercial. "Employment" is confusing. Also relates to area of employment around Newton/Khyber Pass Road (opposite Mt Eden prison)	Newmarket / Parnell	Quality Built Environment	None	Newton/Khyber Pass Road area is predominantly employment with offices. Not many apartments in this area. Issues with noise and pollution and overlooking Mt Eden Prison precludes conversion to mixed use. Consolidated outcomes document definition considered appropriate.	Decline
NP15	Business/Mixed Use	BMU - Transition issues	Parked Feedback	The Strand/ St Georges Bay Road more appropriate for mixed use	Newmarket / Parnell	Quality Built Environment	None	Area is adjacent to the Strand which has potential noise issues. Currently still predominantly provides an "employment" outcome and is currently zoned business 5. May have the potential to transition to mixed use in the longer term. During the engagement phase feedback was received - including 'Retain as employment with site specific analysis as part of district plan review due to Mixed use/Employment interface'.	Decline
NP16	Business/Mixed Use	General	Parked Feedback	Need to reconcile Mixed use outcomes with topography e.g. If steep slope, then it would be difficult to provide mixed use as people will 'struggle' with steep slopes.	Newmarket/Parnell	Quality Built Environment	None	Acknowledge that parts of Newmarket/Parnell have some steep slopes. Mixed use areas meet the locational criteria (close to centres and good accessibility to public transport), but topography may be a constraint. A feedback item was received on the need to generally reflect topography in controls for Newmarket, however this can be consider further in District Plan development.	Next Phase
<b>Otahuhu</b>									
<b>Key changes</b>									
O1	Centres	C - Classifications	Object	Sylvia Park as a town centre, seeks principal centre classification as it does not reflect the current and future role and sub-regional function that it is capable of having, and the potential in the future to function as a principal centre.	Otāhuhu	Economic Development	Both	Refer to Citywide spatial framework discussion on changes to the classification of centres. Recommend that Sylvia Park be classified as a Principal Centre.	Accept
O2	Centres	C - Classifications	Comment	Difficult to transition privately owned Sylvia Park mall to town centre.	Otāhuhu	Economic Development	Both	Refer to Citywide spatial framework discussion on changes to the classification of centres. Recommend that Sylvia Park be classified as a Principal Centre.	Decline
O3	Centres	C - Classifications	Object	Otahuhu as a principal centre rather than a town centre for the reasons that as it does not have any realistic prospect of attaining that role, it performs more like a town centre.	Otāhuhu	Economic Development	Both	Refer to Citywide spatial framework discussion on changes to the classification of centres. Recommend that Otahuhu be classified as a Town Centre.	Accept
O4	Centres	C - Classifications	Support	Otahuhu as a principal centre.	Otāhuhu	Economic Development	Both	Refer to Citywide spatial framework discussion on changes to the classification of centres. Recommend that Otahuhu be classified as a Town Centre.	Decline
O5	Centres	C - Classifications	Object	Mixed use outcome for Mount Wellington Shopping Centre, seeks local centre classification for site to allow for continued focus on local retailing while providing continued scope for suitable non-retail uses.	Otāhuhu	Economic Development	Both	Refer to Citywide spatial framework discussion on changes to the classification of centres. Recommend that Mount Wellington Shopping Centre be classified as a Local Centre.	Accept
O6	Key Site	KS - Additional change	Comment	Concern that the northern part of Sylvia Park Centre has been allocated Town Centre status and the southern part of Sylvia Park Centre has been allocated Key Site status. By treating the two parts differently it fails to acknowledge that Sylvia Park Centre is an integrated development.	Otāhuhu	Economic Development	Both	The key site status applies to both the northern and southern parts of Sylvia Park Centre so as to foster integrated development of the total site. A key site symbol should be added to the northern part of Sylvia Park Centre to clarify this.	Accept
<b>Key themes - support</b>									
O7	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Support	Upgrade of Otahuhu rail station.	Otāhuhu	Transport Choices	None	The upgrade of Otahuhu rail station is a key outcome for the area plan outlined in page 83 of the supporting text, Connect communities.	Accept
<b>Key themes - issues</b>									

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
O8	Open Space/ Commu	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Support	Provision of a swimming pool.	Otāhuhu	Strong and Healthy Communities	None	There is significant support for the provision of a swimming pool in Otahuhu. A swimming pool for Otahuhu is no longer in the LTCCP. Provision of this facility is best addressed through the LTCCP submission process.	Refer / Delegate
O9	Centres	C - Growth of Centres	Comment	Sylvia Park may become so big that it will reduce the possibilities for the other centres.	Otāhuhu	Economic Development	None	This matter will be investigated as part of the development of the District Plan.	Next Phase
O10	Centres	C - Growth of Centres	Comment	The regional classification project identified an appropriate range of functions for town centres. It might be useful to identify which of these functions need to be added to Sylvia Park to enable them to operate as a town centre.	Otāhuhu	Economic Development	Text	A joint workshop between council officers and Kiwi Income Property Trust is being arranged to identify and obtain agreement on those essential elements including the mix of land uses needed to transition Sylvia Park to a Principal Centre over time.	Refer / Delegate
O11	Centres	C - Growth of Centres	Comment	Set out what steps are going to be taken to ensure that the urban design of Sylvia Park Centre will provide for the public realm functions that are absent or inadequately provided at present.	Otāhuhu	Economic Development	Text	A joint workshop between council officers and Kiwi Income Property Trust is being arranged to identify and obtain agreement on those essential elements including public realm functions needed to transition Sylvia Park to a Principal Centre over time.	Refer / Delegate
<b>Minor changes</b>									
O12	Area specific category	AS - General	Minor change/correction	Rename Pakuranga Bridge as Panmure Bridge.	Otāhuhu	General	Map	Pakuranga Bridge has been incorrectly labelled as Panmure Bridge on the area outcomes map. The map should be amended to correct this error.	Accept
O13	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Minor change/correction	Indicate improved public transport services between Otahuhu Centre and rail station.	Otāhuhu	Transport Choices	Text	This aspiration to improve public transport services supports the outcome of improving access and strengthening connections between Otahuhu Centre and rail station. Accordingly, page 83 "Connect communities" of the supporting text should be amended to include the following bullet point: improvements to bus services between Otahuhu town centre and rail station.	Accept
O14	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Minor change/correction	Amend page 81, under Challenges and opportunities, last paragraph of supporting text from "Public transport (or lack of)" to "Public transport (or lack of appropriate public transport to cater for expected growth)".	Otāhuhu	Transport Choices	Text	The amendment should be accepted as it will improve the clarity of the sentence.	Accept
O15	Transport	Walking and cycling	Minor change/correction	Opposes the pedestrian/cycle linkage over the site located at 968 Great South Road, Penrose due to the loss of land, and safety and security issues arising from public access.	Otāhuhu	Transport Choices	Map	The correct location of the pedestrian/cycle linkage should be the small carpark area, which provides an entry point and pathway into Hamlins Hill from Great South Road. Recommend that the pedestrian/cycle linkage be removed from the site, and placed over the small car park area.	Accept
O16	Area specific category	KS - Additional change	Minor change/correction	Seeks the inclusion of properties purchased by the Kings College Trustees since the last district plan review at 31 and 31A Middlemore Road, 38 Golf Avenue and 38 Mangere Road to be included as part of the College campus.	Otāhuhu	Strong and Healthy Communities	Map	While the area plan map has identified 31 and 31A Middlemore Road and 38 Mangere Road as being part of the Kings College site with an "Education" outcome, 38 Golf Avenue has been omitted and should be included in the College site with the same outcome. Accordingly, the outcome for 38 Golf Avenue be amended from "Single dwelling small site/townhouse to "Education".	Accept
O17	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Comment	Why was low-rise apartments not provided for along Atkinson Avenue to north of Otahuhu centre	Otāhuhu	Quality Built Environment	Map	The area meets the locational criteria for the mixed use outcome i.e. near a principal centre, with good access to the motorway and public transport. The mixed use outcome provides opportunities for intensification of uses eg. residential and commercial which benefit from high accessibility and visibility along Atkinson Avenue. However, it was considered that the community's views in relation to this area should be specifically gauged during the engagement phase. No comments were received on this matter, and no change is recommended.	Decline

## Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
O18	Residential	R - Transition areas	Aspiration	Would like the Allright Place area to transition from residential to business.	Otāhuhu	Quality Built Environment	Map	The proximity of this area to Sylvia Park town centre and railway station provides an opportunity for getting more residential intensification, which would support the rail service and achieve a better mix of activities in the area. However, it was considered that the community's views in relation to this area should be specifically gauged during the engagement phase. One comment was received which expressed concern about the low rise apartments/terraces outcome along Waipuna Road on the basis that AMET1 was likely to increase traffic flows along Waipuna Road. The adverse effects of traffic flows and noise will be investigated as part of the development of the District Plan. No change is recommended.	Decline
O19	Area specific category	AS - General	Comment	Need to upgrade, tidy up built form, northern and southern entry way along Great South Road	Otāhuhu	Quality Built Environment	None	The upgrade and tidy up of the existing built form are matters that are beyond the scope of the area plan. The issue of achieving quality built form and good urban design outcomes will be considered as part of the development of the District Plan. No comments were received on this issue, and no change is recommended.	Next Phase
O20	Area specific category	H - Cultural	Comment	Add Maori site of significance symbol to the Portage. Consider how the Portages are represented.	Otāhuhu	Quality Natural Environment	Map	As the Portage is not a scheduled heritage item in the District Plan, a decision was made to retain the blue watermark on the area plan, and to gauge the community's view on this. Apart from two comments seeking Portage interpretation and a Portage gateway sculpture, no specific comments were received on this issue, and no change is recommended.	Decline
<b>Remuera/Meadowbank</b>									
<b>Key changes</b>									
RM1	Key Site	R - Interface issues	Aspiration	Recognise the St Johns College site as a key site as master planning would help incorporate future development into the historic nature of the site.	Remuera/Meadowbank	Quality Built Environment	Map	This site satisfies the locational criteria of being over 1.5 hectares, will be close to the transport node at the proposed St John's station, could be integrated into access to St Johns Bush.	Accept
RM2	Centres	C - Classifications	Object	Object to Remuera's classification as a local centre - want to be a town centre	Remuera/Meadowbank	Economic Development	Map	Refer to Citywide Strategy for discussion of Remuera's status as either a town or local centre.	Accept
RM3	Transport	Park n Ride	Aspiration	Want more park and rides	Remuera/Meadowbank	Transport Choices	Both	A park and ride was proposed for St Johns subject to feedback. One of the main themes of the support for the St Johns rail station was that it would increase the parking available as both Glen Innes and Meadowbank were full during the day. It is recommended that the park and ride symbol be reinstated on the proposed St Johns rail station site.	Accept
<b>Key themes - support</b>									
RM4	Transport	Walking and cycling	Support	Support various walk or cycleways	Remuera/Meadowbank	Transport Choices	None	Accept support	Refer / Delegate
RM5	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Support	Support proposed rail station at St Johns	Remuera/Meadowbank	Transport Choices	None	Accept support	Refer / Delegate
RM6	Open Space/ Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Open Space	Support	Supporting open spaces or ecological corridors	Remuera/Meadowbank	Quality Natural Environment	Map	Accept support	Accept
<b>Key themes - issues</b>									
RM7	Transport	Roads	Aspiration	Lack of provision for the private motor vehicle, concerns about congestion.	Remuera/Meadowbank	Transport Choices	Both	Refer to Transport Strategy for their information. The strategy applied by the area plans attempts to match land use with the provision of public transport as a means of decreasing the number of trips made by car. Council's traffic studies indicate the existing road network can cope with anticipated growth.	Refer / Delegate
<b>Minor changes</b>									
RM8	Specific Use	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Object	Lower field at St Kentigern School at 70 Shore Road is shown as open space. Would like it shown as part of the school as is owned by school.	Remuera/Meadowbank	Strong and Healthy Communities	Map	Make change as requested.	Accept



## Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
RM9	Specific Use	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Object	Corran School boundary incorrectly drawn on map	Remuera/Meadowbank	Strong and Healthy Communities	Map	Check.	Accept
<b>Parked feedback</b>									
RM10	Open Space/Community Facilities	OS - Ecological corridors	Minor change/correction	Ecological corridor to run between Little Rangitoto and Orakei Basin adjacent to improved pedestrian environment line	Remuera/Meadowbank	Quality Natural Environment	Map	An ecological/urban forest corridor could be created through street tree planting (Upland Road) to link the two volcanic features. The improved pedestrian and/or cycle environment linking the two volcanic features should be moved westwards, also to Upland Road. This has already been amended on the map.	Accept
RM11	Open Space/Community Facilities	OS - Ecological corridors	Minor change/correction	Pedestrian connection (and ecological corridor if approved) between Little Rangitoto and Orakei Basin should run through the neighbourhood shops	Remuera/Meadowbank	Quality Natural Environment	Map	Refer to reference CB AP 90. Duplicate	Accept
RM12	Centres	BMU - Interface issues	Comment	Question the edge of Newmarket high density area. Should there be a transition rather than a hard edge?	Remuera/Meadowbank	Quality Built Environment	None	This matter will be considered further in the development of the District Plan rules and assessment criteria. It is unclear what transition the feedback is referring to e.g. to mixed use, low rise outcome or other outcomes.	Next Phase
RM13	Specific Use	OS - Provision of Community Facilities	Minor change/correction	Investigate St Johns Theological College as an E (education) and historic buildings on this site	Remuera/Meadowbank	Strong and Healthy Communities	Map	This has already been amended on the map.	Accept
<b>Tamaki</b>									
<b>Key changes</b>									
T1	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Object	Whether the extent of the low rise apartments/terraces outcome should be reduced around Glen Innes and/or Panmure?	Tāmaki	Quality Built Environment	Map	While there has been some feedback supporting the extent of the low rise apartments/terraces outcome generally and/or requesting that the outcome be applied to additional sites or areas, most feedback which commented on the low rise apartment/terraces outcome suggests that there is too much provided for within the Tamaki area. Recommend reducing extent of low rise apartments/terraces around Glen Innes by changing two areas that are outside the 1000 metre pedestrian shed and plan change 61 boundaries to single dwelling small site outcome, namely, a small area on Eastview Road and a slightly larger area on the southern part of Erima Avenue. Leave in the low rise apartments/terraces along Howard Hunter (to act as a buffer between Mixed Use/Employment and Single dwelling small site areas) and on Pilkington Road. Further, because Glen Innes has been changed from a Principal Centre to a Town Centre, revisit the low rise apartments/terraces area on Pilkington Road. Note: change would impact on Citywide maps.	Accept
T2	Business/Mixed Use	BMU - Large Format Retail	Object	Whether the large format retail outcome should be applied to further areas of the Isthmus and whether the definition of large format retail should be broadened?	Tāmaki	Economic Development	Both	This is a citywide issue, but has particular relevance to the Tamaki and Mt Roskill/Hillsborough area plans as the only two specific large format retail areas provided for are on Lunn Avenue and Carr Road. Recommend changing the outcome name for 'large format retail' to 'bulky goods' which is more appropriate given the narrow definition applied to that outcome. Amend text in section 3 and section 4: corridors to make it clearer that the mixed use outcome could include large format retail where the outcome is located in corridors, subject to urban design considerations and consideration of its relationship with centres.	Accept
T3	Business/Mixed Use	C - Growth of Centres	Object	Whether the employment outcome that has been applied to the Harvey Norman Centre should be changed to large format retail and/or mixed use?	Tāmaki	Economic Development	Map	The Harvey Norman site would meet the criteria for application of the Mixed Use or Large format retail outcome, as it is located at the edge of the Panmure town centre. The Large format retail outcome would reflect existing uses but would not be aspirational. Recommend changing the Harvey Norman site and land to the north to Mixed Use to reflect proximity to Panmure station. This would be consistent with the treatment of the Masport site to the west.	Accept

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
T4	Business/Mixed Use	BMU - Interface issues	Object	Whether the Atlas Concrete site should be excluded from the business node around the Tamaki station and have a production and distribution outcome applied to it?	Tāmaki	Economic Development	Both	The Atlas site is within the Tamaki Innovation Precinct area. Applying the employment outcome would address some of the reverse sensitivity concerns while still being an appropriate future use to 2030. Applying the production and distribution outcome would not be consistent with the objectives of the Tamaki Innovation Precinct. Recommend applying the Employment (rather than Business Node) outcome to the site.	Accept
T5	Business/Mixed Use	BMU - Business Node	Object	Whether the business node outcome around the Tamaki station should have the Local Centre, Mixed Use and/or Key Site outcomes applied to it?	Tāmaki	Economic Development	Both	Recommend providing for some Mixed Use (office, residential and supporting retail) on the eastern side of the railway line, with the balance of the area to remain as Business Node, or mainly Business Node with some Employment in the south-western part of the area (also refer to discussion in relation to Atlas Concrete's feedback below). Also recommend applying the key site outcome as, while the Tamaki station area is not within or adjacent to an existing centre, it is a critical site in terms of future development of the area/advocating for the reopening of the Tamaki station.	Accept
T6	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Object	Whether the single dwelling, traditional site outcome should be applied to additional streets in the area?	Tāmaki	Quality Built Environment	Both	The part of Mt Wellington between Ferndale and Barrack Roads scores relatively poorly in terms of the locational criteria for Single dwelling small site outcome. However, with the exception of a few pockets of residential 5 around Panorama and Fitzgerald Roads, the land already has a residential 6a zoning. There is also a significant amount of existing infill development. The north-eastern corner of the area, bordered by West Tamaki Road, Taniwha Street and Kotae Road and currently zoned residential 5, also scores relatively poorly against the locational criteria for townhouse/small site development. There is some existing infill development, but not a significant amount. Changing the Single dwelling small site outcome for this area to Single dwelling traditional site outcome would also integrate better with the Eastern Bays area plan. Recommend changing part of this area to Single dwelling traditional site outcome (including Inglewood Street, Clairville Crescent, Fernwood Place, Silverton Avenue). Retain Single dwelling small site outcome along Lyndhurst Street and Taniwha Street to avoid different outcomes on either side of Taniwha Street.	Accept
								In addition to amending the map, amend the text (house our growing population well, 5th bullet point) by adding the words "and land around Wai-o-taiki Nature Reserve" after the words "Maungarei-Mt Wellington" and delete the "s" from "continues".	
<b>Key themes - support</b>									
T7	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Support	General support for enhanced public transport to service the area. There was a particularly high level of response to the rail line and associated stations and park and rides.	Tāmaki	Transport Choices	None	These comments are supportive of the aspiration to improve public transport provision in the area. However, some of the comments are qualified by statements relating to the need to improve rail services and security at stations.	Accept
T8	Transport	Walking and cycling	Support	A large number of comments were received in general support of the improvements to the pedestrian and/or cycle environments. There was particular mention of the improved pedestrian and/or cycle environment outcome along the Tamaki River and improved connections to the Panmure train station.	Tāmaki	Transport Choices	None	These comments are supportive of the Area Plan outcomes.	Accept
T9	Business/Mixed Use	C - Growth of Centres	Support	Support for increased local business/employment opportunities and economic growth, including rejuvenation of town centres and development of the Tamaki Innovation Precinct.	Tāmaki	Economic Development	None	These comments are supportive of the Area Plan outcomes.	Accept

## Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
T10	Heritage	H - Natural	Support	A large number of comments were received in general support of the "Green the city and protect our heritage" outcomes (including improving the safety of open space, enhancing water quality and protecting natural and cultural heritage).	Tāmaki	Quality Natural Environment	None	These comments are supportive of the Area Plan outcomes.	Accept
<b>Minor changes</b>									
T11	Business/Mixed Use	KS - Additional change	Minor change/correction	Whether the area around the Panmure station should be identified as a key site?	Tāmaki	Quality Built Environment	Map	This is a critical area on the edge of the Panmure town centre which is currently being master planned. Recommend identifying it as a key site.	Accept
T12	Transport	Walking and cycling	Minor change/correction	Whether the improved pedestrian and/or cycle environment outcome along AMETI/rail corridor should be extended slightly to the northern side of Ellerslie-Panmure Highway?	Tāmaki	Transport Choices	Map	This minor change would address the concern that there needs to be much better pedestrian access to the Panmure rail station from the other side of the Ellerslie-Panmure Highway (coming from the south). Recommend making change.	Accept
T13	Transport	Walking and cycling	Minor change/correction	Whether the improved pedestrian and/or cycle environment outcomes around Panmure should be joined up so that Maungarei-Mt Wellington is more clearly linked to the Panmure Basin walkway?	Tāmaki	Transport Choices	Map	This minor change would address the request that the Winifred Higgens walkway and woodlands should be linked to the Panmure Basin walk, Van Dammes Lagoon and the University of Auckland's Tāmaki campus. Recommend making change.	Accept
T14	Transport	Walking and cycling	Minor change/correction	Whether there should be better provision for cyclists on the Panmure bridge?	Tāmaki	Transport Choices	Both	The peer review of AMETI has recommended that a cycle lane be added to the Panmure bridge, so it would be consistent to add the improved pedestrian and/or cycle environment outcome to the bridge. Recommend making change to the map and adding "across the Panmure bridge" as a 3rd bullet point under "continuous access along the Tamaki River (as far as practicable)" (Green the City, 7th para).	Accept
T15	Business/Mixed Use	KS - Opposition to key site	Minor change/correction	Whether the Fletcher Industries site at 40-44 Gavin Street should be excluded from the key site for the Harrison Road quarry?	Tāmaki	Economic Development	Map	The key site outcome was only intended to cover the Harrison Road quarry. The Fletcher sites have been inadvertently included because of the "blobby" nature of the map and could easily be excluded by redrawing the key site boundary. Recommend making change.	Accept
<b>Parked feedback</b>									
T16	Transport	Roads	Parked feedback	Whether the proposed Lagoon Drive to Cleary Road link should be shown as part of AMETI?	Tāmaki	Transport Choices	Map	Confirmed with Transport Strategy that the Lagoon Drive to Cleary Road link is still part of AMETI and should be added to the map. Recommend making change. Consequential amendments to the Citywide maps will be required.	Accept
T17	Business/Mixed Use	C - Growth of Centres	Parked feedback	Whether the location of the future Stonefields local centre needs to be amended?	Tāmaki	Economic Development	Map	The location of the Stonefields local centre needs to be shifted slightly to the south-east in order to accurately reflect the structure plan for the former Mt Wellington quarry. Recommend making change.	Accept
T18	Business/Mixed Use	KS - Additional change	Parked feedback	Whether the mixed use outcome should be applied to the western edge of the Harrison Road quarry key site?	Tāmaki	Economic Development	None	This site is outside the 800 metre pedestrian shed to the Ellerslie town centre (although not by much) and, therefore, does not meet the locational criteria in terms of proximity to shops, frequent public transport services etc. The whole site is a business development area of change in the Growth Management Strategy and within an industrial air quality management area in the proposed Auckland Regional Council's Air, Land and Water Plan, so is more suitable for business/employment uses than mixed use development (which can include residential activities). Recommend declining change.	Decline
T19	Open Space/Community Facilities	OS - Provision of Open Space	Parked feedback	Whether there should be some green added around Purchas Hill to show that it is open space as well as a geological feature?	Tāmaki	Lifestyle Choices	Map	Purchas Hill has been acquired by council for open space. Adding some green around the volcanic/geological feature symbol would make it clear that there will be a reserve in this location. Recommend making change.	Accept

## Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
T20	Residential	R- Sensitivity to building heights	Parked feedback	Whether the medium rise apartment outcome within Stonefields needs to be amended?	Tāmaki	Quality Built Environment	None	The operative structure plan for Stonefields provides for 5-6 storey apartments, while the medium rise outcome provides for 5-8 storeys. It is not the intention to depart from the structure plan, but the medium rise outcome covers the development provided for under the structure plan while the low rise apartments/terraces outcome would be too restrictive. The fact that apartments are not intended to be more than six storeys will be picked up in the next phase.	Next Phase
T21	Transport	Roads	Parked feedback	Can the improved connectivity along the AMETI alignment in the Tamaki business node area be deleted?	Tāmaki	Transport Choices	Map	This is a minor correction that should be made to avoid confusion. The improved connectivity outcome should have been removed when the AMETI alignment was updated.	Accept
<b>Western Bays</b>									
<b>Key themes - issues</b>									
WB1	Centres	R - Residential Intensification	Question	Feedback questioning the proposed expansion of Point Chevalier Local Centre and residential intensification around it.	Western Bays	Quality Built Environment	None	Point Chevalier represents a significant infill opportunity for the city, promoted by the relatively few built heritage values in the residential area surrounding the centre. It has excellent public transport along Great North Road (GNR), connecting easily to available services and other areas. The centre itself is in need of refurbishment and expansion, and also needs to refocus itself away from the GNR, which divides it, making it difficult for pedestrians to cross the current local centre. Land use intensification on the scale proposed would promote the regeneration of the centre without seeking to undermine other centres in the economic hierarchy.	Decline
WB2	General	R - Sensitivity to building heights	Comment	Feedback referred to sensitivity of building heights along Ponsonby, Jervis and Great North Road (ridge lines) .	Western Bays	Quality Built Environment	None	Appropriate to locate intensified land uses along these routes, particularly around the existing centres, with passenger transport facilities and other services close to hand, but likely that final height outcomes will be moderated by view shafts and sight lines at the District Plan stage.	Next Phase
WB3	Centres	C - Growth of Centres	Object	The Gables restaurant/bar site Kelmarna Avenue/Jervis Road which is included in the Jervis Road Centre outcome. A number of local resident object on the basis that the land should be used for residential purposes.	Western Bays	Quality Built Environment	None	Historically, the site is identified for commercial use, a redevelopment application for a mix of uses was dismissed on appeal in 2008. Despite this, it is considered that the Centre designation best reflects the likelihood that a commercial rather than residential use on the site is most likely to follow if current restaurant/bar closes.	Decline
WB4	Transport	Walking and cycling	Aspiration	Concern about insufficient amount of cycling routes, particularly those that are not regional cycling links (which are well reflected in the area plan) and concern about the safety of cyclists on the shown routes. A desire for dedicated cycling lanes.	Western Bays	Transport Choices	None	Particular care was taken however to reflect regional cycling network in the area plan. There are also new linkages proposed (suitable for pedestrians and cyclists) and the area is generally accessible by road and existing facilities. Many of these routes involve sharing the space with other users (pedestrians and/or vehicles). This creates the potential for conflict which needs to be carefully addressed in the implementation and design of these routes. The area plan is aspirational and should aspire to improve the number of cycling opportunities in the Western Bays, but subsequent stages will need to address the detailed implementation of them.	Decline
<b>Minor changes</b>									
WB5	Area specific category	AS - General	Aspiration	Wants area plan general description to refer to certain local features: Point Chevalier Beach, waste water overflows and water quality issues around Cox's creek, closed landfill at Meola reef, Ponsonby Road should be mentioned as a regionally significant café/retail destination.	Western Bays	Quality Built Environment	Text	It is not considered appropriate to add this level of detail to the area plan descriptions.	Note - no further action required

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
WB6	Key Site	KS - Additional change	Aspiration	<p>Wishes boundaries of Selwyn Village to be correctly identified in Key Site designation and wants Key site identified as 'suitable location for housing for population growth' concerned that single dwelling small site / townhouse outcome shown over site does not reflect growth potential or the presence of 6 storey Lichfield Towers and 3 storey Bishop Selwyn apartments and Randerson apartments on Selwyn land. More intense residential development is consistent with approved concept plan (3 storeys permitted activity) with 3-4 storey allowable.</p> <p>Wants a change to Area plan outcome to reflect Selwyn Village will be providing range of housing for the elderly, change proposed from 'single dwelling small site/townhouse' to 'Low rise terraces/apartments'</p>	Western Bays	Quality Built Environment	Map	Noted that that property acquisitions by Selwyn Village suggest the key site area should be enlarged. Outcome change from 'single dwelling small site/townhouse' to 'Low rise apartments/terraces' has been previously considered. Neither outcome describes the intended use of this site well, but the Key Site outcome is intended to reflect a particular purpose. For this reason, reject outcome change but accept feedback in part (realign key site boundaries consistent with the map included in the feedback and consistent with the 'blobby' mapping approach taken by the FPF). Text discussion about future development potential of the site, as homes for elderly, can be referred to the more detailed phase (District Plan).	Accept
WB7	Transport	Roads	Object	Refer to Waterview tunnel portal as per Avondale / Blockhouse Bay area plan map	Western Bays	Quality Built Environment	Both	The Avondale/Blockhouse Bay map contains an annotation 'State Highway 20 Waterview tunnel portal' and a dotted line leading to the tunnel entrance. This is consistent with plans shown on the NZ Transport Agency (formerly NZ Transit) project website.	Accept
WB8	Transport	Walking and cycling	Aspiration	Continuation of Pedestrian link across Motions Creek linking Westmere to Meola Reserve.	Western Bays	Transport Choices	Map	The area plan does not show a continuation of the coastal pedestrian/cycle improvements along the Meola Reef into Westmere, although there is an available route to the Meola creek formed by Wainui Avenue. This route could be indicated on the area plan.	Accept
WB10	Residential	R - Residential Intensification	Object	<p>Concern that the Area Plan applies a "low rise apartments / terraces" typology to the Housing New Zealand land at 97 Vermont Street. This land is presently occupied by 1950s style single storey duplex and terrace housing and developed to a density of approximately 1:191m<sup>2</sup>. It is one of only two sites within the street where terrace/townhouse development fronts the street, and is surrounded by character housing on sites of approximately 450m<sup>2</sup>. If carried through to the District Plan, the identification of the Housing New Zealand land for low rise apartments and terrace housing (described within the Future Planning Framework as being up to four storeys high) would result in a pocket of high intensity zoning surrounded by much lower intensity character housing.</p> <p>This would entrench a form of development that is alien to the predominant heritage character of the properties fronting Vermont Street. The identification of the Housing New Zealand land at 97 Vermont Street for low rise apartments and terrace housing completely undermines the stated objective of protecting the character of areas like Ponsonby. In addition, it is hard to reconcile with the strategy of intensifying centres and corridors, given that the land is some considerable distance and isolated from Ponsonby Road. Seeks that this typology be deleted from that land and replaced with the "single dwelling traditional site" typology applying to the rest of the street. Alternatively, it should be deleted and replaced with the "single dwelling small site / townhouse" typology which would permit a scale of development more compatible with the street.</p>	Western Bays	Quality Built Environment	Map	The site is Housing New Zealand land, containing single level duplex, triplex developments in an area predominantly one or two storey residential. Application of low-rise apartments/terraces typology would be inconsistent with character of the area. Noted that Housing New Zealand feedback does not refer to this site. The feedback is accepted. Recommend that the outcome be changed to Single dwelling small site/townhouse	Accept
WB9	Transport	Walking and cycling	Aspiration	Connection Westmere along Meola Reef perhaps from Weona Place	Western Bays	Transport Choices	Map	The suggestion has merit and could be further explored by other processes. Inclusion as an aspiration on the area plan map does not commit the council to the option but retains it as a matter for further feasibility study and decision.	Accept

### Future Planning Framework (Version 1.0) Feedback Summary Report

REF #	Topic	Theme	Feedback Type	Issue	Geographic Area / Location	Strategy Outcome	Type of change	Discussion	Recommendation
WB11	Transport	Walking and cycling	Object	Bridge Meola creek (feedback unclear) prefer this to be located so as to allow yachts to move up the waterway	Western Bays	Transport Choices	Map	The location of this connection was always intended to be indicative of a need for a crossing rather than prescriptive of its location. The indicative location could be moved further upstream as suggested to nearer to the end of Wainui Avenue which is unlikely to pose an obstacle to water craft, or the map could be amended to clarify that the crossing location is indicative only and subject to further investigation. The latter approach is recommended.	Accept
<b>Parked feedback</b>									
WB12	Heritage	R - Residential Intensification	Question	Herne bay coastline has greater intensification (low rise apartment outcome). Why Change from residential 6a/7a?. What about heritage?	Western Bays	Quality Built Environment	None	Outcome is a reflection of what is currently built on the coastline. Specifically gauge the community's views on this outcome during the engagement phase. The residential heritage study will review this area. Forward to Heritage team	Next Phase
WB13	Business/Mixed Use	UD - Urban Design	Comment	Agree with Mixed use outcome as long as not just high rise apartments (as is the case in existing mixed use areas). Potentially good outcomes at Pt Chevalier / Garnet Road and West Lynn	Western Bays	Quality Built Environment	None	Acknowledge that the Mixed Use outcome needs further development as part of District Plan development. Needs a 'true vertical' mix of uses and not allow for just residential development (as referred to in the definition in the Consolidated Outcomes document). No action	Next Phase
WB14	Transport	Public transport (buses and rail)	Aspiration	Public transport - need a circuit through northern sector of area including bus along Meola Road linking Point Chevalier/West end/Jervois Roads	Western Bays	Transport Choices	None	Area plan text acknowledges this deficiency and recommends providing this service. No further change required (does not meet threshold for showing as a key road passenger transport route).	Decline
WB15	Key Site	KS - Opposition to key site	Object	Richmond Road industrial area. Why designate industrial 'key site'? Mixed Use more appropriate? Not many industrial sites left in Western Bays	Western Bays	Economic Development	None	Key site due to acquisition of properties by developer. Acknowledge that industrial sites are low on supply in Western Bays. However there are still 'industrial uses' e.g. mechanical workshops etc in areas such as Great North Road. Richmond Road is slowly changing to Mixed Use. Single feedback item (from landowner) received at item above. No opposition to the proposed land use from general community, recommend no change at this stage.	Decline
WB16	Corridors	BMU - Interface issues	Comment	Greater intensification along Great North Road ridge?	Western Bays	Quality Built Environment	None	Mixed use outcome provides for both business and residential intensification along the ridge. Type of land uses within Mixed Use outcome to be worked out as part of District Plan development. See also response above to feedback items concerned about ridge line development, which is a matter to be carefully addressed at District Plan stage, building heights in particular.	Next Phase
WB17	Heritage	C - Growth of Centres	Object	No merit in shops along Jervois Road and Ponsonby Road. Possible offices but need to retain heritage buildings. Centres constrained - maybe more appropriate to develop on the side behind existing businesses because of traffic issues along the busy roads	Western Bays	Quality Built Environment	None	Shops and businesses are already located on the northern side of Jervois Road opposite Jervois Road shops. Predominantly within heritage buildings. Issue of character/heritage overlay being addressed as part of heritage work (both residential and business).	Next Phase
<b>General</b>									
<b>Key themes - support</b>									
G1	General	General	Support	Support for the Future Planning Framework process	General	General	None	These comments included those which were in support of the Future Planning Framework process	Accept
<b>Key themes - issues</b>									
G2	General	General	Comment	District plan matters	General	General	None	These comments included suggested improvements to current district plan rules and development controls and additional rules and controls.	Next Phase
G3	General	General	Comment	Operational issues - footpaths	General	General	Both	These comments related to issues around footpath maintenance and upgrade. Refer to Transport Strategy/Operational groups for their information	Refer / Delegate
G4	General	General	Comment	Operational issues - trees	General	General	None	These comments included suggested tree species for planting along roads, footpaths and parks, complaints about certain types of trees planted in public areas and requests for more street tree planting. These comments will be referred to Transport and ACR Services for their information.	Refer / Delegate