Developer Survey: Intensification in Auckland

Final Report

December 2006

A technical document produced on behalf of the Auckland Regional Growth Forum, as an input into the review of the Regional Growth Strategy

Prepared on behalf of the Regional Growth Forum by Fiona Knox, Strategic Policy Analyst and John Smith, Consultant. ARC

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Introduction to the Survey

In the lead up to the first Regional Growth Strategy (RGS), a number of residential developers were interviewed in 1997. Almost 10 years on it was seen as useful to revisit this survey to gather some trend information with those residential developers originally interviewed, but also gather information and perspectives from the newcomers and those with a more commercial property interest.

The objective of the revised survey has been to touch base with a range of companies participating in the Auckland market, and:

- Find about their role in both the intensification and future urban (greenfield) market and gather their perceptions of the constraints to effective participation in these markets.
- Gather their views on the future of residential and business development in Auckland.
- Seek feedback on the opportunities and constraints to achieving the RGS vision and outcomes and identify tools that will assist in improving implementation.

A sample of 23 developers were surveyed on behalf of the Regional Growth Forum. Further interviews were held with a small number of financiers and planning consultants.

Survey Responses

Developers were asked to identify the main constraints to more effective developer participation in the intensification market. Constraints in this context may prevent development, limit the type of development or add costs to development and reduce their viability. Key survey responses are outlined below:

Planning Processes and Procedures

There is a predominant view that Council planning processes and procedures are hindering rather than facilitating intensification. Almost without fail, both developers and planning consultants interviewed commented on the following issues:

- The time delays caused by notified application processes. These delays create uncertainty for developers and have a direct monetary effect on developments – particularly on the holding costs for land. Developers strongly feel that this issue continues to get worse in Auckland.
- A lack of incentive for innovation built into district planning processes. A key message from developers is that district plans are not providing an incentive for innovation in design. In an effort to avoid processing delays through notified applications, developers are choosing, wherever possible, to fit their development proposals into the permitted activity 'box', which allow for homogenous development and bland design outcomes.
- A lack of flexibility in rules to respond to intensification objectives. Developers feel that height restrictions and parking requirements in district plans have not changed to sufficiently allow for variation in design and height and reduced car parking requirements.

This is an example of practice not following policy, where more concentrated growth is supposed to support less cars and more public transport usage and better urban design.

- Council policies and practices are internally inconsistent. Developers noted urban design and traffic requirements are often in direct conflict at the district level, as is intensification and storm water management at the regional level. Developers admit to being unclear as to which policy direction will take precedence or what code will be cited as relevant in each of their applications.
- Risk aversion is stifling innovation. There is a feeling from developers that officers and/or politicians are being very conservative in their judgements and decisions and this is largely seen as a response to a minority of public lobbyists. Even where a development has met district plan criteria and has gone through assessment processes, including an urban design panel, developers noted that there was still uncertainty as to whether their applications would be consented to. Where developers are interested in varying design and height, certainty of consent becomes almost negligible.
- Experience is an issue. Developers acknowledge that councils have problems with recruiting and retaining experienced staff. High staff turnover does, however, impact on customer service and continuity in a process. Additionally, more experienced developers who are capable of providing good quality products at a larger scale, felt that they are being treated the same as newcomers or inexperienced developers operating at a smaller scale.

The Cost of Development

The cost of development was also heralded as one of the biggest constraints to achieving intensification in Auckland. These costs directly affect the viability of developments, the subsequent number of developments and the cost to the purchaser. Costs fell into the following categories:

- Land holding costs. These are by far the greatest cost for developers, delays in consent processes have a direct impact on the holding costs and invariably these costs are passed on to the end user.
- The price of land. The increasing prices of land in Auckland have had an impact on development costs and have decreased profit margins. Some of the larger developers are prepared to wait for the economics of development or redevelopment to become more viable.
- Development/infrastructure contributions. Although these are accepted as necessary by most developers, they have an issue with a lack of transparency regarding where and what their contributions are to be spent on.
- Building costs (labour and materials). These costs were largely accepted as part of the development business. All cited these costs as increasing, however there was a mixed response as to whether this was restricted to Auckland.
- The cost of processing consents. This was a concern for some developers who have seen costs continue to increase over the years without any corresponding increase in customer service/processing times.

Location of Development and Provision of Infrastructure

When asked about the main influences on their choice of location, developer responses were consistently related to availability of land, market demand for type, whether the economics of the development would make it worthy.

Very few developers are actively looking for land or opportunities in town centres and corridors. Although many of the developers responded that the RGS had influenced their company strategy by encouraging more intensive development, town centres and corridors are seen to be too difficult and not viable at present. There are areas in the region that are seen to be prime for redevelopment, however plan changes have not happened to allow this.

Only a limited number of developers are responding to transport improvements in the choice of their locations for future development. Some did recognise key projects such as the northern busway, park and ride facilities in Albany, State Highway 20 extension, as being an attraction for residents and businesses. However, the current transport improvements are not yet seen as sufficient to act as a draw card to certain areas.

Some examples were cited where the lack of infrastructure impacted on development potential and costs. At a regional level, aspects such as traffic congestion and the reliability of electricity supply were raised. More locally, examples largely related to storm water requirements, where in some circumstances, developers are being asked to reduce storm water flows to below that currently experienced from the site.

Market Demand for Type

Developers and Financiers agree that there has been a slow down in the residential market. Most point to lower profit margins as the key reason, however they see the slow down as a short-term matter. Lower margins are due to the increase in cost of developing in Auckland.

Some developers acknowledged the metropolitan urban limit (MUL) as a contributing factor to increasing the market demand for different types of residential development. There was a belief that the market (and consumer) was becoming educated about intensive development although there was still a role for continued education. Greenfield fringe developers believe that there is insufficient land for single dwellings within the MUL in the long term.

Developers with a commercial focus noted that there was always demand for new retail activity and if this was not provided, then activity would disperse rather than cluster where intensification is desirable. Business land developers agree that land is becoming in short supply for industrial activities and there will need to be development beyond the current MUL to provide for market demand.

Leadership

Almost all of the developers cited a lack of leadership in progressing the objectives of RGS, particularly in town centres and corridors. It was felt that there was no certainty about development in the region and leadership was needed to stimulate areas through prioritising resources, assembling land and providing incentives for development of the right quality in the preferred areas. It was also felt that there were no continued efforts to inform and educate the public about growth and about the need for increasing housing choices, modes of travel and employment choice in local areas.

Other Issues

Respondents were asked a range of other questions about their experiences in Auckland. Some pertinent issues are covered below:

- The urban design panels are seen as positive initiatives but there needs to be more consistency and better integration with Council policy and processes. Even if a panel supports a development proposal, this does not always translate into certainty in the consent process.
- Demand for sustainable building design and practices are increasing to address emerging business/commercial tenant requirements. However, the interest is limited with residential development and at the moment there is no incentive to provide for this market.
- Leaky buildings, poorly designed buildings and associated urban design are having an impact on the image of the higher density market in Auckland. Providing a demonstration of high quality development is necessary to convince the public that change can be advantageous in the urban environment.

A number of developers indicated that they think the Auckland market is maturing. There are some reasonably sized developers who are indicating they are in the market for the long haul and are passionate about building quality products and overcoming any 'bad press' associated with more intensive developments.

Summary Conclusions

Many of the themes mentioned by developers are as expected and in fact very similar to those issues covered by the 1997 survey. The fact that this message remains the same and on some issues has intensified should be a concern for authorities charged with implementation of the Growth Strategy. However, it should be acknowledged that these concerns have been raised during a period of high growth and significant development in the central city, infill and greenfield locations.

Implementation of the RGS objectives of "quality, compact urban environments" with growth focused "around town centres and major transport routes" will require improvements in the way things are done in Auckland. In particular developers and planning consultants noted the need to:

- **Provide leadership**, by politicians taking a comprehensive view about Auckland and what it should look like, and providing clarity about where growth will be focused and what infrastructure will be provided, so that developers are not left guessing.
- **Providing certainty in the development process and creating incentives for desired development,** largely through using more 'carrots' and less 'sticks' and planning positively.
- **Creating smarter processes,** suggestions were around finding better ways of operating under the Resource Management Act to ensure that quality developments do not get held up in bureaucratic processes, and that council staff are delegated to make things happen efficiently.

1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction

One of the key features of the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) is that growth is to be managed by promoting quality, compact urban environments, referred to as intensification. The growth concept in RGS provides for future intensification in selected areas of the region by limiting growth outside the existing metropolitan area and focussing most growth around town centres and major transport routes (corridors).

This survey has been undertaken to inform the implementation-focused review of the Regional Growth Strategy. The survey replicates and builds an earlier survey carried out in 1997 as part of the preparation of the RGS. The survey has been helpful in gathering together the views of developers in the residential and commercial intensification markets and identifying what they think are they key barriers are to successful implementation and provide suggestions around improvements.

1.2 Definition of Intensification

Intensification is "an increase of density (dwellings/activity units/population and so on) over the existing density within a defined area". Intensification in terms of the survey included general incremental intensification (often described as "infill"), selective intensification in nodes and corridors (including mixed use in employment areas), and more intense development of greenfield land.

1.3 Developer Survey Objective and Methodology

The key objective was to contact a range of companies participating in Auckland residential and business development and to find out about:

- Their role in both the intensification and future urban (greenfield) markets.
- Their perceptions of constraints to effective participation in these markets.
- Futures for residential and business development in Auckland.

The survey content was similar to the original survey carried out in 1997, with addition in the 2006 survey of new questions on business intensification. Appendix 1 of this report provides the survey questions in their entirety. Where possible, developers who were interviewed in the earlier survey were offered the opportunity to participate in the current one. Appendix 2 contains a list of companies interviewed.

The final sample interviewed included companies that collectively operate across the seven Auckland territorial urban areas in both residential and commercial markets. The interview sample of 23 companies was selected after discussion with territorial authority (TA) officers and the Property Council of NZ. Face to face interviews were held, lasting between 1.5 to 2 hours in length. Each participant was assured of the confidentiality of his or her individual comments and informed that the information they provided would be analysed thematically. Interviews were also held with a small number of planning consultants and financiers. The intention was to gather supporting information from those people who regularly work with development companies in Auckland.

1.4 Collaboration on the Survey

Interviews were conducted in collaboration with research partners Motu Economic and Public Policy Research Trust (a charitable trust) and DTZ. The partners are undertaking research into housing supply in the Auckland Region on behalf of the Centre for Housing Research Aotearoa New Zealand (CHRANZ), Department of Building and Housing and the Housing New Zealand Corporation. The principal purpose of the research is to identify factors that may constrain new housing supply within the Auckland region and to suggest solutions to these constraints. The outcomes of this research will be published separately from the Regional Growth Strategy review.

1.5 Limitations of the Survey

This survey was an attempt to make contact with developers in the region as part of the RGS review process. The survey forms one input into the review alongside other pieces of technical work. The limitation of this survey is that it is a sample of the developers operating across the region and is based on individual experiences and perceptions. The findings from this survey will inform other work carried as part of the review and will not be treated in isolation.

1.6 Format of this Report

The report structure follows the sequence of questions put to the interviewees. In particular:

- Section 2 provides more details of the survey participants.
- Section 3 covers the overall residential and business intensification activity.
- Section 4 lists the main constraints to participation in intensification activity.
- Section 5 provides some developers' perspectives on intensification futures.
- Section 6 reflects back on the changes since the first survey was undertaken.
- Section 7 provides some summary conclusions and observations.

2. Survey Participants

2.1 Development Companies

The development companies interviewed are listed in Appendix 2 of this report. They range from small companies comprising property professionals and project managers (0-5 staff) to large companies with significant numbers of professional, administrative and sales staff as well as contract builders (up to 50 professional and administrative staff and up to 1200 sub contracted builders).

The average length of time that companies have been developing residential property is between 21 and 22 years, with business orientated development between 11 and 12 years. Some of the individual companies surveyed have been in existence less than 5 years whilst there were also long standing established companies included ranging from 50 to 97 years.

Financiers indicate that a number of larger developers have emerged in the intensification market who are producing significant numbers of housing stock. There is an expectation that these developers will continue for the long term.

The vast majority of companies operate in three or more local council areas with one doing business in all TA's across the Auckland Region. Only two companies operate in just one Council area. Over 75% of respondents are involved in development outside of the Auckland region, the most common areas being Whangarei, Taupo and Queenstown. Four of those interviewed are operating overseas, principally in Australia.

The range of companies surveyed was similar to those surveyed in the 1997 survey, even though only five of the previous twenty-one companies were surveyed on this occasion.

2.2 Planning Consultants and Financiers

Interviews were also held with a small number of financiers and planning consultants to provide an additional perspective on development practice and process and the impact on intensification. Those companies interviewed are also provided in Appendix 2.

3. Intensification Building Activity

3.1 Residential Activity

The residential development companies surveyed have constructed a total of over 13,000 dwelling units over the last 5 years, an average of over 750 per company. Of these, around 5,000 intensification dwellings have been completed in existing urban areas, an average of nearly 400 dwelling units per company.

The types of developments are varied, from central and inner city high rise apartments, to large luxury apartments on the waterfront and single dwellings, low rise apartments, terrace and townhouse developments in greenfield areas.

The Regional Growth Strategy, supported by the Regional Policy Statement, anticipates that most urban growth will be focussed in town centres and along major transport routes. In the period from 2001 to 2006, a total of 19,300 intensification dwellings were completed in the Auckland Region. Over 60% of these dwellings were located in Growth Nodes but 70% of these were in the CBD.

The developers surveyed contributed around 50% to the total higher density dwellings completed in this period. Over 35% of these were built in greenfield locations.

Table 1: Location of intensive residential development

Urban Area Location	Number of Dwellings	%
Greenfield *	3728	36.5
Business Zones	3635	35.5
Other Built Up	2767	28.0
Total	10220	

* excludes 3350 sections or single dwellings

Developers were asked what influenced their choice of location. Around 40% indicated that cost of land and viability are the main factors, whilst size of the land is also a factor and the economic opportunity associated with a site.

Of those companies holding land for future development, over half are holding more than they were five years ago. This applies to both brownfields and greenfields land. Most developers anticipate the land will be developed in the coming five years for a range of housing types, although single dwellings are more likely on greenfield sites.

3.2 Commercial/Business Activity

Eleven of those surveyed have developed commercial property in the last five years. Almost 800 commercial units have been developed, including industrial units, hotel and leisure facilities and retail and office developments. Developers interviewed covered many aspects of the commercial development market from land developers to unit and office builders and refurbishers. In a number of cases developers interviewed retain interest in the commercial unit either as a landlord or through a property trust or other financial mechanism.

There is a clear indication from developers that, other than Auckland CBD, town centres and corridors are not providing attractive opportunities for commercial development. The majority of units are being developed on greenfield land, in existing business parks and industrial areas or on brownfield sites.

Whilst there has been some development of mixed residential and business units, developers indicate that they are no longer looking at this as a viable option due to either a negative view from the TA or to a lack of market interest.

Developers also expressed a view that there is a current shortage of land for industrial development.

3.3 Influence of the Regional Growth Strategy on Intensification Activity

Around three quarters of the developers responded that the RGS had influenced their company strategy (rather than driven it).

Residential developers noted that the RGS gave them some confidence that intensification of residential areas was a good market to get into. Developers in the business market were aware of the RGS, largely because of the metropolitan urban limits and the effect they were feeling with a shortage of business land for development.

Section 4.0 outlines constraints to intensification, but it is worth noting up front that developers in both markets are finding it hard to develop in town centres and corridors as it is seen to be too difficult and not viable at present.

4. Constraints to Intensification

4.1 Introduction

Developers were asked to identify the main constraints to more effective developer participation in the intensification market. Constraints in this context may prevent development, limit the type of development or add costs to development and reduce their viability. The quantitative results of this question are listed in Table 2 and these are expanded on qualitatively in sections 4.2 to 4.8.

Table 2: Constraints to Intensification

Constraint	Yes	No	Key Reason for Yes
Land Availability	16	7	MUL restricting land availability for greenfield development. Difficult/costly to amalgamate sites for intensification
Land Ownership	12	10	Land parcels being land banked and land difficult to consolidate
Planning Procedures	19	3	Resource consent too slow, 20 day requirement not met, too many further information requests
Planning Rules	15	7	Rules too rigidly applied & no incentive for innovation, no change in parking and height restrictions to support intensification
Consent Preparation Costs	10	12	Costs have increased
Consent Processing Times	20	3	No certainty, lack of experienced staff, no delegated authority
Building Regulations	8	15	
Availability of Suitable Labour	13	9	Obtaining & retaining good labour a problem but reducing
Availability of Infrastructure	13	10	
Drainage Requirements	10	13	Requirements on individual site too onerous
Site Access Factors	8	15	Transit New Zealand too rigid in approach
Infrastructure Contributions	16	7	Not transparent
Development Contributions	19	4	Too high, rising fast, not transparent
Lack of Innovation by Designers	5	18	
Finance Availability	2	20	
Cost of Land	19	4	Land cost has increased rapidly
Cost of Building Materials	13	10	Cost of materials has risen but not Auckland specific
Market Demand by Type	10	12	
Increasing Competition	4	18	
Low Profit Margins	14	6	
Availability of Materials	5	16	
Community Opposition	13	10	3rd party objection given to much weight
Conversion of Brownfields Land	5	15	
Other	4	17	Lack of leadership, council leaders too risk adverse

4.2 Land Supply

There is a clear view by many of the developers that the availability of land is a constraint to development. The view is strongly held by greenfield land developers, particularly those involved in land subdivision and single dwelling construction. Developers of commercial land, particularly for industrial, also hold this view.

Amongst developers of higher density residential dwellings, constraints to the availability of land relate primarily to the amount of suitably zoned land, the difficulties of amalgamating land parcels to an economic size, or the cost of that land in the present market. Many of these developers see the metropolitan urban limit (MUL) as assisting the future viability and availability of land for intensification in the existing urban area.

Land ownership is viewed as less of a constraint although there is perceived to be significant land banking of greenfield land around the MUL. Other developers are concerned that many large sites have been redeveloped and that consolidation of smaller sites to achieve sufficient scale for higher density development is proving to be difficult and unviable at present.

4.3 Planning Processes and Rules

Planning consents are identified as the major constraint to intensification. Developers explained that they avoided notified applications wherever possible to reduce delays and uncertainty in the planning consent process. This means that developers will design developments to fit within permitted planning rules. Permitted activity rules require a 'fit within the box' approach for sign off. By choosing this path developers recognise that the opportunity for innovation in design is reduced.

Delays and uncertainty caused by consent processing times added costs to developments by increasing holding costs of land and put pressure on pre sale processes, which often occur prior to resource consent. Developers indicate that the time taken to gain consent, and later compliance, has increased significantly in recent years. The uncertainty surrounding the time taken to gain consent is an additional and costly risk in the development process.

Three quarters of the developers interviewed believe there are differences in time to gain regulatory approval between the different TA's in Auckland, this was supported by comments from planning consultants. Council staff turnover is perceived to be high and subsequently it is difficult to build up on going relationships. Both developers and planning consultants noted that they deal with numerous council staff through the consent process, each with their own view on the development outcomes.

Developers express a desire to produce better quality higher density developments but believe this is hindered by delays in the consent process as well as existing planning rules. A vast majority of developers indicate that planning rules are a constraint to intensification. In general, the main issues for developers with planning rules surround their rigid application. These rules may not apply well to specific site conditions and the application of them is found to be counter to achieving the benefits of a more compact and liveable city. Excessive parking requirements and limits on height restrictions were the two examples used. Both developers and planning consultants consider that planning rules do not reward innovation and the pursuit of quality development. Where developers are interested in varying design and height, they say that certainty of consent becomes almost negligible.

Consent preparation costs are not considered a major constraint, however the continued request for further information and greater detail during the resource consent process is adding to costs from holding charges and the need to engage planning consultants and lawyers over the duration. Some developers noted the increasing cost for consent preparation, without a corresponding increase in customer service.

The consistency of approach in implementing policy within and between councils was also seen as a constraint. Some developers and both of the planning consultants cited instances where urban design and traffic requirements are often in direct conflict at the district level, as is intensification and storm water management at the regional level. Developers admit to being unclear as to which policy direction will take precedence or what code (subdivision or traffic code) will be cited as relevant in each of their consent applications.

Council experience is also an issue, although developers and planning consultants did acknowledge that councils are having problems with recruiting and retaining experienced staff. High staff turnover does however impact on customer service and continuity in a process. Over long time frames (e.g. through notified applications) this means that a developer can deal with numerous council staff, each with their own view on the development outcomes. Additionally, more experienced developers who are capable of providing good quality products, felt that they are being treated the same as newcomers or inexperienced developers.

4.4 Building in Auckland

Compared to the other issues raised building regulations are not seen as being a constraint to intensification. Some developers believe that there are too many regulations, particularly following the incidence of "leaky buildings" and that regulations are now too complex and onerous. Others state that more regulation will improve the quality of buildings. One of the planning consultants noted that the interpretation of the building code caused problems. He noted that one council included in their district plan provisions that should actually be covered in the Building Code, to make sure fundamental standards (such as external windows) were provided for in their intensive housing developments.

A shortage of available labour, particularly trades, which was apparent in recent years, is reducing. Developers noted that there continues to be a shortage of professional staff available to project-manage complex developments.

Only a small number of developers consider the conversion of brownfields land to residential use to be a constraint to development.

4.5 Infrastructure and Contributions

Infrastructure and reserve contributions are seen as a constraint on development, although planning and building consent issues are considered to be more so. The majority of those surveyed did not question the necessity for contributions, but the consistency of application and the clarity of use of the funds are certainly of concern. All of the developers expressed a desire for contributions to be fairly applied and the calculation of them to be transparent.

The availability of infrastructure is seen by a majority of developers as a constraint to intensification, in most instances it is the impact of region wide infrastructure such as traffic congestion or reliability of electricity supply.

Drainage requirements are not particularly seen as a significant constraint. However, in certain circumstances there are concerns that the developer is being required to fix a lack of previous planning and action by the council (e.g. around storm water issues) and that a specific development is required to perform at a standard much higher than both the surrounding land and the existing site.

Site access factors are also not perceived as a significant issue but where developers see it as a constraint it is in relation to the role of Transit New Zealand in approving developments.

4.6 Development Factors in Auckland

Developers clearly stated that the availability of finance, market demand, the availability of materials and increasing competition are not constraints to intensification.

Residential developers noted that the market (and consumer) is becoming more educated about higher density opportunities and there is finance available to proceed with developments. Leaky buildings and poorly designed buildings are noted as having an impact on the image of the higher density market. Providing demonstration examples of high quality development is considered necessary to embrace this in the market as a housing choice.

The cost of land and building materials are contributing to low profit margins. Increasing prices of land in Auckland have had an impact on development costs. Some of the larger developers are prepared to wait for the economics of development or redevelopment to become more viable.

Developers noted that since 1997 dwelling prices have risen considerably and this has allowed developers to factor higher land and materials costs into the sales price to the consumer. Financiers confirm that the availability of finance for development and home lending has contributed to the increases in house and land prices. Developers see the rising/falling of land prices as an aspect of market adjustment and adjust their own operations accordingly.

With a current slow down of dwelling price increase, developers indicate that low profit margins, as a reflection of both land costs and demand for dwellings, will reduce the volume of development in the short term. Financiers, who see recent changes as a correction rather than a downturn, confirm this.

An inflow of funds from overseas, principally Australia, is also influencing the commercial development market, with significant long-term investment by a range of property funds and trusts.

Building costs (labour and materials) were largely accepted as part of the development business. All developers cited these costs as increasing, however there was a mixed response as to whether this was restricted to Auckland.

Whilst developers do not see a lack of innovation by designers as a constraint, there is recognition that the present planning processes do not encourage or reward innovation in design. Most developers recognize that skilled designers are available but the need to follow planning rules in order to reduce uncertainty surrounding the resource consent process leads to a lack of innovation in design.

4.7 Community Opposition

Developers accept that there is value in community input to the planning process but question both the number of opportunities to object and the ability of small (and often well organized) numbers of individuals who are able to influence the time taken to achieve resource consent. As noted earlier, the time taken to gain consent adds risk and costs to the development and lowers a projects overall viability.

A number of developers reflected on experiences from overseas (largely Australia), where council leadership and clarity around an area assigned for development meant that they were less inclined to listen to "all minor objectors" and could then focus on the outcome.

One planning consultant noted that the uncertainty that is provided in the Resource Management Act (RMA) tilted towards objectors and these objectors kept getting to comment on development projects at every level of the process.

4.8 Other Factors

In many cases developers commented that they did not see a commitment to intensification from councils in the Auckland region. Almost all of the developers cited a lack of leadership in progressing the objectives of RGS, particularly in town centres and corridors. Developers noted there was no certainty about development in the region and leadership was needed to stimulate areas through prioritising resources, assembling land and providing incentives for development of the right quality in the preferred areas.

One of the planning consultants noted that under the RMA councils do not have an opportunity to separate strategic approvals from statutory approvals and that this meant that councils are having trouble 'positively planning' for an area.

Additionally a number of developers mentioned that they thought risk aversion in councils was stifling innovation. Officers and politicians are being very conservative in their judgements and decisions of developments. This is largely seen as a response to a minority of public lobbyists.

Even when a development has met district plan criteria and has gone through rigorous assessment processes, including an urban design panel, developers noted that there was still uncertainty as to whether their applications would be consented to.

One of the planning consultants commented that social housing and affordable housing is increasingly becoming an issue for the region. The increasing use of covenants on developments to get some people out and housing values up should be a concern for councils.

5. Intensification Futures In Auckland

5.1 Removing Constraints to Intensification

Developers were asked to prioritise which constraints they considered hinder innovation in the intensification market. Following this they were asked whether removing certain constraints would contribute to greater participation in the intensification market. The results are outlined in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Constraints to Development

Constraint	Hinder Innovation	Assist Intensification
Land Supply (Availability, ownership)	2	8
Planning & Building (Procedures, rules, times, costs, building regulations)	31	13
Infrastructure & Contributions (Availability, drainage, site access, contributions)	2	1
Development (Design innovation, finance, land & material costs, demand & competition, profit margins)	0	5
Community Opposition	1	2
Other	1	4

Overwhelmingly, developers believe that improvement in planning procedures, rules and consent times is needed to remove the key constraints to both innovation and greater intensification. Specific comments from the developers include:

"Local government regulatory processes are creating a culture based on process not outcomes, innovation and value"

"It's the implementation of policies, not the policies themselves that creates issues."

"Anything out of the ordinary takes too long."

"Need to go back to the beginning of the RMA - look at projects and their impact on the community as a whole, not in isolation. Urban Design Panels go some way to resolving this - but each project is still dealt with in isolation."

"You very rarely find 'permitted activities' in any District Plans now - this fine grained approach to the planning process is causing delays and increasing costs - there needs to be some level of flexibility in the rules."

"The ARC is not seen as an advocate for growth – leadership is not being shown. There is a disconnect between disciplines – for example storm water requirements intensification policy. More local jobs are an environmental benefit and should be offset against storm water flow issues. Councils need to lead their communities."

"Practice just really doesn't seem to follow the policy, I thought more concentrated growth was supposed to support less cars and provide for public transport, but there has been no change in any parking requirements in the district plan"

There were a number of suggestions put forward to manage the issues raised in chapter 4 of this report. Some developers and the planning consultants suggested that there was a need for senior staff to be delegated with responsibilities that could allow them to shepherd an experienced developer through a consent process without delays. This approach was quoted to be fairly standard internationally. Some councils have adopted this approach recently, which was seen as positive but sporadic. Another suggestion included establishing a rating system for developers where those highly rated are granted quicker consent processes.

5.2 Creating Incentives for Intensification

Table 4 outlines the areas where developers thought attention needed to be given to make intensification attractive in Auckland.

Table 4: Major factors to make Intensification attractive

Reduce Approval Time	5
Certainty of planning rules	5
Flexibility of planning rules	4
Reward good development	8
Reduce contribution costs	0
Remove MUL	2
Council leadership in town centres	3
Other	5

In addition to the previously mentioned issue of consent approval delays, developers believe that introducing rewards for good development was considered absolutely necessary. The following quotes highlight what a majority of the developers were saying:

"There is a need for outcomes driven process; incentives for doing right thing & rewards for new things"

"There are too many sticks and not enough carrots. You won't get the development you want without some incentive"

"Fast tracking processes, coupled with quality design is a win-win situation"

The matter of rewards was again prominent in considering what initiatives would encourage intensification in Town Centres, as outlined in Table 5 overleaf:

Table 5: Encouragement of intensification in Town Centres

Reduce approval times	3
Certainty of planning rules	2
Flexibility of planning rules	5
Reward good development	6
Reduce contribution costs	2
Remove MUL	0
Council land consolidation	5
Council infrastructure provision	5
Promote good examples of intensification	3
Other	7

Both developers and planning consultants also focused on the need for leadership by councils. Suggested areas of focus included greater flexibility in planning rules, clarity about where and when growth will occur and action in consolidating land into larger parcels.

Developers were asked if present program of transport improvements, particularly around passenger transport, were influencing their location choice for intensification. Only a small number of developers considered these infrastructure improvements as part of their decision criteria for location, some did recognise key projects such as the northern busway, park and ride facilities in Albany, State Highway 20 extension, as being an attraction for residents and businesses. However, to date, the transport improvements are not yet seen as sufficient to act as a draw card to certain areas.

As covered previously, results from Tables 6 and 7 show that reduced profit margins are impacting on a short-term view of opportunities for intensification in Auckland. Developers are indicating that there is presently a lack of opportunity but the long-term prospects are extremely good.

Table 6: Future for intensification – short term

Lack of opportunity	9
Plenty of opportunity	2
Lower profit margins	4
Other	3

Table 7: Future for intensification – long term

Lack of opportunity	5
Plenty of opportunity	11
Low demand	0
High demand	7
Lower profit margins	0
Higher profit margins	0
Other	8

5.3 Other Information

Only two developers were unaware of the existence of Urban Design Panels, as demonstrated in Table 8. In most instances experience suggests that Panels are useful, however there were a number of comments made that as the Panels do not have statutory power they can only recommend agreed design solutions and these suggestions are sometimes not accepted by Council.

Table 8: Experience of Urban Design Panel

Somewhat useful	9
Very useful	3
Difficult	1
Unclear or complicated	6
Too subjective	5
Too involved in minor details	2
Other	4

Over two thirds of developers interviewed consider that the Building Act has influenced their company's activities. There was a general view that the impact was generally minor, even given the incidence of "leaky homes", but has gone a little far in its prescriptive nature.

Around 75% of respondents conduct post occupancy research. Whilst much of this is informally gained through ongoing involvement with owners and tenants, in all cases developers value the contribution and factor the information into planning and designing their subsequent developments.

Commercial developers indicate that there is increasing recognition of sustainable building design in the design of commercial buildings that is being driven by client requirements. The trend is less apparent in residential buildings although there is awareness of the issues and many developers are testing the viability of design and building products including solar access, solar water heating and energy efficiency.

Overseas trends are monitored by around three quarters of developers. This is generally done via desktop research but trips to Australia are common.

Table 9 indicates that developers think activity outside of Auckland is easier. This is largely because they have been provided with support from the councils in those other regions.

Table 9: Development outside of Auckland

More opportunity	2
Less opportunity	1
More support from Council	7
Less support from Council	0
Less costs	0
Higher margins	0
Other	1

5.4 Future of Auckland

In considering the impact of the future growth of Auckland to a population of around 2 million contained within the MUL, developers recognised that there would be many opportunities for Auckland. Table 10 shows that developers were mostly positive concerning the potential opportunities for intensive development. Some developers think there is likely to be greater pressure for intensification but the availability of suitable land could create a problem.

Table 10: Opportunities or problems with two million population

Land prices will rise	2
Availability of land	8
More pressure for intensification	11
More pressure for infrastructure	4
More traffic congestion	3
Greater diversity of housing	4
Other	5

A range of quotes on the opportunities and challenges for a growing Auckland are provided below:

"Auckland can easily fit within the MUL, with some rezoning of land, but demand for stand alone housing may require some limited expansion of the MUL in certain directions."

"There are affordability issues, the MUL may make sense for residential purposes, but it could harm the vibrancy of industrial activity"

"The hype is a little overdone on the availability of business land, a lot is held by certain key players who won't sell"

"The prospects for intensification are good given continued growth of Auckland. It will be important to develop work next to housing. Business might move out of the city"

"The opportunities are good for Auckland, but need to keep the amenity and be smarter about the use of public facilities and areas"

"You need to make provision for development to go 'up' in certain areas, some areas are ready now for this. These areas have to be close to the city and to transport and rail connections. You have to regain control to provide for future growth, at the moment the drainage engineers are determining intensification"

Table 11 overleaf shows that major response to the identification of key transport projects was for motorway construction, particularly SH20. A number of respondents also mentioned the need for a faster link to the airport, either by the motorway or by train.

Table 11: Priority Transport Projects

Northern Busway	2
Rail upgrade	4
SH20	7
Other Motorway	8
Link to Airport	5
Other	8

Comments on this issue included:

"Need a comprehensive bus network throughout the region."

"Stop mucking around with railway lines etc… and complete all the motorways - lack of a decent motorway network costs developers a lot of money in terms of material delivery."

"CBD improvements are needed, it is important people can get in, out and around easily"

"Customs Street & Queen Street should be closed to traffic - need to focus on enhancing the waterfront area."

"Congestion charging based on GPS vehicle travel over whole network"

"Choice is important, Auckland needs to grow up and provide more than one option for people to get around. There is no reason why we can't be like Sydney or Melbourne."

"A good transport infrastructure system is needed to get people across the city and to stop them from spreading out"

"Make better use of the waterways, ferries can bring people in from a whole range of areas, cheaply, safely and conveniently, but they have to be slick, cool and modern"

"Get cars off the roads, and provide areas for bikes and pedestrians"

6. Reflections from the 1997 Survey

6.1 Introduction

The feedback from developers in the 2006 survey has been clear about improvements in planning processes, provision of certainty and finding ways to provide incentives for good quality development in Auckland. Developers were also clear that they wanted to see leadership from councils about where development should occur. They also wanted to see consistency of policy and practice and transparency of processes.

Given the focus of this survey is to reflect on the changes since 1997, this section briefly outlines what the developers were saying in 1997 and where the major changes in their comments have been. The section also provides some statistics on the growth of the region and rate of building since 1997.

6.2 What Were The Developers Saying In 1997?

In 1997, 20 development companies were interviewed about their participation in the residential intensification market and on their views on future intensification and regional form. Since that survey, the Regional Growth Strategy was released and changes to the Auckland Regional Policy Statement were made. These documents outline an urban form for the region that supports communities, limits sprawl, protects valued areas and increases density around town centres and corridors.

In 1997 the main constraints to intensification were as follows (in prioritised order):

- Infrastructure and reserve contribution requirements. At that time the purpose and necessity of the contributions was accepted but the size of the contributions and their impact on affordability was questioned. There was a desire that contributions be fair, equitable, justified and able to be challenged.
- Planning procedures. The major constraint of these procedures were the delay in the development process, adding to costs and hence the price of dwellings. Many developers noted they avoided notified applications, although some suggested that more developments should be notified for quality control. Concerns were that procedures were difficult to understand, were inconsistently interpreted and demonstrated conflict between TA requirements and the ARC. Specific planning rules that constrained development were those that did not allow for a level of density to enable a good return, and parking requirements in the central area and fringe which were seen to be excessive.
- Cost of Land. This was emerging as a constraint adding to overall costs and reducing profit margins. Developers noted that once land costs rise to where a reasonable profit margin cannot be made this can lead to lower site amenity and involvement in only some market sectors.

- **Land Availability.** There was no consensus on land availability as a constraint. Some said there was sufficient land for intensification housing, others that suitable sites for redevelopment were scarce. A theme that supply can easily be increased through zoning (increased density) changes emerged and that price rather than supply was the major limitation, especially for the lower cost-housing sector.
- **Profit margins.** These were said to be reducing and a high turnover is necessary to compensate. Major factors in reducing profit margin are cost of land and TA processes such as resource consents and reserve contributions.
- **Other factors.** Included, a lack of ARC co-ordination across TA's and a perceived lack of clout by ARC for setting higher standards for development. Also, no special zoning or incentives for creating affordable housing or encouraging mixed socio-economic development.

It is clear from the responses provided in Chapter 4 of this report, that the issues raised in the 1997 survey are similar to those being raised in 2006. The fact that this message remains the same and in some areas has intensified should be a concern for authorities charged with implementation of the Growth Strategy.

However, it should be acknowledged that these concerns have been raised during a period of high growth and significant development in the central city, infill and greenfield locations. Section 6.3 below outlines the trends in building consents since 1997.

6.3 Building Consent Trends

Statistics show that the number of residential units approved has continued to rise from prior to adoption of the Growth Strategy.

Around 60% more dwellings were approved in the period 2001-2006 compared to 1991-1996. Of those dwellings approved, the proportion in growth nodes has increased from 18% to 32% in the same period.

The total number of intensification dwellings (5+ units per consent) has also increased substantially over this time. From 1991 to 1996 the proportion of intensification dwellings was 14% of the total, between 2001 and 2006 the proportion had risen to over 40%.

Over 60% of intensification dwellings have been approved in growth nodes. Apartment construction in the CBD has been the major factor in this increase with over 70% of intensification dwellings in growth nodes being in the CBD.

Tables 12 and 13 overleaf provide the numerical data to support the information provided above.

Table 12: Building Consents in Auckland – All Dwellings

All Dwellings	1991-1996	1996-2001	2001-2006
Total	27,688	38,655	44,817
Total HDCC	4,932	7,695	14,595
Total CBD	1,522	1,684	8,652
Total HDCC not CBD	3,410	6,011	5,943

Source: Statistics New Zealand

Table 13: Building Consents in Auckland – Intensification Dwellings

Intensification Dwellings	1991-1996	1996 - 2001	2001 - 2006
Total	3,770	11,247	19,303
Total HDCC	2,055	3,995	12,087
Total CBD	1,464	1,635	8,566
Total HDCC not CBD	591	2,360	3,521

Source: Statistics New Zealand

7. Summary Conclusions

7.1 Introduction

As noted in section 6, many of the themes mentioned by developers are very similar to those issues covered by the 1997 survey are still being raised today. The constraints to intensification raised are translating not only into costs for developers, which are passed on to consumers, but also means that it is difficult to implement the RGS objectives of "quality, compact urban environments with growth focused "around town centres and major transport routes".

The survey has identified a lack of developer interest in developing in town centres and corridors, it has also identified that the present program of transport improvements, particularly passenger transport, does not appear to be influencing the locational choice for intensification projects.

7.2 A Potential Way Forward?

The report so far has covered thematic responses from developers. A number of developers and the planning consultants had specific suggestions about ways to improve processes and the quality of the product in Auckland. Their suggestions have been grouped into three areas, as outlined below:

Providing leadership, this involved:

- The regions' councillors having a comprehensive view about Auckland and what it should look like.
- Councillors having a clear vision about where development in Auckland is going and when. The ARC and TA's need to be upfront about where growth will be focused, what is expected in that area and what infrastructure (particularly transport, but also social infrastructure) will be provided and then making the appropriate plan changes, so that developers are not left guessing.
- Taking some risks in an area and at a scale that can demonstrate what Auckland aspires to be.
- Getting clear and consistent messages out to the public about changes that are bound to occur in the context of a growing Auckland.

Providing certainty in the development process and creating incentives for desired development. This is linked to the leadership issue, but also includes:

- Finding ways in council plans to reduce bureaucracy and increase clarity of processes for design that is recognised as good quality.

- Focusing less on 'sticks' and more on 'carrots' to get the quality of development that the council wants in an area. Incentives could include floor space bonuses, height bonuses, reduced car parking, development contribution concessions on projects that are seen as important in an area.
- Finding ways to enable the consolidation of land parcels in town centres to get a development large enough to make a return, but also improve an area and make an impact (this is done successfully overseas, particularly in the UK). Councils need to provide opportunities for developers to develop at a large scale, rather than having to 'pepper pot' in Auckland (as this generally leads to fragmented and poorer quality development).
- Investigating approaches such as site-specific zoning or comprehensive development planning, e.g. an area or site that has prescriptive design criteria, height and density provisions (as used overseas, e.g. downtown San Diego).

Creating smarter processes. Again, these ideas are linked with the issues already raised above. Suggestions included:

- Establishing a rating system for developers where those highly rated for their demonstrated quality projects are granted faster consent processes.
- Senior staff in councils be delegated with responsibilities that could allow them to shepherd an experienced developer through a consent process without delays.
- Building up expertise in Councils. Developers felt councils needed to get a better understanding about the economics of development and the economic impacts of spatial decisions.
- Ensuring that council staff are trained so that a consistent answer is provided no matter what part of the council is approached.

7.3 Conclusion

This report has to be considered alongside a range of other documents relevant to the RGS review. As noted in section 1.5 this survey is limited in that the material was collected from a sample of developers and is largely perception based. Nevertheless, the issues that have been raised are clearly consistent with those raised in 1997 and reinforce a number of trends that need to be addressed not only in the review of the RGS, but consistently, as a matter of good practice.

Appendix 1 – Developer Survey

A Survey on behalf of the Regional Growth Forum as part of the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy Review.

The Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) guides the long-term management of growth of the Auckland region. In the Strategy, growth is managed by promoting quality, compact urban environments (intensification) with most growth focused around town centres and major transport routes (the growth concept).

Six years on from the launch of the RGS, the Regional Growth Forum is reviewing and updating the Strategy, in particular progress of implementation against the expectations outlined in the document. This review will reflect on progress made, identify barriers to successful implementation and find ways to remove those barriers and provide incentives for desired types of development

The growth concept as promoted in the RGS is about creating communities. Finding ways to improve RGS implementation should assist the region to achieve this vision. (Further information on the Regional Growth Strategy can be found at http://www.arc.govt.nz/arc/auckland-region/growth/)

OBJECTIVE OF SURVEY

A number of residential developers were interviewed in the lead up to the development of the 1999 Regional Growth Strategy. This process aims to repeat this original survey to gather trends since 1997. The key objective was to check in with a range of companies participating in Auckland residential and business development and find out about:

- Their role in both the intensification and future urban (greenfield) markets;
- Their perceptions of constraints to effective participation in these markets; and
- What is seen as the future for residential and business development in Auckland.

METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLE

A range of property developers, builders, development financers and others involved in the residential and business development market within the 7 local authority areas in the Auckland Region will be interviewed via *face to face* interviews.

The questions seek information about the companies selected and their present residential and business development activity, while others will seek more open-ended responses to intensification constraints and futures. *Note, not all the questions will relate to your type of business.*

Information collected in the survey will remain confidential to the ARC and to our research partners, led by Motu Economic and Public Policy Research Trust (a charitable trust undertaking research on Auckland housing constraints). *Individual responses will not be identified when results of the survey are reported.*

DEFINITIONS

- <u>Intensification</u> is "an increase of density (dwellings/activity units/population and so on) over the existing density within a defined area". Intensification in terms of the survey would include general incremental intensification (often described as "infill"), selective intensification in nodes and corridors (included mixed use in employment areas), and more intense development of greenfield land.
- <u>Metropolitan Urban Limit</u> (MUL) delineates the outside edge of metropolitan Auckland.
- <u>Greenfield</u> is land on the periphery that has been allocated for new/future urban uses.
- <u>Brownfield</u> is land previously used for industrial or other purposes available to be redeveloped for alternative purposes.

Section 1: Company Details

1. Name of Development Company and individuals interviewed.
2. Size of Company
   - ⇨ Total number staff
   - ⇨ No of professional staff
   - ⇨ No of builders (if appropriate)
3. Length of time the company has been developing residential dwellings / units.
4. Length of time the company has been developing commercial units.
5. Annual turnover in $ (if willing).
6. Which local authority areas in Auckland do you work in? Do you work in other parts of NZ or overseas? If yes, where?
7. Has the Regional Growth Strategy influenced your company's role or strategy for development? If so in what ways (e.g. increased/decreased activity in town centres/corridors/Greenfield areas/infill)?

Section 2: General Residential Activity

1. How many dwelling units have you developed in the past five years?
2. How many of these are in the existing built-up urban area (town centre/infill/redevelopment)?
3. How many of these are in new (greenfield) urban areas?
4. How many of these are on business-zoned land?
5. What have been the main influences on your choice of location?
6. Do you currently own greenfield land in the Auckland Region within or outside the MUL that you expect to use for residential development? If so how much do you own.
7. When do you anticipate developing this land and for what type of housing?
8. What, if any, problems do you anticipate in developing this land?
9. Do you currently own brownfield land within the MUL that you expect to use for residential development? If so how much do you own.
10. When do you anticipate developing this land and for what type of housing?
11. What, if any, problems do you anticipate in developing this land?
12. Are your land holdings for Greenfield and/or brownfield land the same, more or less than five years ago?

Section 3: Urban Residential Intensification Activity

For this section we need information on residential development considered to be part of urban intensification. This is defined as any units developed on sites <500 m^2 yielding an overall net residential density of at least 15 dwellings per hectare.

How many dwellings per year would you build in the following site density?

Site Density	Net Yield (Dwellings per hectare)	Annual production	Type of Dwelling *	Location (inner city/ town centre/infill/ greenfield)
401 m^2 – 500 m^2				
301 m^2 – 400 m^2				
200 m^2 – 300 m^2				
< 200 m^2				
Other				

* Separate house / townhouse / terrace house / 3 storey apartments / high rise apartments etc / other

1. What is the range of land prices (per unit) for each type of dwelling?
2. What is the range of selling prices (per unit) for each type of dwelling?
3. Can you comment on any regional variation in land prices or building prices (including why you think this is)?
4. Can you give a couple of good examples of residential intensification from your viewpoint (including the address). The examples could be from your own or other company activities.

Section 4: General Business (Commercial Land) Activity

1. How many business units have you developed in the past five years?
2. How many would be in the existing built-up urban area (town centres/infill/redevelopment)?
3. How many would be in new (greenfield) urban areas?
4. How many of these have been for a mix of business and residential uses?
5. How many business units have you developed in the last year?

Business Sector	No of units	Location
Office • CBD • Town Centre • Other		
Multi-tenant		
Warehouse/Distribution		
Retail • Shop • Bulk • Showroom		
Industrial • Heavy • Light		
Hotel & Leisure		
Special Purpose		
Other		

Section 5: Constraints to Intensification (Residential and Business)

Please include what you see as the main constraints to developer participation in the <u>residential and business</u> intensification market (specify details if possible).

CONSTRAINT	YES	NO	EXAMPLE OR COMMENT
Land availability			
Land Ownership			
Planning procedures (i.e. notified applications)			
Planning rules (i.e. amount of parking or height/boundary relationship)			
Consent preparation costs			
Consent processing times			
Building regulations			
Lack of innovation by designers			
Community opposition			
Availability of infrastructure			
Drainage requirements			
Site access factors			
Finance availability			
Infrastructure contributions			
Cost of land			
Cost of building materials			
Development contributions			
Market demand for type			
Increasing competition in intensification market			
Low profit margins			
Availability of suitable labour			
Availability of materials			
Conversion of brownfields land to residential use (i.e. contamination, location, regulation)			
Other (specify)			

1. Are there certain constraints, which you think hinder innovative development?
2. In your opinion, the removal of which of these constraints would lead to greater participation in the intensification market – for residential and/or business activity?

Section 6: Intensification Futures (Open-Ended Questions)

1. List what you see as the major factors necessary to make residential/business intensification attractive to the development industry.
2. Who or what are your greatest competitors for suitable residential/business intensification land?

3. How could Local Authorities encourage residential/business intensification, particularly in town centres and corridors?
4. How do you see the future for increased residential/business intensification in the short (5 years), medium (10 years) and longer term (25-30 years)?

Section 7: Other Information

1. Are you aware of the Auckland City Council's Urban Design Panel? If you have you used it, please tell us about your experience of it.
2. Has the Building Act (2004) influenced the nature and/or cost of your company's activities?
3. In your view, do any parts of the current Building Code impinge on your ability to achieve intensification, better design or better urban design? What things do you think could be changed in the Building Code to provide you an incentive in this area?
4. If you have developed or are developing property in more than one Local Authority area, are there differences in time to gain regulatory approval to your development?
5. Do you do any post occupancy research on your development to test and analyse response to your design?
6. Do you factor sustainable building design and/or building products into your business? If yes list?
7. Do you monitor overseas trends and factor those into your business and development outcomes?
8. If you operate outside of Auckland, can you reflect on the opportunities or constraints in other NZ cities regarding intensification?

Section 8: Future of Auckland

1. The Regional Growth Strategy anticipates a population of 2 million in Auckland by 2050. This growth is projected to occur within the current Metropolitan Urban Limits. Do you foresee any opportunities or problems with this?
2. Has the upgrade (or proposed upgrade) of transport links and facilities such as roads, rail lines, bus ways and stations, influenced your company's role or strategy? Are there any particular examples?
3. In order to achieve the RGS vision of a compact city, are there any transport projects which you think are a priority to complete?
4. Are there any other comments you wish to add about current or future residential and business intensification and urban growth for Auckland?

Appendix 2– Developers Surveyed

	Developer	Development Type	Participated in 1997 survey*
1.	McConnell Property Ltd	Apartments & greenfield integrated housing	No
2.	Broadway Developments	Terraces, apartments, industrial, retail	No
3.	Cornerstone Group	High & low rise apartments, townhouses, commercial	No
4.	Symphony Group	Apartments, hotels, commercial	No
5.	Land Co	Land development	No
6.	Neil Group	Land development, commercial	Yes
7.	Kensington Properties	Apartments, master planned residential, business parks	No
8.	Fletcher Residential	Greenfield land and house development	Yes
9.	Hopper Developments	Residential subdivision, coastal development	No
10.	Housing New Zealand	Public rental housing, redevelopment	Yes
11.	Kitchener Group	Apartments, commercial	No
12.	Northbridge Properties	Office park, retail	No
13.	Otto Burke & associates	Residential apartments	No
14.	Perron Developments	Terraces, apartments, commercial refurbishment	No
15.	Platypus Group	Apartments, commercial	No
16.	Redwood	Apartments, townhouses, commercial	No
17.	Samco	Apartments	No
18.	Southside Group	Apartments, residential subdivision, commercial	No
19.	Watts Group	Apartment construction, commercial development	No
20.	Working Concepts	Apartments, townhouses	No
21.	Universal Homes	Greenfield land and house development	Yes
22.	IMF	Retail / commercial centre redevelopment	No
23.	Dines Group	Commercial / industrial, master plan land development	No
Planning Consultants			
24.	Boffa Miskell	Planning and urban design specialists	No
25.	Harrison Grierson Ltd	Planning, construction and engineering specialists	No
Financiers			
26.	ASB Property Finance		No
27.	Hanover Finance		No

- *Note that of the 20 developers that were surveyed in 1997, a total of 8 are still operating in Auckland under the same names.*