



Auckland
Regional Council
TE RAUHĪTANGA TAIAO

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AUCKLAND) AMENDMENT ACT 2004

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

**DECISION REPORT OF THE
AUCKLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL**

ARC 6 – BUSINESS ISSUES

Decision Regarding:

- **Proposed Change 6 to the Auckland Regional Policy Statement.**

On 14 June 2007 the Auckland Regional Council adopted the recommendations of the Joint Regional Policy Statement and District Plan Changes Hearings Panel in relation to Proposed Change 6 to the Auckland Regional Policy Statement.

The recommendations in this report have been adopted as the decisions of the Auckland Regional Council.

31 July 2007

**Index of submissions and further submissions addressed in Report ARC 6
Business Issues**

Rec. Rpt s5: sub-section no.	Sub number	Submitter name	Supported by	Opposed by	Hearing Report Section No.
26	289/8	Auckland International Airport Limited		257 Waitakere City Council	5.28
27	289/9	Auckland International Airport Limited	196 Winstone Aggregates 193 Contact Energy Limited 580 Mighty River Power Limited 290 Ardmore Airport Limited <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	<i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	5.27
16	250/4	Auckland Regional Council	257 Waitakere City Council 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority		5.17
17	250/5	Auckland Regional Council	<i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	<i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	5.18
26	250/11	Auckland Regional Council	<i>130 Holcim (NZ) Ltd, Aggregates Division 128 The Aggregate & Quarry Assoc. of NZ (Inc) 129 New Zealand Minerals Industry Association</i>	<i>130 Holcim (NZ) Ltd, Aggregates Division 128 The Aggregate & Quarry Assoc. of NZ (Inc) 129 New Zealand Minerals Industry Association</i>	5.27
27	250/12	Auckland Regional Council	257 Waitakere City Council		5.28
29	250/13	Auckland Regional Council	257 Waitakere City Council		5.30
6	100/2	B.A. Trustees Limited			5.7
4	264/8	Centre for Urban and Transport Studies		257 Waitakere City Council	
29	86/6	Cornerstone Ltd		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited	5.30
14	85/1	Enterprise Waitakere	95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 289 Auckland International Airport Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited <i>196 Winstone Aggregates 257 Waitakere City Council</i>	<i>196 Winstone Aggregates 257 Waitakere City Council</i>	5.15
22	85/2	Enterprise Waitakere	140 Garelja Brothers Strawberry Gardens <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	<i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	5.23
22	85/3	Enterprise Waitakere	86 Cornerstone Ltd 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 257 Waitakere City Council 1202 Perrendale	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited	5.23
22	85/4	Enterprise Waitakere	95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 257 Waitakere City Council 88 Schippers Cleanfill Limited 89 Huron Holdings Limited 90 Pacific Rim Builders Limited	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited	5.23
11	32/5	Haka International NZ Limited	86 Cornerstone Ltd 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	257 Waitakere City Council	5.12

**Index of submissions and further submissions addressed in Report ARC 6
Business Issues**

Rec. Rpt s5: sub-section no.	Sub number	Submitter name	Supported by	Opposed by	Hearing Report Section No.
			1202 Perrendale 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited		
3	77/3	Harry Bhana & Associates Ltd			5.4
26	89/28	Huron Holdings Limited	157 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	5.27
11	300/1	IMF Westland Ltd	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 96 Housing New Zealand Corporation (2) 205 Fulton Hogan Limited (1) <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i> <i>95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)</i>	<i>95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)</i>	5.12
17	300/5	IMF Westland Ltd	<i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	<i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	5.18
21	300/6	IMF Westland Ltd	<i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	<i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	5.22
14	277/1	JM Hayman	1199 Pukekawa Ratepayers Association 277 JM Hayman 157 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)		5.15
17	294/9	Jon Mapes Land Solution Ltd (representing 16 parties)	<i>277 JM Hayman</i> <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited <i>277 JM Hayman</i> <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	5.18
26	294/26	Jon Mapes Land Solution Ltd (representing 16 parties)	<i>277 JM Hayman</i>	<i>257 Waitakere City Council</i> <i>277 JM Hayman</i>	5.27
17	253/8	Manukau City Council	20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 277 JM Hayman <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	<i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	5.18
9	253/9	Manukau City Council	95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 69 Project Consultancy Group Limited 277 JM Hayman 294 Jon Mapes Land Solution Ltd (representing 16 parties) 323 Wairoa River Canal Partnership 140 Garelja Brothers Strawberry Gardens <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	5.10
26	253/21	Manukau City Council	<i>277 JM Hayman</i>	<i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	5.27
25	254/2	North Shore City Council	88 Schippers Cleanfill Limited 89 Huron Holdings Limited 90 Pacific Rim Builders Limited	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	5.26
26	254/3	North Shore City		107 Westfield (New	5.27

**Index of submissions and further submissions addressed in Report ARC 6
Business Issues**

Rec. Rpt s5: sub-section no.	Sub number	Submitter name	Supported by	Opposed by	Hearing Report Section No.
		Council		Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 257 Waitakere City Council	
26	90/25	Pacific Rim Builders Limited	157 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) 257 Waitakere City Council	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 257 Waitakere City Council	5.27
25	255/48	Papakura District Council		258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 257 Waitakere City Council	5.26
26	255/49	Papakura District Council		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 257 Waitakere City Council	5.27
5	108/1	Progressive Enterprises Limited	208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd	5.6
5	108/14	Progressive Enterprises Limited	208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd	20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 109 The Warehouse Ltd 257 Waitakere City Council	5.6
19	108/18	Progressive Enterprises Limited	208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 257 Waitakere City Council	257 Waitakere City Council	5.20
30	108/21	Progressive Enterprises Limited	208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 109 The Warehouse Ltd	5.31
18	69/3	Project Consultancy Group Limited	20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 90 Pacific Rim Builders Limited 257 Waitakere City Council	95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 257 Waitakere City Council	5.19
7	106/1	Property Council of New Zealand	193 Contact Energy Limited 257 Waitakere City Council	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 257 Waitakere City Council	5.8
2	106/4	Property Council of New Zealand	69 Project Consultancy Group Limited 205 Fulton Hogan Limited (1)	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 257 Waitakere City Council	5.3
14	256/1	Rodney District	86 Cornerstone Ltd	107 Westfield (New	5.15

**Index of submissions and further submissions addressed in Report ARC 6
Business Issues**

Rec. Rpt s5: sub-section no.	Sub number	Submitter name	Supported by	Opposed by	Hearing Report Section No.
		Council	109 The Warehouse Ltd 20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 69 Project Consultancy Group Limited 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 90 Pacific Rim Builders Limited <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	
18	256/5	Rodney District Council	86 Cornerstone Ltd <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	<i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	5.19
26	256/15	Rodney District Council	20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 86 Cornerstone Ltd <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited	5.27
1	188/4	Ross Simpson		20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 294 Jon Mapes Land Solution Ltd (representing 16 parties)	5.2
26	88/28	Schippers Cleanfill Limited	196 Winstone Aggregates 157 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc) <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 204 The Waitakere Ranges Protection Society Incorporated 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	5.27
28	208/2	Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	<i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i>	5.29
10	111/4	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i> 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.11
15	111/7	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i> 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.16
12	111/9	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i> 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.14
12	111/10	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i> 108 Progressive Enterprises	5.14

**Index of submissions and further submissions addressed in Report ARC 6
Business Issues**

Rec. Rpt s5: sub-section no.	Sub number	Submitter name	Supported by	Opposed by	Hearing Report Section No.
				Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	
12	111/11	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited	257 Waitakere City Council 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.13
26	111/12	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.27
23	111/13	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.24
23	111/14	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.24
30	111/15	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.31
30	111/17	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 257 Waitakere City Council 300 IMF Westland Ltd 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.31
23	111/19	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.24
23	111/20	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.24
10	109/4	The Warehouse Ltd		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises	5.11

**Index of submissions and further submissions addressed in Report ARC 6
Business Issues**

Rec. Rpt s5: sub-section no.	Sub number	Submitter name	Supported by	Opposed by	Hearing Report Section No.
				Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	
15	109/7	The Warehouse Ltd		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.16
12	109/9	The Warehouse Ltd		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.13
12	109/10	The Warehouse Ltd		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.14
12	109/11	The Warehouse Ltd	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited	257 Waitakere City Council 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.13
26	109/12	The Warehouse Ltd		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd	5.27
23	109/13	The Warehouse Ltd	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited	256 Rodney District Council 257 Waitakere City Council 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.24
23	109/14	The Warehouse Ltd	108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	257 Waitakere City Council 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.254
30	109/15	The Warehouse Ltd		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.31
30	109/17	The Warehouse Ltd		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 257 Waitakere City Council 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd	5.31
23	109/19	The Warehouse Ltd	1202 Perrendale	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	5.24

**Index of submissions and further submissions addressed in Report ARC 6
Business Issues**

Rec. Rpt s5: sub-section no.	Sub number	Submitter name	Supported by	Opposed by	Hearing Report Section No.
				256 Rodney District Council 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	
23	109/20	The Warehouse Ltd		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.24
8	299/2	Unitec New Zealand			5.9
4	314/7	Vision Waimauku Association Inc.			5.5
11	257/5	Waitakere City Council	86 Cornerstone Ltd 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 256 Rodney District Council 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 1226 Titirangi Residents for Balanced 96 Housing New Zealand Corporation (2) 140 Garelja Brothers Strawberry Gardens 300 IMF Westland Ltd	258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited	5.12
13	257/6	Waitakere City Council	86 Cornerstone Ltd 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) <i>193 Contact Energy Limited</i>	196 Winstone Aggregates <i>193 Contact Energy Limited</i>	5.14
18	257/8	Waitakere City Council	86 Cornerstone Ltd 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 205 Fulton Hogan Limited (1) 300 IMF Westland Ltd <i>130 Holcim (NZ) Ltd, Aggregates Division</i> <i>128 The Aggregate & Quarry Assoc. of NZ (Inc)</i> <i>129 New Zealand Minerals Industry Association</i>	284 Oratia Landowners Action Group <i>130 Holcim (NZ) Ltd, Aggregates Division</i> <i>128 The Aggregate & Quarry Assoc. of NZ (Inc)</i> <i>129 New Zealand Minerals Industry Association</i>	5.19
20	257/10	Waitakere City Council	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 140 Garelja Brothers Strawberry Gardens 300 IMF Westland Ltd	258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority	5.21
24	257/22	Waitakere City Council	95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)		5.25
25	257/29	Waitakere City Council	95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 76 Ivan & Milka Selak 74 Roy Wigg 75 Steve Nuich		5.26
25	257/30	Waitakere City	86 Cornerstone Ltd	107 Westfield (New	5.26

**Index of submissions and further submissions addressed in Report ARC 6
Business Issues**

Rec. Rpt s5: sub-section no.	Sub number	Submitter name	Supported by	Opposed by	Hearing Report Section No.
		Council	205 Fulton Hogan Limited (1) 1202 Perrendale	Zealand) Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 254 North Shore City Council	
10	110/4	Warehouse Stationery Limited		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.11
15	110/7	Warehouse Stationery Limited		108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.16
12	110/9	Warehouse Stationery Limited		108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.13
12	110/10	Warehouse Stationery Limited		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.13
12	110/11	Warehouse Stationery Limited	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited	257 Waitakere City Council 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.13
26	110/12	Warehouse Stationery Limited		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd	5.27
23	110/13	Warehouse Stationery Limited		257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.24
23	110/14	Warehouse Stationery Limited		107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.24
30	110/15	Warehouse Stationery Limited		257 Waitakere City Council 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.31
30	110/17	Warehouse Stationery Limited	<i>300 IMF Westland Ltd</i>	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	5.31

**Index of submissions and further submissions addressed in Report ARC 6
Business Issues**

Rec. Rpt s5: sub-section no.	Sub number	Submitter name	Supported by	Opposed by	Hearing Report Section No.
				300 IMF Westland Ltd 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited <i>300 IMF Westland Ltd</i>	
23	110/19	Warehouse Stationery Limited		257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.24
23	110/20	Warehouse Stationery Limited		257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	5.24
5	107/1	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	<i>208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited</i>	110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd <i>208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited</i>	5.6
5	107/14	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	300 IMF Westland Ltd <i>208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited</i>	20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 109 The Warehouse Ltd 257 Waitakere City Council <i>208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited</i>	5.6
19	107/17	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd <i>257 Waitakere City Council</i> <i>208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited</i>	<i>257 Waitakere City Council</i> <i>208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited</i>	5.20
30	107/20	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	<i>208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited</i>	110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 109 The Warehouse Ltd <i>208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited</i>	5.31

RECOMMENDATION REPORT OF THE JOINT HEARINGS PANEL TO THE PLAN CHANGES NOTIFIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AUCKLAND) AMENDMENT ACT 2004 AND THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

AUCKLAND REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT PROPOSED CHANGE 6

ARC 6 – BUSINESS ISSUES

1. OUTLINE

This report is part of a series of reports that contain the recommendations of the Joint Regional Policy Statement and District Plan Changes Hearings Panel (“the Panel”) following consideration of submissions and further submissions received in relation to business issues outlined in the Auckland Regional Policy Statement Proposed Change 6 (“RPS Change 6”). Other submissions and further submissions to RPS Change 6 are dealt with in additional topic based recommendation reports.

The Panel was jointly appointed by the councils of the region under the Local Government (Auckland) Amendment Act 2004 (“the LGAAA”). Following consideration of all the submissions and supporting evidence presented and/or tabled by the submitters and further submitters at the hearings, and the reporting officer’s report, the Panel now makes the recommendations contained in this report to the Auckland Regional Council (“ARC”).-

To reiterate, this report contains the **recommendations** to Council of the Panel on submissions that have been made during the course of the hearings. **It is not the decision of the Council.**

The suggested amendments to the Auckland Regional Policy Statement (“RPS”) arising from the Panel recommendations discussed throughout this report are set out in the Panel Recommendation Version of RPS Change 6, which forms Appendix 1 to this report. Appendix 1 incorporates the amendments to RPS Change 6 resulting from all of the Panel’s recommendations.

2. BACKGROUND

RPS Change 6 was notified on 31 March 2005 as a mandatory requirement of the LGAAA.

The LGAAA mandates that all councils in the Auckland Region integrate their land transport and land use provisions and ensure these are consistent with the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy (“RGS”), give effect to its Growth Concept and contribute to the land transport and land use matters specified in Schedule 5 (s39 & s40 LGAAA). This is, in effect, the purpose of RPS Change 6.

The matters that the LGAAA requires to be included in changes to statutory documents support the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“RMA”) in promoting sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

Auckland Regional Policy Statement Proposed Change 6 amends the text of Chapter 1– Introduction, Chapter 2 – Regional Overview and Strategic Direction, and Chapter 4 – Transport and Appendix A and D, to give effect to the LGAAA. RPS Change 6 incorporates the Growth Concept into the RPS and provides a policy framework for the location and density of urban, rural, coastal towns and countryside living growth throughout the region. The Change also introduces a schedule identifying areas suitable for accommodating further urban development, with reference to desired densities of development.

3. THE PANEL AND THE HEARINGS PROCESS

3.1 The Joint Hearings Panel

The Panel was comprised of the following members:

Cr Paul Walbran (Chair)
Cr Wyn Hoadley (Deputy Chair)
Cr Carolynne Stone
Cr Neil Morrison
Cr Bill Smith
Lindsey Rea
David Hill
Alan Watson

The members of the Panel included regional councillors, city and district councillors, a community board chairperson and two independent commissioners.

The councils of the region jointly delegated to the Panel their powers, functions and duties to hear submissions and make recommendations (under s41(1) and (2) LGAAA, and s24A RMA) on the following 15 proposed plan changes:

AUCKLAND REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT

Proposed Change 6 - Giving Effect to the Regional Growth Concept and Integrating Landuse and Transport.

Proposed Change 7 – Metropolitan Urban Limits

AUCKLAND CITY DISTRICT PLAN – Operative Isthmus Section

Proposed Plan Modification 175 - Giving Effect to the Regional Growth Concept

FRANKLIN DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Plan Change 20 - Changes Pursuant to Local Government (Auckland) Amendment Act 2004.

MANUKAU CITY DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Plan Change 12 – Manukau's Growth.

NORTH SHORE CITY DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Plan Change 12 - Redraft of parts of the North Shore City District Plan - Required by the Local Government (Auckland) Amendment Act 2004.

PAPAKURA DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Plan Change 10 – ARPS Changes to the Operative District Plan.

RODNEY DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Variation 22 to the Proposed District Plan 2000
Proposed Plan Change 97 to the Operative Transitional District Plan 1993.

WAITAKERE CITY DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Plan Change 13 – Hobsonville Airbase;
Proposed Plan Change 14 – Hobsonville Village Centre;
Proposed Plan Change 15 – Massey North;
Proposed Plan Change 16 – Managing City Growth;
Proposed Plan Change 17 – New Lynn;
Proposed Plan Change 18 – City Wide Urban Design Rule

3.2 The Hearings Process

The proposed plan changes were notified by local authorities by 31 March 2005, in accordance with section 39 of the LGAAA. Given the number of proposed plan changes and the predicted volume of submissions to be dealt with, the Panel agreed that submissions were to be separated into categories. The categories used are detailed in the following table:

Category	Topic	Number of Submissions	Number of submitters and further submitters
A	General Growth	1575	266
B	Infrastructure / Natural Resources / Rural / Countryside Living	1098	174
C	Business Issues & Retail Location	290	93
D	Transport	534	115
E	MUL Issues (Not Hobsonville/Massey North)	79	85
F	Housing Lobby Identical Submissions	996	520
G	Swanson / Penihana	251	229
H	MUL Hobsonville and Massey North	1041	197
I	New Lynn	332	48
J	Urban Design WCC 18	281	32
K	Howick	60	29
M	ARC Miscellaneous	8	32
W	WCC 16 & 18 (Miscellaneous)	20	12
TOTAL		6565	1832

Hearing Reports were generated by each local authority in the region under Schedule 1 of the RMA for each category – 50 reports in total. Public hearings were notified and held for each category, addressing all submissions deemed by the relevant Hearing Reports to fall within that category. In total, there were 46 hearing days, commencing on 27 April 2006. A further 12 days were utilised for site visits and deliberations. The Panel allocated time at the end of each hearing day to conduct preliminary deliberations. Additionally, more in-depth interim deliberations were held at the end of each topic. The last day of deliberations following the hearings was on 21 May 2007.

The Panel obtained legal advice in relation to the scope of the hearings process and other key issues raised prior to and during the hearings.

In forming its recommendations, the Panel focussed on the purpose of the LGAAA – to integrate land use and land transport provisions to ensure consistency with the growth strategy, give effect to its Growth Concept and contribute to the matters specified in Schedule 5 of the LGAAA. Under the legislation, local authorities were mandated to notify changes to the RPS and all District Plans to achieve this purpose – a substantial process.

The LGAAA came into effect on 1 July 2004 and notification of changes was required from all local authorities by 31 March 2005. It is relevant that, while District Plans are required to give effect to the RPS, the proposed changes to the RPS were notified at the same time as the proposed amendments to the District Plans.

Due to the relatively short timeframe and substantial changes envisaged by the LGAAA, there has been a mixed approach from local authorities, with different levels of detail reflected in the various proposed plan changes. This had the potential to frustrate the purpose of the LGAAA in terms of achieving integration across planning documents. Given the ambitious task set by the LGAAA, the Panel has taken the decision to concentrate its efforts on ensuring the RPS gives effect to the Growth Concept and meets the purpose of the LGAAA. The Panel considers that, once the RPS reflects the aims of the LGAAA, the District Plans will be required to give effect to the RPS and consequential amendments to the Plans will follow accordingly.

The Panel noted that many of the submissions focussed only on the plan changes and variations notified under the LGAAA. These changes were in many instances “filling the gaps” that existed in the current planning documents. When considering the Panel’s recommendations it is necessary to take into account the changes notified under the LGAAA, the existing District Plans, and other changes that have been notified both before and during the LGAAA process. The Panel was advised that work that each council currently has in train provides an indication of each council’s longer term plans.

The Panel also noted that many of the submissions lodged under the LGAAA were made in respect of the RPS and simply stated that the District Plans should be amended to reflect any changes to the RPS. The Panel considers that the issues raised in these submissions are best addressed after local authorities release the decision reports and any appeals to RPS Change 6 and RPS Change 7 are concluded. It will then be clear to what the District Plans must give effect.

This approach was not universal across the region or for all issues raised by the submissions. Some proposed District Plan changes were substantial, for example, those put forward by Waitakere City. In such cases, the Panel has dealt with the proposed changes in the same level of detail as the proposed RPS changes.

The Panel considers that the approach outlined above is practical and realistic, and will give local authorities time to prepare the necessary changes and carry out consultation with local communities. Ultimately, the objectives of the LGAAA can best be achieved by allowing the process in respect of the RPS to run its course, with subsequent amendments to District Plans in the context of a clear and robust RPS. Legal advice to the Panel has confirmed this approach.

3.3 Evidence

The Panel has received extensive and detailed evidence from submitters during the hearings process. The Panel has carefully considered this evidence and the substantial number of submission points put before it. This recommendation report does not attempt to comprehensively summarise each submission point and/or piece of evidence as this would result in an unduly lengthy report without substantially adding to the recommendations.

3.4 Integration

A key element of the LGAAA is the requirement for “integration” in a number of aspects. These include “*giving effect, in an integrated manner, to the growth concept*” and “*contributing, in an integrated manner, to the matters specified in schedule 5* “. Changes that seek to achieve these requirements must, in relation to each other, be integrated (s40 LGAAA). Schedule 5 also refers to “*facilitating integrated transport management*”, and “*integrating transport and land use policies*”.

Integration is therefore required within each of the planning instruments, and across all planning instruments in the Auckland Region. The Panel recognises the importance of integration to the LGAAA process and has been very mindful of this in its deliberations.

The Panel has made a number of recommendations on matters which provide integration across the planning documents, for example the recommendations to include material on the following:

- recommendations in relation to corridors
- recognition of regionally significant infrastructure
- integrated transport assessments
- Appendix H on densities required to support public transport

These, and other matters, are discussed further in the Panel Key Issues Recommendation Report.

4 PANEL KEY ISSUES RECOMMENDATION REPORT

In response to the extensive detail and evidence presented, the Panel has produced a Panel Key Issues Recommendation Report (the “Key Issues Report”) setting out its direction on the issues it considers to be key to the LGAAA process. This report is overarching of issues and is not separated into different categories, as with the recommendation reports. The recommendation reports for each proposed plan change and category refer back to the Key Issues Report where it assists in providing the context for specific recommendations.

The Key Issues Report is attached to and forms part of this recommendation report, and should be taken to comprise Section 4 of this report. It should be read in conjunction with Section 5 – Discussion and Recommendations.

5 DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following discussion is the Panel's recommendation, having considered all the submissions and further submissions, both within the reporting officer's report and presented and/or tabled at the hearings.

Abbreviations Used In This Report

Auckland Regional Policy Statement – ARPS / RPS
Auckland Regional Growth Strategy – RGS
Auckland Regional Economic Development Strategy – AREDS
Auckland Regional Freight Strategy – ARFS
Auckland Regional Passenger Transport Plan – ARPTP
Auckland Regional Transport Authority – ARTA
Auckland Region Business Land Strategy – BLS
Integrated Catchment Management Plan – ICMP
Local Government (Auckland) Amendment Act 2004 – LGAAA
Metropolitan Urban Limit – MUL
Regional Land Transport Strategy – RLTS
Regional Open Space Strategy – ROSS
Resource Management Act 1991 – RMA
Territorial Authorities – TA / TAs

5 a. Auckland Region Business Land Strategy

In 2002 the Regional Growth Forum identified a need for the development of a strategy to provide sufficient business land to accommodate future business growth. The need was similarly identified in programme 5 of the Auckland Regional Economic Development Strategy (AREDS). As a result, the Auckland Region Business Land Strategy (BLS) was prepared in consultation with all councils in the Auckland region. The BLS was endorsed by the ARC in July 2006 and received by the Growth Forum in October 2006 for input into the review of the Regional Growth Strategy. The BLS provides a strategic framework that enables Auckland local authorities to plan and provide for sufficient, appropriate business land in the Auckland region to accommodate future business growth to 2031.

The BLS recognises that, if current growth continues, the region will face a shortage of vacant business zoned land sometime between 2011-2020. Given this shortage and the long timeframes required to identify and re-zone new business land, the BLS provides a way forward that reinforces the region's town centres and high density corridors and provides for some growth in new greenfield business areas.

The BLS advocates that most business growth occurs in existing centres. This will re-invigorate Auckland's centres and better enable the provision of supporting public transport. However, due to reverse sensitivity concerns it is inappropriate to locate some business sectors in centres. The BLS recognises the need for additional land for these business sectors.

In summary, the strategic framework of the BLS:

- Encourages Group 2 business sectors (retail, accommodation cafes and restaurants, finance and insurance, and other service sectors) to locate in existing town centres, high-density corridors and the CBD
- Acknowledges the need for new greenfield business land for Group 1 business sectors (manufacturing, wholesale trade, construction, transport and storage sectors) that should be discouraged from locating in centres
- Seeks to prevent residential take-up of business land that is zoned for heavy industry type activities
- Encourages mixed use activities in town centres and high density corridors
- Encourages greater local employment to reduce cross-region commuting.

The BLS provides the way forward in how we plan and provide for future business growth. The RPS is the statutory tool that will give effect to the strategic framework contained in the BLS.

5 b. General Comment on submissions

A number of submissions are seeking changes or retentions to the Plan Change and the RPS to address the lack of business land to incorporation of sustainable economic development. Issues related to these matters have also been identified through the Auckland Region Business Land Strategy (BLS) (as discussed above). The BLS reinforces the Growth Concept by advocating for most growth to occur in existing centres and corridors, while providing for some growth of certain types of business activities in new green field business areas. The Panel considered that, in general, the existing RPS and plan changes do not adequately address these matters.

A number of submissions have also sought changes to the Plan Change to prescribe particular business sectors and activities, in particular retail. The Panel does not support the prescription of types of businesses and/or activities to be located in centres and corridors. Instead the Panel considers that the RPS policies should provide the direction and general criteria to ensure the appropriate location of business types based on desired outcomes (such as achieving the intent and form of high density centres and corridors).

Therefore the following new and amended clauses to the RPS are recommended:

- Part of existing Issue 2.4.5 subsection 3 has been relocated to a new Issue 2.4.10
- New issue 2.4.10 relating to the diminishing supply of business land through the region
- New strategic objective 2.6.1.18 – sustainable economic development in appropriate locations through the region
- New urban containment method 2.6.3.6 – capacity for growth surveys to assist with determining the availability of residential and business land
- Amendments to existing urban structure policies 2.6.5.6, 2.6.5.13, 2.6.5.14 and 2.6.5.15 to provide guidance on the direction and criteria for business and/or activities within centres and corridors
- Amendments to existing urban structure policies 2.6.5.13 and 2.6.5.14 to clarify reverse sensitivity issues
- New urban structure policy 2.6.5.15 – provision of appropriate business zoned land for industrial activities
- New urban structure method 2.6.6.18 – identification of the amount and location of greenfield sites for future business growth of those sectors identified in 2.6.5.13
- A new method 2.6.6.19 outlining further work to establish criteria for the identification of greenfield land.
- Amendments to urban structure reasons 2.6.7 – to assist in explaining the new and amended sections of urban structure policies and methods.
- A new method 2.6.12.9 to identify a regional approach to accommodate retail activity.

Various submitters also seek other more specific matters; these concerns are addressed in the remainder of this report.

1 Whole RPS Change Industrial Subdivision - Levies

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
188/4	Ross Simpson	Amend the Plan Change so that any new industrial subdivision, is levied a development contribution (of at least \$100.00 per square metre); and levied for transport and infrastructure (\$5.00 per square metre per year).	Opposed By: 20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 294 Jon Mapes Land Solution Ltd (representing 16 parties)

Discussion:

Submission **188/4** seeks to include levies and development contributions for new industrial subdivision. The matters raised in submission **188/4** are outside the scope of the RPS, as the ARC does not have statutory powers to include rules or regulations. Local City or District Councils may identify specific development contributions for those areas as part of their district plan change processes. For the reasons provided above, it is considered submission **188/4** should be rejected.

Panel Recommendation:

5.1 The Panel recommends:

5.1.1 That submission **188/4** be rejected

5.2 That the further submissions made in opposition to the submission noted in 5.1.1 above, are accepted accordingly.

2 Whole RPS Change Non-Residential Development – rapid price rises

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
106/4	Property Council of New Zealand	Amend the plan change to address issues regarding rapidly rising prices for non-residential land to a shortage of non-residential zoned land within the Region. If this issue is not addressed quickly, the Auckland region will start to lose competitiveness and job opportunities to other cities within New Zealand and Australia.	Supported By: 69 Project Consultancy Group Limited 205 Fulton Hogan Limited (1) Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 257 Waitakere City Council

Discussion:

Submission **106/4** seeks to make changes to the RPS to address rapid price rises of non-residential land. The ARC is required under Section 40 of the LGAAA to make changes to its regional policy statement to give effect to the growth concept in the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy (ARGS). The Growth Concept within the ARGs puts greater emphasis on urban intensification rather than urban expansion, with most urban growth focused around centres and major passenger transport routes. Giving effect to the Growth Concept will result in the best approach to enabling a broad range of outcomes so people and communities can provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being, this includes sustainable economic development.

Furthermore, investigations to support the development of the BLS identified a future shortage of vacant business land. Notwithstanding the emphasis on intensification in the RPS, it is important that there is availability of vacant business land, particularly for those business sectors that are unable to intensify in existing centres and corridors. It is considered that the various changes recommended in this report, in particular policy 2.6.5.15 and method 2.6.6.18 should go some way to address the concerns of the submitter.

Submitter **69** (Project Consultancy Group) presented evidence that they agree with the officer's assessment and recommend that Appendix 1 be re-written to identify adequate land supply for the urban development market to operate within a 15 to 20 year period. The submitter also supports the relief sought by the Property Council and commented further that section 40 of the LGAAA requires that issues, objectives, policies and methods are required to give full effect to the matters specified in schedule 5 of the LGAAA.

Panel Recommendation:

5.3 The Panel recommends:

5.3.1 Submission **106/4** is accepted in part.

5.4 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submission noted in 5.3.1 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

- 5.5 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the RPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of 5.3.1 above. That is, *policies 2.6.5.14, 2.6.5.15, method 2.6.6.18 and reason 2.6.7.*

3 Whole RPS Change Provision for Retail Activities – specific property

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
77/3	Harry Bhana & Associates Ltd	Amend the Auckland Regional Policy Statement as necessary to enable Lot 2 DP 122011, located at Clinker Place, New Lynn, to be developed and used for retail activities.	

Discussion:

Submission **77/3** seeks to amend the RPS to allow the property at Clinker Place to be developed and used for retail activities. The RPS is a high level strategic document that does not have the jurisdiction to show permitted activities for particular sites. This certainty is only available through the District Plan provisions, in this case the Waitakere District Plan. Therefore, this submission is rejected.

Panel Recommendation:

- 5.6 The Panel recommends:
- 5.6.1 Submission **77/3** is rejected.

4 Whole RPS Change Economic Growth as pre-requisite

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
264/8	Centre for Urban and Transport Studies	Amend the RPS change to ensure sustainability of competitive economic growth as a pre-requisite for all else.	Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council
314/7	Vision Waimauku Association Inc.	Amend the plan change to ensure: <i>"...the development of a competitive and efficient economy and a high quality of life, underpinned by a quality environment and amenity."</i>	

Discussion:

Submission **264/8** seeks to amend the RPS to provide for sustainability of competitive economic growth as a pre-requisite for all else. Submission **314/7** seeks that the plan change be amended to ensure the development of a competitive and efficient economy along with the other matters identified in LGAAA Schedule 5 (e). It is considered that the RPS facilitates a broad range of outcomes, enabling people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being. It is acknowledged that sustainable economic development is not sufficiently articulated in the RPS. Various changes to the RPS are recommended that are considered to go some way to address the concerns of the submitters. For example, new strategic objective 2.6.1.18 seeks to enable sustainable economic development.

Panel Recommendation:

- 5.7 The Panel recommends:
- 5.7.1 Submissions **264/8** and **314/7** are accepted in part, with no further changes recommended to the RPS.
- 5.8 That the further submission made in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.7.1 above, are rejected in part, accordingly.

5 Whole RPS Change Centres Based Approach – retail development

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
107/1	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	Amend the RPS Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) enable activities including retail activities in a way which is commensurate with growth and demand for such activities; (b) to be consistent with the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy and encourage a centres based approach to planning for business activity including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Maintaining and enhancing transportation efficiency through the development and intensification of appropriately located business centres; (ii) Enabling a compact and coherent urban form; (iii) Maintaining and enhancing the Region's existing resources including existing and proposed town centres; and (iv) Ensuring the continued function and social role of the Region's existing business centres. 	Opposed By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd Support and Opposed By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
108/1	Progressive Enterprises Limited	Retain the plan change insofar as it is consistent with a centres-based approach to planning for retail and business development; is consistent with the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy and Auckland Regional Policy Statement; and is commensurate with the needs of the community in particular the need to maintain and enhance the growth and development of existing and proposed business centres in the District; and subject to specific amendments sought in Submissions 108/2 - 108/23.	Supported By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited Opposed By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd
107/14	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	Amend the plan change, as an alternative to the relief set out in Submissions 107/2 - 107/13, as is necessary to make it clear that retail and business development will be encouraged to locate in high density town centres, town centres and sub-regional centres and will be discouraged outside these areas. The provisions of the Plan Change may need to distinguish "residential intensification" (which may be appropriate within wider identified "corridors") from "retail and business development" (which should be directed to high density town centres).	Supported By: 300 IMF Westland Ltd Opposed By: 20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 109 The Warehouse Ltd 257 Waitakere City Council Support and Opposed By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
108/14	Progressive Enterprises Limited	Amend (as an alternative to submissions 108/2 - 108/13) the RPS change to seek such alternative relief as is necessary to make it clear that retail and business development	Supported By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd

		will be encouraged to locate in high density town centres, town centres and sub-regional centres and will be discouraged outside these areas. The provisions of the Plan Change may need to distinguish "residential intensification" (which may be appropriate within wider identified "corridors") from "retail and business development" (which should be directed to high density town centres).	Opposed By: 20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 109 The Warehouse Ltd 257 Waitakere City Council
--	--	--	--

Discussion:

Submissions **107/1**, **108/1**, **107/14** and **108/14** seek to make changes to the RPS related to the centre based approach to retail activity and development. Submitters **107** (Westfield (New Zealand) Limited) and **108** (Progressive Enterprises Limited) presented evidence stating that the only appropriate retail development in corridors is convenience retail. They acknowledged that the RPS is a high level document, however it is important that it provide policy direction for territorial authorities on what development is "appropriate" within corridors.

The ARC is required under Section 40 of the LGAAA to make changes to its regional policy statement to give effect to the Growth Concept in the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy. The Growth Concept puts greater emphasis on urban intensification than urban expansion, with most urban growth focused around identified centres and corridors. The LGAAA requires the RPS to give effect to the Growth Concept, which is considered the best approach to enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being. This approach does not allow the market to determine where all future growth should occur. It is an integrated approach linked with infrastructure provision, that is regionally agreed, ensures certainty for future investment and ensures the costs of future development do not unfairly burden ratepayers.

With particular regard to submissions **107/14** and **108/14**, the Panel does not support the prescription of types of businesses and/or activities to be located in high density centres and corridors. The amended policy 2.6.5.6 instead allows for business activities that support high density centres and corridors. The reasons under 2.6.7 sets out the kind of activities that are likely to be suitable for high density centres and corridors which includes retail. Therefore retail activities are envisaged for high density centres and corridors. Further, it is considered appropriate for residential activities to co-locate with retail and service sectors in high density centres and corridors. The Panel considers that the outcomes identified in submissions **107/1**, **108/1**, **107/14** and **108/14** are provided for in the plan change.

Panel Recommendation:

5.9 The Panel recommends:

5.9.1 Submissions **107/1**, **108/1**, **107/14** and **108/14** are accepted in part, with no further changes required to the RPS.

5.10 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.9.1 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

6 Whole RPS Change Building character – align with DP

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
100/2	B.A. Trustees Limited	Amend to provide consistency with ACC District Plan - Isthmus Section - Plan Change132 in relation to existing building character in Town Centres.	

Discussion:

Plan Change 132 to the Auckland City District Plan: Isthmus introduced Character Overlays for Eden Valley (Dominion Road), Upper Symonds Street, Kingsland, West Lynn (Richmond Road), Grey Lynn (Surrey Crescent) and Ellerslie. The Plan Change seeks to introduce controls that recognise the varied mix and character of buildings in these areas. RPS Plan Change 6 introduced urban design objective and policies (see objective 2.6.1.5 and policies 2.6.8). It is considered that these objectives and policies appropriately set the scene. Furthermore, it is not considered appropriate to make any changes to the RPS to be consistent with Plan Change 132 as, the version of RMA section 75 that applied at the time of the LGAAA planning document notification, stated that district plans must not be inconsistent with the RPS, not vice versa.

Panel Recommendation:

5.11 The Panel recommends:

5.11.1 Submission **100/2** is rejected.

7 Whole RPS Future Growth Priorities

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
106/1	Property Council of New Zealand	Amend the plan change to include a priority within the Regional Policy Statement to <i>"nurture the development of commercial, industrial and retail activity within and in proximity to the Metropolitan Urban Limit (MUL)"</i> .	Supported By: 193 Contact Energy Limited Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority Support and Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council

Discussion:

Submission **106/1** seeks to make changes to the RPS to reflect a priority for commercial, industrial and retail activity within and in proximity to the MUL. Proposed Plan change 6 seeks to enable sustainable economic growth within the policy direction contained in the ARGS Growth Concept, with most urban growth focused around centres and major passenger transport routes. Some expansion opportunities are required to provide sufficient business land capacity, particularly for heavy, land extensive business activities. However, various amendments recommended to the RPS discussed in this report are considered to go some way to address the concerns of the submitter. For example, policy 2.6.5.15.

Panel Recommendation:

5.12 The Panel recommends:

5.12.1 Submission **106/1** is accepted in part, with no further changes required to the RPS.

5.13 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.12.1 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

8 Whole RPS Change Retain RPS Change

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
299/2	Unitec New Zealand	Retain the Plan Change. There is logic in the expansion of town centres, and provision of educational and employment upskilling	

		opportunities, on and around the key node points of public and private transport routes.	
--	--	--	--

Discussion:

Submission **299/2** seeks retention of Plan Change 6. While minor amendments to the RPS are recommended in response to some submissions, in general it is recommended that RPS 6 be retained.

Panel Recommendation:

5.14 The Panel recommends:

5.14.1 Submission **299/2** is accepted.

9 Whole RPS Change Address land availability

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
253/9	Manukau City Council	Amend Proposed Plan Change 6 to include additional objective and policies to address land availability to sustain economic development and location and distribution of employment opportunities.	<p>Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 69 Project Consultancy Group Limited 277 JM Hayman 294 Jon Mapes Land Solution Ltd (representing 16 parties) 323 Wairoa River Canal Partnership 140 Garelja Brothers Strawberry Gardens</p> <p>Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited</p> <p>Support and Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council</p>

Discussion:

Submitter **253/9** (Manukau City Council) presented evidence at the hearing in support of the addition of Issue 2.4.10 and the recognition of the shortage of business land. Submission **253/9** seeks to enable sustainable economic growth within the policy direction contained in the ARGS Growth Concept, with most urban growth focused around centres and major passenger transport routes. Therefore the Panel considers that the amendments recommended in section 5B of this report will address the concerns of the submitter, in particular issue 2.4.10, policy 2.6.1.18, methods 2.6.3.6, 2.6.5.14, 2.6.5.15, 2.6.6.18, 2.6.6.19 and reasons 2.6.7.

Submitter **69** (Project Consultancy Group) further supported submission **253/9** in their evidence at the hearing. The submitter also focuses on the identification of industrial land supply, however, this is a role assumed by the local authorities during development and review of District Plans and is not within the jurisdiction of Regional Council. Thus, the submission is outside the scope of the RPS and no further changes to the RPS are required.

Panel Recommendation:

5.15 The Panel recommends:

5.15.1 Submission **253/9** is accepted.

5.16 That the further submissions made in support of the submission noted in 5.15.1 above, are accepted or rejected in whole, accordingly.

5.17 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the ARPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of 5.15.1 above. That is, *issue 2.4.10, policy 2.6.1.18, methods 2.6.3.6, 2.6.5.14, 2.6.5.15, 2.6.6.18, 2.6.6.19 and reason 2.6.7.*

10 2.2 The Importance of Retailing

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
109/4	The Warehouse Ltd	Amend Part 2.2 to include a section on retailing including its dynamic nature, the variety of formats, and the importance of enabling choice and competition.	Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
110/4	Warehouse Stationery Limited		
111/4	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		

Discussion:

Submissions **109/4, 110/4 and 111/4** seek to amend section 2.2 The Setting – Auckland Today, to include details on retailing such as its dynamic nature, variety of formats and the importance of enabling choice and competition.

Submitters **109** (The Warehouse Ltd) and **110** (Warehouse Stationery Ltd) presented evidence that they disagree with the officer's assessment that it is inappropriate to address particular business matters in the RPS. Their submission states that it is appropriate to do so and is in accordance with the requirements of the LGAAA. Experts appearing on behalf of submitters **109** and **110** presented evidence that stated that retail does warrant a mention in high-level policy documents to ensure that the right direction is provided at the district plan rule level so that the special circumstances retail creates and needs are provided for in an appropriate manner. The evidence presented further suggested that retail is distinct from other types of business, particularly with regard to effects on traffic movements and growth, and thus requires specific mention in policy documents.

Evidence presented by submitter **111/4** (The National Trading Company) refers to the recommendation in the officer's report to include Issue 2.4.10 to address the submitter's concern. This evidence states the reasons provided in the officer's report for the inclusion of Issue 2.4.10 also provide rationale for the provision of large format retail/supermarket activities in corridors. Submitter **111/4** disagrees with the officer's assessment that retailing does not warrant specific mention in the RPS on the basis that retailing plays an important role in the overall scheme of development.

The Panel acknowledge that certain types of retail activity have a large land requirement and the region's planning documents are currently not clear on how this will be managed. A new method (2.6.12.9) is therefore recommended to identify a regional approach to accommodate retail activity. This approach will need to give effect to the Growth Concept contained within the RGS and integrate land use and transport. This regional approach will guide TAs in their amendment of District Plans to address retail activity. The new method may go some way in satisfying the concerns of submitters **109/4, 110/4 and 111/4.**

Panel Recommendation:

5.18 The Panel recommends:

5.18.1 Submissions **109/4, 110/4 and 111/4** are accepted in part.

- 5.19 That the further submissions made in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.18.1 above, are rejected in part accordingly.
- 5.20 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the RPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of 5.18.1 above. That is, *method 2.6.12.9*.

11 2.3 Additional Locations for Employment (Re) Development

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
32/5	Haka International NZ Limited	Amend paragraph commencing 'Major employment...' in section commencing 'Specific new areas..' by including reference to providing the environment for major employment development throughout Rodney.	<p>Supported By: 86 Cornerstone Ltd 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 1202 Perrendale 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited</p> <p>Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council</p>
300/1	IMF Westland Ltd	<p>Amend 2.3 the last paragraph before the sub-heading of Section 2.3 to insert the following words as shown in italics:</p> <p>Major employment (re)development is envisaged in a number of existing and new areas including Albany, East Tamaki, Sylvia Park, Mt Wellington, <i>Westgate / Hobsonville</i> and the central area. Maintaining and improving access to jobs and between businesses will be vital.</p>	<p>Supported By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 96 Housing New Zealand Corporation (2) 205 Fulton Hogan Limited (1) 257 Waitakere City Council</p> <p>Support and Opposed By: 81 IB, GA and IE Midgley 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)</p>
257/5	Waitakere City Council	<p>Amend to ensure that greater emphasis is placed on the importance of Auckland as a location for economic activity, in particular the provision of additional employment land in Waitakere City and the wider Northern and Western Sector to address the following issues:</p> <p>The necessity for appropriate management of the supply of land for 'business' purposes across the region.</p> <p>The need to manage the supply of that land in the context of population growth.</p> <p>The need to understand what business needs are and where there are market pressures.</p> <p>The analysis within the BLS is based on historical take up rates and does not recognize the major policy moves to secure a step change in Auckland's economic prospects.</p> <p>The need to plan around realistic development timescales.</p>	<p>Supported By: 86 Cornerstone Ltd 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 256 Rodney District Council 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 1226 Titirangi Residents for Balanced 96 Housing New Zealand Corporation (2) 140 Garelja Brothers Strawberry Gardens 300 IMF Westland Ltd</p> <p>Opposed By: 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited</p>

Discussion:

Submissions **32/5** and **300/1** seek to amend ARGS section 2.3 to include specific areas for growth. Evidence presented by Submitter **300** (IMF New Zealand Ltd) clarify that the words "Westgate/Hobsonville" should be added to the list of areas for where employment (re) development is envisaged. It is not considered appropriate to accept these changes as the specific areas for growth are contained in Schedule 1 of the RPS. It is also noted that references in section 2.3 are indicative only and do not serve as a list of future growth areas.

Submission **257/5** appears to seek a general amendment that provides for additional employment land to address a range of issues. Submitter **257** (Waitakere City Council) presented evidence that provided for general support for changes to the RPS that would help to address the imbalance of residents and employment opportunities in Waitakere City. Submitter **257** also suggested amending section 2.3 to acknowledge that the regional growth concept includes the need for a better supply of employment land to match population and meet the needs of the dynamic Auckland market. It is considered that the RPS sufficiently provides for a range of employment growth opportunities through objective 2.6.1.18, method 2.6.3.6, policies 2.6.5.14, 2.6.5.15, 2.6.5.18 and 2.6.5.19.

Submitter **300** (IMF New Zealand Ltd) presented evidence that supported the planning officer's recommendations for submission **257/5**.

Panel Recommendation:

5.21 The Panel recommends:

5.21.1 Submissions **32/5** and **300/1** are rejected.

5.21.2 Submission **257/5** is accepted.

5.22 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.21.1 and 5.22.2 above, are accepted or rejected accordingly.

5.23 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the ARPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of 5.21.2 above. That is, *issue 2.4.10, objective 2.6.1.18, methods 2.6.3.6, policies 2.6.5.14, 2.6.5.15, 2.6.5.18, 2.6.5.19 and reason 2.6.7.*

12 2.4 Accommodating Increased Demand for Retail Activities

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
109/9	The Warehouse Ltd	Amend Section 2.4.3 by inserting a new paragraph after the fourth paragraph on page 2-15 stating: <i>"Increasing populations in centres and along corridors will create an increased demand for retail activity. The development of all retail format should be enabled to ensure that consumers have ready access to a choice of goods and services at competitive prices."</i>	Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
110/9	Warehouse Stationery Limited		
111/9	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		
109/10	The Warehouse Ltd	Amend the ultimate sentence in paragraph 3 of Section 2.4.5(3) by deleting the new word "are" and reinstate "can be".	Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
110/10	Warehouse Stationery Limited		
111/10	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		

109/11	The Warehouse Ltd	If submission 109/10 is not granted, amend Section 2.4.10 to address the need for increased retail activity to serve an increasing population.	Supported By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
110/11	Warehouse Stationery Limited	If submission 110/10 is not granted, amend Section 2.4.10 to address the need for increased retail activity to serve an increasing population.	
111/11	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited	If submission 111/10 is not granted, amend Section 2.4.10 to address the need for increased retail activity to serve an increasing population.	

Discussion:

Submissions **109/9, 110/9, 111/9, 109/10, 110/10, 111/10, 109/11, 110/11 and 111/11** seek to make changes to parts of section 2.4 – Issues, to make reference to the need for increased retail activity to serve an increasing population.

Submitter **109** (The Warehouse Ltd) presented evidence at the hearing that they disagree with the officer's assessment that it is inappropriate to address particular business matters in the RPS. The evidence states that it is appropriate to do so and is in accordance with the requirements of the LGAAA. The evidence also states that retail does warrant a mention in high-level policy documents to ensure that the right direction is provided at the district plan rule level so that the special circumstances retail creates and needs are provided for in an appropriate manner. Submitters' **109** evidence also suggests that retail is distinct from other types of business, particularly with regard to effects on traffic movements and growth, and thus requires specific mention in policy documents. Submitter **109** particularly disagrees with the officer's assessment that new Issue 2.4.10 adequately addresses issues related to the need to accommodate population growth and economic development. This is because new Issue 2.4.10 is primarily concerned with maximizing the use of the diminishing supply of vacant business land, and does not recognise the increased demand for retail created by a growing population. Submitter **109** requests that the original relief sought be granted.

Evidence from Submitter **111** (The National Trading Company) states that the reasons provided in the officer's report for the inclusion of Issue 2.4.10 also provide rationale for the provision of large format retail/supermarket activities in corridors. Submitter **111** also disagrees with the officer's assessment that retailing does not warrant specific mention in the RPS on the basis that retailing plays an important role in the overall scheme of development. Furthermore, submitter **111** adds that policy direction at the regional level is needed to direct the provisions for retail within district plans.

The Panel does not support the prescription of types of business or activities within centres and corridors. Therefore, changes to the RPS that specify a particular business sector are considered inappropriate. However, the amended policies 2.6.5.6 and 2.6.5.13 now address those business activities within high density centres and corridors may therefore go some way to alleviating the submitters concerns.

Panel Recommendation:

5.24 The Panel recommends:

5.24.1 Submissions **109/9, 110/9, 111/9, 109/10, 110/10, 111/10, 109/11, 110/11 and 111/11** are accepted in part.

5.25 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.24.1 above, are accepted or rejected accordingly.

13 2.4.1 Population Growth

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/6	Waitakere City Council	Amend to include the following issues in Issue 2.4.1 and other appropriate issues,	Supported By: 86 Cornerstone Ltd

		<p>policies, objectives, explanation and reasons: the structure of the economy, rate of structural change, and attracting industries that build and use our knowledge enhancing resources also needs to be considered in relation to its impact on the urban form and requirements for physical infrastructure.</p> <p>It also needs to be recognised that much of this played out in local areas, where there are synergies to be gained from business clustering together for strategic advantage.</p> <p>The region has experienced significant growth since the ARGS was adopted in 1999. 2003 was in fact a peak year. Based on data from census it is more appropriate to utilise a high population growth projection.</p>	<p>95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) Opposed By: 196 Winstone Aggregates Support and Opposed By: 193 Contact Energy Limited</p>
--	--	--	--

Discussion:

Submission **257/6** seeks to make amendments to the RPS to address population growth issues. It is acknowledged that sustainable economic development is not sufficiently articulated in the RPS. Submitter **257/6** (Waitakere City Council) presented evidence at the hearing provides general support for changes to the RPS that help to address the imbalance of residents and employment opportunities in Waitakere City. The Panel considers that the amendments recommended in section 5b address the original concerns raised by the submitter.

It is noted that Proposed RPS plan change 6 does not preclude local councils from determining and developing the most appropriate local economic development outcomes to their area. Rather, the Plan Change provides a context for future growth, which is regionally agreed, consistent with the ARGS Growth Concept, and ensures certainty for future investment.

Panel Recommendation:

5.26 The Panel recommends:

5.26.1 Submission **257/6** is accepted in part with no further changes recommended to the RPS.

5.27 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.26.1 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

14 2.4.1 Economic Activity

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
256/1	Rodney District Council	Amend the discussion of Issue 2.4.1 to recognise and refer to the need to accommodate economic activity particularly industrial land.	Supported By: 86 Cornerstone Ltd 109 The Warehouse Ltd 20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 69 Project Consultancy Group Limited 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 90 Pacific Rim Builders

			Limited Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited Support and Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council
277/1	JM Hayman	Amend 2.4.1 Issue to use the wording 'commercial' when describing the focus of the Auckland Urban Region, and to use the wording 'economic' when describing the focus of the Auckland Rural Region.	Supported By: 1199 Pukekawa Ratepayers Association 157 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)
85/1	Enterprise Waitakere	Amend issue 2.4.1 to recognise the need for some businesses to locate in areas which provide a sufficient land resource and/or which are on or adjacent to a required physical resource.	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 289 Auckland International Airport Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited Support and Opposed By: 196 Winstone Aggregates 257 Waitakere City Council

Discussion:

Submission **256/1** seeks to make changes to section 2.4 – Issues to make reference to the need to accommodate economic activity, particularly industrial land. Submitter 256 (Rodney District Council) supported the inclusion of new Issue 2.4.10 in their evidence at the hearing and followed up on their submission with proposed wording to clarify Issue 2.4.10. Much of the proposed wording has already been incorporated into Issue 2.4.10, thus no further changes are required.

Submitter **69** (Project Consultancy Group) presented further evidence in support of Submission 256/1. The submitter is seeking additional relief beyond that sought by Submission **256/1**, including the recommendation that a process be included which requires the identification of Greenfield land for future industrial use that is timely, transparent and include input from the business sector. The Panel does not support the prescription of types of businesses and/or activities to be located in centres and corridors (and by default outside centres and corridors). Therefore changes to the RPS to include a mechanism for identification of land for future industrial land is not considered appropriate.

Submission **277/1** seeks to amend the focus of urban and rural regions with the inclusion of additional wording to differentiate the focus in each area. Submitter **157** (Federated Farmers) tabled a letter at the hearings in support of the original and further submission made by submitter **277** (JM Hayman). The Panel considers that differentiating 'commercial' activity in urban areas and 'economic' in rural areas does not provide sufficient clarity about economic growth in the respective areas.

Submission **85/1** seeks to amend issue 2.4.1 to recognise the need for some businesses to be located in particular areas. The Panel considers that the amended Issue 2.4.1 and new Issue 2.4.10 adequately address the identification of the spatial implications of a declining supply of vacant business land. Furthermore, methods 2.6.1.18, 2.6.3.6, objectives 2.6.5.13, 2.6.5.14, 2.6.5.15, 2.6.5.18, 2.6.5.19, 2.6.7 reasons and definition of land extensive business activities.

Panel Recommendation:

5.28 The Panel recommends:

5.28.1 Submissions **256/1** and **85/1** are accepted in part.

5.28.2 Submission **277/1** is rejected.

5.29 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.28.1 and 5.28.2 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

5.30 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the ARPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of recommendation 5.28.1 above. That is *issue 2.4.10, methods 2.6.1.18, 2.6.3.6, objectives 2.6.15.13, 2.6.15.4, 2.6.15.15, 2.6.5.18, 2.6.5.19, reason 2.67 and definition of land extensive business activities.*

15 2.4.3 The Effects of new Retail on Existing Town Centres

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
109/7	The Warehouse Ltd	Delete the 6 th bullet of Issue 2.4.3.	Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
110/7	Warehouse Stationery Limited		
111/7	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		

Discussion:

Submissions **109/7, 110/7 and 111/7** seek to delete the 6th bullet point in the 2nd paragraph of Issue 2.4.3. Issue 2.4.3 identifies that poorly planned, ad hoc developments can lead to loss of urban amenity. The subsequent bullet points in the second paragraph give examples of urban amenity loss. Bullet point 6 refers to how large format retail can undermine the vitality of town centres.

Submitter **109** (The Warehouse Ltd) presented evidence that stated that it is important that flexibility be built into planning documents to enable the establishment of various retail formats and support the differing needs of retail types.

Submitter **111** (National Trading Company) presented evidence that supports their original submission that bullet point 6 be deleted as they consider it to be incorrect and carries a negative flavour that is contrary to resource management planning.

Bullet Point 6 does not preclude the development of large format retail from town centres, but outlines the problems that can occur when this type of retail is not planned with urban amenity in mind. It is considered that poorly planned, large format retail does have the potential to undermine town centres with a loss of urban amenity, and should therefore be planned to enhance rather than detract from such centres. As Bullet Point 6 provides the reasoning for urban redevelopment that supports pedestrian-oriented town centres, it should not be deleted.

Panel Recommendation:

5.31 The Panel recommends:

5.31.1 Submissions **109/7, 110/7 and 111/7** are rejected

5.32 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.31.1 above, are accepted accordingly.

16 2.4.3 Improving Urban Amenity

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/4	Auckland Regional Council	Amend by adding another paragraph under the heading "Improving urban amenity" to read: <i>"Local Authorities responsible for public infrastructure in Town Centres can stimulate high quality private sector mixed use development by planning for multi-modal accessibility in adjoining street networks, and by ensuring public places and streetscapes are built to a high standard attractive to pedestrians and local residents"</i> In order to better link this issue with the strategic policies of the RPS.	Supported By: 257 Waitakere City Council 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority

Discussion:

Submission **250/4** seeks to insert an additional paragraph in Issue 2.4.3 under the heading 'Improving urban amenity'. Submitter **250** presented evidence to support its original submission and the inclusion of this paragraph. One additional item was that the reference to "town centres" should be amended to "high density centres and corridors" to reflect the Sector Agreements (particularly the Central Sector Agreement) and the Regional Growth Concept in general.

The Panel consider that this additional paragraph will assist in providing appropriate linkages to the subsequent strategic policies of the RPS. Local authority assistance and follow through on improved urban amenity is imperative to successful urban amenity in the Auckland Region.

Panel Recommendation:

5.33 The Panel recommends:

5.33.1 Submission **250/4** is accepted in part

5.34 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.33.1 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

5.35 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the ARPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of recommendation 5.33.1 above. That is *Issue 2.4.3*.

17 2.4.5.3 Industrial Areas and Commercial Centres

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
300/5	IMF Westland Ltd	Retain Issue 2.4.5 the second paragraph and the first two sentences of the third paragraph under the subheading '3. Industrial Areas and Commercial Centres'.	Support and Opposed By: 81 IB, GA and IE Midgley 257 Waitakere City Council
250/5	Auckland Regional Council	Amend the bold title of Issue 2.4.5 to include the words " <i>industrial areas</i> " and " <i>commercial centres</i> ". Amend the list of important centres for industry and commerce in paragraph two of subsection 3. <i>Industrial areas, and commercial centres</i> to add the Wairau Industrial Estate at North Shore and similarly aged commercial zones in other parts of the region.	Support and Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council

253/8	Manukau City Council	Amend Issue 2.4.5(3) to relocate and incorporate the proposed additional text, and the entire section 2.4.5(3) - Industrial Areas, and Commercial Centres with Issue 2.4.1.	Supported By: 20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 277 JM Hayman Support and Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council
294/9	Jon Mapes Land Solution Ltd (representing 16 parties)	Amend 2.4.5.3 by adding an objective and policies to address land availability to sustain economic development and location and distribution of employment opportunities. Delete the “ <i>Industrial areas, and commercial centres</i> ” section from 2.4.5. Relocate this section to Issue 2.4.1.	Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited Support and Opposed By: 277 JM Hayman 257 Waitakere City Council

Discussion:

Submission **300/5** seeks to retain mixed-use activities in centres, including residential and industrial. Submitter **300** (IMF New Zealand Ltd) presented evidence supporting the officer’s recommendations for submission **300/5**.

Submission **250/5** seeks to amend Issue 2.4.5 to clarify the Issue and include additional examples in subsection 3. Submitter **250** (Auckland Regional Council) presented evidence to support the officer’s report and inclusion of new issue 2.4.10 but also suggested that the words “from time to time” be removed to make the policy clearer. The Panel also considers that these words be removed from Issue 2.4.10 to make the policy clearer and does not detract from the overall intent of the issue.

Submissions **253/8** and **294/9** seek changes to Issue 2.4.3 to make better provision for economic development. Submitter **253** (Manukau City Council) presented evidence supporting the officer’s recommended changes to the RPS, including the addition of Issue 2.4.10.

While minor amendments to RPS Plan Change 6 are recommended in response to some submissions, in general it is recommended that RPS 6 is retained. Issue 2.4.5.3, has been relocated under Issue 2.4.10 and is essentially the same but with some additional text being added in response to section 5.1 of this report.

The Panel recognises that neither Issue 2.4.3 nor 2.4.1 sufficiently address economic development issues. The new Issue 2.4.10 addresses the issue of economic development in the region and identifies the likely spatial implications of economic growth. The amendments are considered to address the concerns of these submissions. Furthermore objective 2.6.1.18, method 2.6.3.6, policies 2.6.5.14, 2.6.5.18, 2.6.5.19 and reason 2.6.7 address the provision of business activities and land availability.

Subsection 3 has been moved from Issue 2.4.5 to new issue 2.4.10. This subsection has been clarified regarding the essential differences between industrial and commercial land and this is considered to address in part the concerns of the submitter.

Panel Recommendation:

5.36 The Panel recommends:

5.36.1 Submissions **250/5**, **300/5**, **253/8** and **294/9** are accepted in part.

5.37 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.36.1 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

5.38 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the ARPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of

recommendation 5.36.1 above. That is, amended *issue 2.4.10, objective 2.6.1.18, method 2.6.3.6, policies 2.6.5.14, 2.6.5.15, 2.6.5.18, 2.6.15.19 and reason 2.6.7.*

18 2.4.5.3 Location of Industrial Areas and Commercial Centres

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
256/5	Rodney District Council	Amend Issue 2.4.5 section 3, to include reference to the issue of the shortage of supply of industrial land in the region. Also amend the third paragraph, first sentence to add reference to Silverdale as an industrial area.	Supported By: 86 Cornerstone Ltd Support and Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council
257/8	Waitakere City Council	Amend Issue 2.4.5.3 as follows: Important centres for industry and commerce are <i>primarily</i> situated throughout the <i>in the central, southern and northern part of the</i> Region in areas such as the central city and CBD, Albany Penrose and Mt Wellington, East Tamaki, Manukau and the airport. There are Recognition of the important industrial and commercial base of the Region is essential in resource management and strategic planning. It is crucial for the economic and social wellbeing of the community. Local authorities should ensure that the introduction of mixed use zones (e.g., residential and industrial) or encroachment of housing on quarrying and industrial areas, especially those storing or using hazardous substances, do not impose high costs on or prejudice the future use of industrial sites due to incompatibility of uses. <u>Areas of business (including industrial) development should be located across the region in a manner that minimises journey to work times and associated environmental effects.</u>	Supported By: 86 Cornerstone Ltd 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 205 Fulton Hogan Limited (1) 300 IMF Westland Ltd Opposed By: 284 Oratia Landowners Action Group Support and Opposed By: 130 Holcim (NZ) Ltd, Aggregates Division 128 The Aggregate & Quarry Assoc. of NZ (Inc) 129 New Zealand Minerals Industry Association
69/3	Project Consultancy Group Limited	Amend to include provision for additional industrial and commercial land in the region (even if this is outside the MUL).	Supported By: 20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 90 Pacific Rim Builders Limited Opposed By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited Support and Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council

Discussion:

Issue 2.4.5.3 seeks to identify the need for integration between transport infrastructure and industrial and commercial areas. It distinguishes between industrial areas and commercial centres and suggests that intensification in such areas would be beneficial. It also recognises that having a mixture of activities in these areas will ensure the multi-functionality of the centre. This issue has been reworded and relocated within the RPS to new issue 2.4.10.

Submission **256/5** seeks to amend Issue 2.4.5.3 to identify the shortage of industrial land and include Silverdale as an industrial and commercial centre. The Panel consider that the spatial implications of economic growth are better contained in the new Issue 2.4.10. In this regard, the amendments recommended in section 5b are considered to address the concerns of the submitter. Submitter 256 (Rodney District Council) presented evidence that supports the inclusion of new Issue 2.4.10 and proposed wording to clarify Issue 2.4.10. Most of the proposed wording has already been incorporated into Issue 2.4.10 following previous submissions, thus no further changes are required. With regard to the inclusion of Silverdale as an industrial or commercial centre, it is noted that the list of examples of industrial and commercial centres is not exhaustive, therefore adding Silverdale is not considered necessary.

Submission **257/8** seeks to amend 2.4.5.3 to specify that the central, north and south parts of the city are important areas for industry and business and to add a paragraph related to the location of businesses at the end of this section. Submitter **257** (Waitakere City Council) presented evidence that supports the new issue 2.4.10 as it clarifies the need for additional business land in the area. However, submitter **257** also presented evidence that new issue 2.4.10 should be amended to quantify the existing regional imbalance of employment to population outlined through Statistics NZ data and the ARBLS. The Panel considers that the role of the Issues are to outline the problem that is to be addressed through the objectives and policies of the RPS which has been done and it is not considered necessary to provide additional quantitative information.

Further evidence presented by Submitter **300** (IMF Westland Ltd) suggests adding a paragraph to Issue 2.4.10 to address commuting behaviour and transport congestion. The Panel consider that commuting behaviour and transport congestion are not directly relevant to this new Issue and has been adequately addressed elsewhere in the RPS (for example in Land Use and Transport Integration Policies - section 2.6.11).

Submission **69/3** seeks to amend 2.4.5.3 to provide for additional industrial and commercial land in the region, regardless of whether it is within the MUL. Submitter **69/3** presented further evidence that still called for the identification of potential industrial land. The Panel does not support the prescription of types of business or activities within the centre and corridors, instead that direction and effects based criteria is used to ensure appropriate location of business types based on desired outcomes. Therefore this evidence and this part of the submission are not accepted.

The provision of business activities and land availability is further provided for in objective 2.6.1.8, policies 2.6.5.14, 2.6.5.15, 2.6.6.18 and 2.6.6.19.

Panel Recommendation:

5.39 The Panel recommends:

5.39.1 Submissions **256/5**, **257/8** are accepted in part.

5.39.2 Submission **69/3** is rejected.

5.40 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.39.1 and 5.39.2 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

5.41 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the ARPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of recommendation 5.39.1 above. That is, *issue 2.4.10, objective 2.6.1.18, policies 2.6.5.14, 2.6.5.15, 2.6.5.18, 2.6.15.19 and reason 2.6.7.*

19 2.4.5.3 Reverse Sensitivity Issues

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
107/17	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	Amend the wording of Issue 2.4.5.3 by adding those words in italics and underlined: <i>“A number of these centres would benefitthe centre becomes multifunctional. <u>While residential development will be encouraged in such centres, residential development will be subject to appropriate design controls to ensure that the introduction of dwellings into existing centres does not result in reverse sensitivity issues”.</u></i>	Supported By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd Support and Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
108/18	Progressive Enterprises Limited		Supported By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited Support and Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council

Discussion:

The development in centres of mixed-use residential, is an appropriate activity that supports the vibrancy and functioning of town centres. However, there remains some potential for reverse sensitivity issues to occur in centres. Therefore, amendments suggested by submissions **107/17** and **107/18** are accepted in part.-

Panel Recommendation:

5.42 The Panel recommends:

5.42.1 Submissions **107/17** and **108/18** are accepted in part.

5.43 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.42.1 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

5.44 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the ARPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of recommendation 5.42.1 above. That is, *issue 2.4.10*.

20 2.4.6 Integration of Employment and Transport System

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/10	Waitakere City Council	Amend Issue 2.4.6, and other appropriate issues, policies, objectives, explanation and reasons, to include the need for an appropriate regional spread of employment land and recognition that the transport system should be sympathetic to the future land use.	Supported By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 140 Garelja Brothers Strawberry Gardens 300 IMF Westland Ltd Opposed By: 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority

Discussion:

Evidence presented by Submitter **257** (Waitakere City Council) regarding economic evidence invalidates the planning officer's conclusion that it was unclear what is meant by the content of the submission. The evidence clarifies that submitter **257** is not seeking an "equal balance" of employment land across the region, but rather a better alignment between population and employment growth in line with the RGS and Northern and Western Sector Agreement. An amendment is suggested to indicate that the lack of employment opportunities in some parts of the region is an issue in terms of transport and land use integration. The Panel consider that this amendment is appropriate as it is acknowledged that lack of employment opportunities together with low density of urban development and dependence on private motor vehicles are an issue for land use and transport integration. However, it is considered that this change has been addressed through Issue 4.2, which relates in part in having an appropriate spatial mix of employment land. No further change to Issue 2.4.6 is recommended.

Panel Recommendation:

5.45 The Panel recommends:

5.45.1 Submission 257/10 is accepted in part.

5.46 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.45.1 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

5.47 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the ARPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of recommendation 5.45.1 above. That is, *issue 4.2*.

21 2.5 Urban Centres

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
300/6	IMF Westland Ltd	Amend 2.5, the third bullet list in Section 2.5 to insert a 6 th bullet as follows: <i>Providing particular support to those urban centres, identified as logical for further intensification, that are constrained from growth and intensification by administrative constraints, such as a metropolitan urban limit or planning provisions e.g. Westgate.</i>	Support and Opposed By: 81 IB, GA and IE Midgley 257 Waitakere City Council

Discussion:

Submission **300/6** seeks to insert an additional bullet point in the third list of bullet points under Section 2.5 – From Issues to Strategic Direction. Evidence presented by submitter **300** (IMF Westland Ltd) supports the planning officer's recommendation and the note that Proposed Plan Change 7 will in part address the submitter's concerns. However, submitter **300** reiterated that an additional bullet point (or similar wording) would provide for and promote the development of nodes and centres which have been identified in the RGS and support these through the expeditious removal of formerly relevant planning controls, combined with the application of newly developed planning controls designed to encourage the development of such nodes and centres in the form intended within the RGS.

The Panel considers that administrative constraints, such as zoning controls and the MUL are important components to manage future growth in a manner that provides for the region's sustainable management. The additional bullet point suggested in submission **300/6** would potentially undermine the use of such mechanisms.

Panel Recommendation:

5.48 The Panel recommends:

5.48.1 Submission **300/6** is rejected

5.49 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.48.1 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

22 2.6 Provide for Growth in Economic Sector

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
85/2	Enterprise Waitakere	Amend strategic objectives 2.6.1 to include a further objective referring to the need to provide adequately for growth in the region's economic sector.	Supported By: 140 Garelja Brothers Strawberry Gardens Support and Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council
85/3	Enterprise Waitakere	Amend policies within 2.6.2 to recognise the particular need to provide locations suitable for accommodating a range of business activity within the region.	Supported By: 86 Cornerstone Ltd 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 257 Waitakere City Council 1202 Perrendale Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited
85/4	Enterprise Waitakere	Amend methods within 2.6.3 to recognise the particular need to provide locations suitable for accommodating a range of business activity within the region.	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 257 Waitakere City Council 88 Schippers Cleanfill Limited 89 Huron Holdings Limited 90 Pacific Rim Builders Limited Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited

Discussion:

Submissions **85/2, 85/3 and 85/4** seek to amend Strategic Objectives 2.6.1, Policies 2.6.2 and Methods 2.6.3 to provide for growth in the economic sector and provide for locations for this growth. It is acknowledged that RPS Plan Change 6 does not adequately identify the need to provide for sustainable economic development and a new Issue 2.4.10 has been recommended to cater for this matter. Other amendments recommended in section 5b of this report, in particular objective 2.6.1.18, policies 2.6.5.14, 2.6.5.15 and reasons 2.6.7 are also considered to address in part the concerns of this submitter.

Panel Recommendation:

5.50 The Panel recommends:

5.50.1 Submissions **85/2**, **85/3** and **85/4** are accepted in part.

5.51 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.50.1 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

5.52 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the ARPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of recommendation 5.50.1 above. That is, *issue 2.4.10, objective 2.6.1.18, policies 2.6.5.14, 2.6.5.15 and reasons 2.6.7.*

23 2.6 Provision for all Retail Formats

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
109/13	The Warehouse Ltd	Amend Section 2.6.6 to include an additional Method requiring TA's to include provisions in District Plans ensuring that all retail formats are provided for.	Supported By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited Opposed By: 256 Rodney District Council 257 Waitakere City Council 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
110/13	Warehouse Stationery Limited		Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
111/13	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited
109/14	The Warehouse Ltd	Amend Section 2.6.7 to include a paragraph giving reasons for ensuring that District Plans contain provision to enable all retail formats to establish.	Supported By: 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
110/14	Warehouse Stationery Limited		Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited

111/14	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited
109/19	The Warehouse Ltd	Amend Section 2.6.12 by inserting a new Item 8 and renumbering the existing Item 8. The new number 8 would read: <i>"TAs shall make specific provision in district plans for all retail formats to address the demand from an increasing population in growth areas."</i>	Supported By: 1202 Perrendale Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 256 Rodney District Council 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
111/19	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited	Amend Section 2.6.12 by inserting a new Item 8 and renumbering the existing Item 8. The new number 8 would read: <i>"TAs shall make specific provision in district plans for all retail formats to address the demand from an increasing population in growth areas."</i>	Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited
110/19	Warehouse Stationery Limited		Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
109/20	The Warehouse Ltd	Amend Section 2.6.13 to include a paragraph setting out reasons why specific provision is required for retail development in all formats.	Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
111/20	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited		Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
110/20	Warehouse Stationery Limited		Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited

Discussion:

Submissions **109/13, 110/13, 111/13, 109/14, 110/14, 111/14, 109/19, 111/19, 110/19, 109/20, 110/20 and 111/20** seek to amend the RPS to make particular provisions for the variety of retail formats.

Submitter **109** (The Warehouse Ltd) presented evidence that they disagree with the officer's assessment that it is inappropriate to address particular business matters in the RPS. Their submission states that it is appropriate to do so and is in accordance with the requirements of the LGAAA. The evidence also stated that retail does warrant a mention in high-level policy documents to ensure that the right direction is provided at the district plan level to ensure that the special circumstances retail creates and needs are provided for in an appropriate manner. Retail is distinct from other types of business, particularly with regard to effects on traffic movements and growth, and thus requires specific mention in policy documents. Submitter **109** also presented evidence that disagreed with the officer's assessment that Issue 2.4.10 adequately addresses issues related to the need to accommodate population growth and economic development. This is because issue 2.4.10 is primarily concerned with maximizing the use of the diminishing supply of vacant business land, and does not recognise the increased demand for retail created by a growing population. Submitter **109** requests that the original relief sought be granted.

Evidence presented by Submitter **111** (The National Trading Company) disagrees with the officer's assessment that it is inappropriate to provide for a specific business sector. The evidence states that RPS direction on retail formats is required to ensure that provisions in District Plans can provide certainty and flexibility for future retail development. Submitter **111** adds that policy direction at the regional level is needed to direct the provisions for retail within district plans. Submitter **111** reiterates support for the original submission and suggested changes.

Evidence presented by Submitter **300** (IMF New Zealand Ltd), supported the officer's recommendations for submission **111/14**.

The Panel acknowledge that certain types of retail activity have a large land requirement and the region's planning documents are currently not clear on how this will be managed. A new method (2.6.12.9) is therefore recommended to identify a regional approach to accommodate retail activity. This approach will need to give effect to the Growth Concept contained within the RGS and integrate land use and transport. This regional approach will guide TAs in their amendment of District Plans to address retail activity.

Panel Recommendation:

5.53 The Panel recommends:

5.53.1 Submissions **109/13, 110/13, 111/13, 109/14, 110/14, 111/14, 109/19, 111/19, 110/19, 109/20, 110/20** and **111/20** are accepted in part.

5.54 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.53.1 above, are accepted or rejected accordingly.

5.55 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the ARPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of 5.53.1 above. That is, *method 2.6.12.9*.

24 2.6.2.2.ix Development Capacity

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/22	Waitakere City Council	<i>Amend the wording of Policy 2.6.2.2ix, associated reasons, and explanation to clarify how capacity is to be determined giving consideration to the issue raised in the submission to the satisfaction of Waitakere City Council. In particular, the realistic availability of land suitable for commercial and industrial purposes.</i>	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1)

Discussion:

Submission **257/22** seeks that the wording of Policy 2.6.2.2 (ix) regarding insufficient capacity to cater for growth be amended to provide for land suitable for commercial and industrial purposes. It is considered that new Method 2.6.3 (6), which relates to undertaking "Capacity for Growth" surveys, will go some way to addressing the concerns of the submitter.

Panel Recommendation:

5.56 The Panel recommends:

5.56.1 Submission **257/22** is accepted in part.

5.57 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.56.1 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

5.58 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the ARPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of 5.56.1 above. That is, *section 2.6.3.6*.

25 2.6.5 Policies - Urban Structure

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
257/29	Waitakere City Council	<i>Amend the relevant policies (including 2.6.5.1 - 2.6.5.6) to acknowledge that achieving higher levels of local employment requires planning for a diverse range of employment generating activities (including industrial uses) as part of the planning of new growth areas.</i>	Supported By: 95 Housing New Zealand Corporation (1) 76 Ivan & Milka Selak 74 Roy Wigg 75 Steve Nuich
257/30	Waitakere City Council	Amend Policy 2.6.5 by adding those words underlined: <i>“High Density Centres and Corridors</i> <i>1. Urban intensification is to occur in <u>or adjacent to specified locations (including but not limited to areas identified in Schedule 1A)</u> to provide the focus for the Region’s residential, commercial, <u>industrial</u> and retail growth.</i> <i>6. The following business sectors support high density centres and corridors and should be encouraged to locate there:</i> <i>i. Retail Trade</i> <i>x. Education facilities</i> <i><u>xi. Manufacturing</u></i> <i><u>xii. Construction.</u>”</i>	Supported By: 86 Cornerstone Ltd 205 Fulton Hogan Limited (1) 1202 Perrendale Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 254 North Shore City Council
255/48	Papakura District Council	Delete Strategic Policy 2.6.5.6.	Opposed By: 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 257 Waitakere City Council
254/2	North Shore City Council	Amend Policy 2.6.5.6 to include a note with the following words: <i>“This Policy shall be used as a guide to the location of certain business types and compliance with it shall not be mandatory where local circumstances preclude such compliance”.</i>	Supported By: 88 Schippers Cleanfill Limited 89 Huron Holdings Limited 90 Pacific Rim Builders Limited Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 257 Waitakere City Council

Discussion:

Submissions **257/29 and 257/30** seek amendments to include a wider range of business sectors in centres so as to generate more local employment. Technical work to support the development of the BLS has indicated that business sectors that best support intensification of centres are those described under reasons 2.6.7. Other business sectors such as manufacturing and construction and storage are less appropriate in centres as they can lead to reverse sensitivity problems, add to local congestion through the additional freight movements, and make centres a less desirable place to live and work. The purposes of policies 2.6.5.6 and 2.6.5.13 is to maximise intensification (and thereby employment) options in town centres and enable more mixed-use activities by encouraging specific business sectors to locate in centres, whilst separating land extensive business and industrial type sectors to out-of-centre locations.

Evidence presented by Submitter **257** (Waitakere City Council) states that Policy 2.6.5.6 should clarify that not all commercial sectors listed should be encouraged to be located in high density centres and corridors. The evidence makes specific reference to educational facilities, which submitter **257** argues should not necessarily be placed in centres, but instead closer to where the majority of the population resides, which would avoid transport problems and poor intensification outcomes and associated environmental effects. Submitter **257** adds that Policy 2.6.5.10 should also be amended to stipulate that large future urban areas should only be set aside for town centre style commercial development where this is the most efficient use of this land. The rationale for this is that most commercial development can be accommodated on smaller parcels of land or in existing centres, while there is a shortage of industrial land, which could be accommodated on the larger sections. Submitter **257** also proposes that Policy 2.6.5.8 includes the words “economic” and “capacity”.

Further submitter **86** (Cornerstone Group Ltd) is seeking a stronger focus on corridors and considers that policies 2.6.5.6 and 2.6.5.13 are too focused on the centres alone. Additional wording to policy 2.6.5.13 is suggested, which would provide for large scale retail activities on key transport corridors. The evidence states that if large scale retail is not provided for on corridors, then provision for these activities should be made in Schedule 1. It is considered that these policies do not place an undue emphasis on centres.

Submission **255/48** seeks the deletion of Policy 2.6.5.6 because it is ambiguous and because the form and scale of an activity determines its suitability to locating in a centre. Submitter **255/48** (Papakura District Council) presented evidence that the relief proposed does not address their submission. The submitter views Policies 2.6.5.6 and 2.6.5.13 as being too prescriptive and managing activities versus effects. They suggest amending the policies to more fully address the implications of prescriptive land use regulation at a regional level.

Submission **254/2** seeks to add a note to Policy 2.6.5.6 because at the time of submission, the BLS had not been adopted. Since it has now been adopted by the ARC and reported to the RGF, the location of business activities is more certain. In addition this policy contains the word “should” and is therefore is not considered to be prescriptive. Submitter 254 (North Shore City Council) tabled evidence at the 17 November hearing in support of their original submission. The submitter states that the Regional Growth Forum has identified a number of further workstreams following the receipt of the BLS as part of the review of the RGS. North Shore City Council has not yet endorsed the BLS or completed their workstreams, which the submitter states is necessary for undertaking an assessment of the economic future affecting the business demand for land within the region. For this reason, Policy 2.6.5.6 should be of a guidance nature only and the submitter supports the inclusion of the word “should” for the policy to be more guiding and less prescriptive. This policy is not intended as a guidance note, Therefore submission 254/2 is rejected.

The Panel does not support the prescription of the types of businesses and/or activities to be located in high density centres and corridors. The Panel instead considers that the RPS policies should provide direction and effects based criteria to ensure the appropriate location of business types based on desired outcomes. This is considered consistent with the request of the original submitters in this group and the changes to policy 2.6.5.6, 2.6.5.8 and 2.6.5.13 in particular, should adequately address the majority of the submitters concerns.

With particular regards to the suggestion of submitter **257/29** regarding the insertion of the words, “economic” and “capacity”. The Panel considers that these words are acceptable as they assist with the intent and clarity of the policy.

Panel Recommendation:

5.59 The Panel recommends:

5.59.1 Submissions **257/29**, **257/30** and **255/48** are accepted in part.

5.59.2 Submission **254/2** is rejected.

5.60 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.59.1 and 5.59.2 are accepted or rejected accordingly.

5.61 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the ARPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of recommendation 5.59.1 above. That is, *policies 2.6.5.6, 2.6.5.8, 2.6.5.13, 2.6.5.14.*

26 2.6.5.13 Larger Scale Business Activities

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
289/8	Auckland International Airport Limited	Delete Policy 2.6.5.13	Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council
255/49	Papakura District Council	Delete Strategic Policy 2.6.5.13, OR, Amend by redrafting so that it is comprehensible and that it establishes a direct nexus to its anticipated environmental outcome.	Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 257 Waitakere City Council
253/21	Manukau City Council	Amend Policy 2.6.5.13 to clarify the intent of the policy.	Supported By: 277 JM Hayman Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council
294/26	Jon Mapes Land Solution Ltd (representing 16 parties)		
256/15	Rodney District Council	Amend Policy 2.6.5 (13) to remove the limitation to “existing” appropriately zoned business land and acknowledge that “new” zoned land can also be the location of the business sectors referred to.	Supported By: 20 Waterside Group Developments Limited 86 Cornerstone Ltd 257 Waitakere City Council Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited
250/11	Auckland Regional Council	Amend policy 13 to read: <i>“Larger scale business activities that generate prone to reverse sensitivity effects, and seeking close proximity to key roads should locate in existing appropriately zoned business areas. These business sectors include: manufacturing and other industrial activities...”</i> In order to highlight that reverse sensitivity is an issue for industrial activities other than manufacturing and also that the activities listed do not ‘generate’ reverse sensitivity effects rather they are affected by them.	Support and Opposed By: 130 Holcim (NZ) Ltd, Aggregates Division 128 The Aggregate & Quarry Assoc. of NZ (Inc) 129 New Zealand Minerals Industry Association

88/28	Schippers Cleanfill Limited	<p>Delete or Amend 2.6.5, Policy 13 to read: <i>“Larger scale business activities that generate reverse sensitivity effects, seek close proximity to key roads should locate in existing appropriately zoned business areas unless the nature of the activity requires a rural location, or the activity serves the rural area, or requires proximity to consumers/users/markets that are served or existing established uses or the activity requires large areas of land. These business sectors include:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Manufacturing Construction Wholesale Trade Transport & Storage</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>And property and business services sector and other office orientated business where these are limited to the support of the above business sectors.”</i> 	<p>Supported By: 196 Winstone Aggregates 157 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)</p> <p>Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 204 The Waitakere Ranges Protection Society Incorporated 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited</p> <p>Support and Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council</p>
89/28	Huron Holdings Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>And property and business services sector and other office orientated business where these are limited to the support of the above business sectors.”</i> 	<p>Supported By: 157 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)</p> <p>Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited</p> <p>Support and Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council</p>
90/25	Pacific Rim Builders Limited		<p>Supported By: 157 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)</p> <p>Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited</p> <p>Support and Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council</p>
111/12	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited	<p>Delete the first sentence of Item 13 of Policy 2.6.5 and replace with: <i>“Larger scale business activities, that some of which may generate reverse sensitivity effects, and seek which operate most efficiently in close proximity to key roads should be able to locate in existing appropriately zoned business areas”.</i></p> <p>Amend Item 13 of Policy 2.6.5 to insert the following as a new bullet after the fourth bullet: <i>“Large format retail”.</i></p>	<p>Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd</p>
109/12	The Warehouse Ltd	<p>Delete the first sentence of Item 13 of Policy 2.6.5 and replace with: <i>“Larger scale business activities, some of which may generate reverse sensitivity effects, which operate most efficiently in close proximity to key roads should be able to locate in existing appropriately zoned business areas”.</i></p> <p>Amend Item 13 of Policy 2.6.5 to insert the following as a new bullet after the fourth bullet: <i>“Large format retail”.</i></p>	<p>Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd</p>
110/12	Warehouse Stationery Limited		
254/3	North Shore	Amend Policy 2.6.5.13 to include a note with	Opposed By:

	City Council	the following words: <i>“This Policy shall be used as a guide to the location of certain business types and compliance with it shall not be mandatory where local circumstances preclude such compliance”.</i>	107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 257 Waitakere City Council
--	--------------	---	--

Discussion:

Submissions **289/8**, **255/49**, **253/21**, **256/15** and **294/26** seek the deletion or amendment of Policy 2.6.5.13 on the basis that it is difficult to understand, incomprehensible, there is no explanation in the reasons and seems to relate solely to reverse sensitivity issues. It is acknowledged that this policy lacks some clarity. The Panel does not support the prescription of types of businesses and/or activities to be located in high density centres and corridors. Policy 2.6.5.13 and policy 2.6.5.6 have therefore been amended (with a consequent change to policy 2.6.5.14). The Panel further recommends that the term “large scale business” be replaced by the term “land extensive business activities”; this term is defined in the definition section. These changes are considered to go some way in addressing the concerns of these submitters.

Evidence presented by **submitter 253** (Manukau City Council) supported the officer’s recommended changes to the RPS, including the addition of Issue 2.4.10.

Submitter **255** (Papakura District Council) presented evidence that Policies 2.6.5.6 and 2.6.5.13 as being too prescriptive and managing activities versus effects. They suggest amending the policies to more fully address the implications of prescriptive land use regulation at a regional level.

Submitter **250** (Auckland Regional Council) presented evidence that Policy 2.6.5.6 be amended to remove the words “be encouraged” in order to provide more certainty in the policy. It is also recommended that the businesses listed in policies 2.6.5.6 and 2.6.5.15 be defined in the RPS.

It is considered that the relief sought by submissions **88/28**, **89/28** and **90/25** would undermine the Growth Concept by enabling growth to occur outside centres and corridors and the requirements of the LGAAA to integrate land use and transport within the region. Evidence tabled by Submitter **157** (Federated Farmers) supports submissions 88/28, 89/28 and 90/25 and requests that they be accepted. The submitter disagrees with the officer’s conclusions and states the report does not consider the benefits of rural business development. The Panel considers that many of the issues raised by submitter **157** are addressed in the “rural issues” section of the RPS.

Submissions **109/12**, **110/12** and **111/12** seek to amend Policy 2.6.5.13, to include large format retail. This policy specifically excludes large format retail, as this activity is considered better suited to locating in centres and corridors. Work to support the development of the BLS identified a shortage of vacant land for land extensive business sectors that are unable to locate in centres and corridors. Consequently, Policy 2.6.5.13 seeks to exclude large format retail from non-centre business areas, whilst Policy 2.6.5.6 seeks to encourage retail trade of all formats into centres and corridors.

Evidence presented by submitter **109** (The Warehouse Ltd) stated that it is important that flexibility be built into planning documents to enable the establishment of various retail formats and support the differing needs of retail types.

Submitter **111** (National Trading Company) presented evidence that a centres and corridors approach, which allows large format/supermarket retail to establish on transportation corridors and in centres will help to meet the likely demand for retail space.

Submission **254/3** seeks to add a note to this policy because, at the time of submission, the BLS had not been adopted. Since it has now been adopted by the ARC, the location of business activities is more certain. Submitter **254** (North Shore City Council) tabled evidence that the Regional Growth Forum has identified a number of further workstreams following the receipt of the BLS as part of the review of the RGS. North Shore City Council has not yet endorsed the BLS or completed their workstreams, which the submitter states is necessary for undertaking an assessment of the economic future affecting the business demand for land within the region. This policy is not intended as a guidance note and therefore this submission is rejected.

Panel Recommendation:

5.62 The Panel recommends:

5.62.1 Submissions **289/8, 88/28, 89/28, 90/25 109/12, 110/12, 111/12** and **254/3** are rejected

5.62.2 Submissions **255/49, 250/11, 253/21, 294/26 and 256/15** are accepted in part

5.63 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.62.1 and 5.62.2 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

5.64 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the ARPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of recommendation 5.62.2 above. That is, *policies 2.6.5.6, 2.6.5.14, 2.6.5.15, and definition of land extensive business activities.*

27 2.6.5.14 Reverse Sensitivity

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
250/12	Auckland Regional Council	Amend policy 14 to read: <i>"In those business areas identified as appropriate for accommodating activities listed in Policy 2.6.5.13 above, residential activities shall only be provided where they do not reduce capacity for business activities as a result of, and where there is no likelihood of reverse sensitivity issues arising."</i> In order to prevent residential take-up of business land for capacity reasons, not just to minimise future reverse sensitivity issues between residential and business activities.	Supported By: 257 Waitakere City Council
289/9	Auckland International Airport Limited	Amend 2.6.5.14 as follows (deletions in strikethrough, added text underlined): <i>"In or near those business areas which are identified as appropriate for accommodating activities which involve air or noise emissions or which involve the manufacture and storage of hazardous or noxious substances, listed in Policy 2.6.5.13 above residential or other sensitive activities shall only be established provided where they do not constrain reduce capacity for business activities due to their sensitivity to those business activities as a result of reverse sensitivity issues."</i>	Supported By: 196 Winstone Aggregates 193 Contact Energy Limited 580 Mighty River Power Limited 290 Ardmore Airport Limited Support and Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council

Discussion:

Submission **250/12** seeks to amend Policy 2.6.5.14 to clarify the residential and business activity reverse sensitivity issue. Evidence presented by Submitter **250** (Auckland Regional Council) supports the planning officer's recommendation.

Submission **289/9** also seeks to amend Policy 2.6.5.14 by making a number of text changes. Submitter **580** (Mighty River Power) tabled a letter at hearings in support of the officer's recommendations with regard to submission 289/9.

The Panel consider that it is appropriate that the amendment suggested in submission **250/12** is made, in order to clarify that this policy seeks to prevent the take-up of business zoned land for residential purposes, if this reduces capacity for business growth. The first sentence of policy 2.6.5.14

has been deleted as a result of changes to policies 2.6.5.6 and 2.6.5.13. the relief sought by submission **289/9** is considered inappropriate as it does not specifically relate to business zoned land; it also includes land nearby. However to go some way to address the concerns of submission **289/9** Policy 2.6.5.14 has been amended to include residential and 'other sensitive activities'. It is considered this will in part address the concerns of the submitter.

Panel Recommendation:

5.65 The Panel recommends:

5.65.1 Submission **250/12** is accepted

5.65.2 Submission **289/9** is accepted in part.

5.66 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.65.1 and 5.65.2 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

5.67 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the ARPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of 5.65.1 and 5.65.2 above. That is, *policy 2.6.3.14* and *2.6.5.14*

28 2.6.6 Methods - Urban Structure

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
208/2	Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited	Amend the Plan Change to include in Method 2.6.6 'Urban Structure' a requirement for Councils to include rules which avoid adverse effects on the amenity and vitality of existing town centres and sub regional centres.	Opposed By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 109 The Warehouse Ltd Support and Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council

Discussion:

Submission **208/2** seeks to amend Method 2.6.6 to include a requirement for Councils to have rules that avoid adverse effects on the amenity and vitality of existing town centres and sub regional centres. This method as currently set out directs the ARC and TA's to achieve appropriate levels of intensification as described in Appendix H. Therefore, the suggestions of this submission would be inconsistent with this method. It also considered that the vitality of existing centres are addressed in the policies 2.6.2 urban containment and 2.6.5 urban structure.

Panel Recommendation:

5.68 The Panel recommends:

5.68.1 Submission **208/2** is rejected.

5.69 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.68.1above, are accepted or rejected accordingly.

29 2.6.7 Reasons – Urban Structure

N0.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
86/6	Cornerstone Ltd	Amend clause 2.6.7 to include greater recognition of large format employment requirements and the importance of appropriately located 'brownfield' and 'greenfield' areas in accommodating such	Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 257 Waitakere City Council

		activities.	108 Progressive Enterprises Limited
250/13	Auckland Regional Council	Amend paragraph 7 starting “ <i>Allowing residential activities...</i> ” ending “ <i>...by the introduction of incompatible activities.</i> ” by adding those words underlined “ <i>...in close proximity to industries which emit significant noise, <u>air</u>, emissions...</i> ”	Supported By: 257 Waitakere City Council

Discussion:

Submission **86/6** seeks to amend section 2.6.7 – Reasons to include reference to large format employment requirements. This plan change seeks to enable sustainable economic growth within the policy direction contained in the ARGS Growth Concept. The Growth Concept puts greater emphasis on urban intensification than urban expansion with most urban growth focused around centres and major passenger transport routes. It is considered that the amendments as recommended in section 5B of this report, in particular 2.4.10, will go some way to address the concerns of this submitter.

Submission **250/13** seeks to insert the word ‘air’ in paragraph 7 for greater clarification. Evidence presented by Submitter **250** (Auckland Regional Council) supported the planning officer’s recommendation. The Panel consider the additional wording suggested by submitter **250** is appropriate as it clarifies the types of effects from some industries.

Panel Recommendation:

5.70 The Panel recommends:

5.70.1 Submission **86/6** is accepted in part with no further changes recommended to the RPS.

5.70.2 Submission **250/13** is accepted.

5.71 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.70.1 and 5.70.2 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

5.72 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the ARPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of 5.70.2 above. That is, *section 2.6.7*.

30 Various submission high traffic generating activities

NO.	Submitter	Summary of Decision Sought	Further Submitter/s
111/15	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited	Amend Policy 2.6.8.1 to include a new item (o) being: <i>“High traffic generating activities are able to be located within town centres, on the periphery of centres or on corridors with good accessibility for private motor vehicles.”</i>	Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited
109/15	The Warehouse Ltd		
110/15	Warehouse Stationery Limited		Opposed By: 257 Waitakere City Council 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
109/17	The Warehouse Ltd	Delete Policy 2.6.11(e) and replace with the following: <i>“The opportunity for the establishment of high</i>	Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 108 Progressive

111/17	The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited	<i>traffic generating activities in both town centre and transport corridor locations should be enabled. The appropriateness of either location for such activities will vary depending upon such factors as operational requirements and the availability of suitable sites."</i>	Enterprises Limited 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 257 Waitakere City Council 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd
110/17	Warehouse Stationery Limited		Opposed By: 107 Westfield (New Zealand) Limited 300 IMF Westland Ltd 258 Auckland Regional Transport Authority 257 Waitakere City Council 108 Progressive Enterprises Limited 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited Support and Opposed By: 300 IMF Westland Ltd
107/20	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	Amend the RPS change to include a new policy 4.4.7.4 as follows: <i>"High vehicle generating activities should be discouraged from establishing adjacent to congested corridors".</i>	Supported By: 208 Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited
108/21	Progressive Enterprises Limited		Opposed By: 110 Warehouse Stationery Limited 111 The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited 257 Waitakere City Council 109 The Warehouse Ltd

Discussion:

Submissions **111/15**, **109/15** and **110/15** request an additional policy that allows for high traffic generating activities to be located on the periphery of centres or corridors with good private vehicle accessibility.

The National Trading Company (**111/15**) presented further evidence stating that the type of change requested by them will not diminish the role and function of centres and at the same time will better enable communities to provide for their well-being in the manner anticipated by the RMA. They consider that planning for the region's growth complemented by a multi-modal transport system must recognise both corridors and centres as potentially suitable locations for retail activity and that corridors offer opportunities for large format retail and supermarkets that are not available in most centres. Accordingly, submitter **111/15** seeks that their submission is accepted.

Submissions **109/17**, **111/17** and **110/17** request that Policy 2.6.11.1 (e) be deleted and a new policy be inserted. It is not considered appropriate to delete this policy as a key principle of the Growth Concept is transport accessibility and therefore being located on transport corridors with good public transport service is considered appropriate.

Evidence presented by submitter **109** (The Warehouse Ltd) states that if development is restricted to town centres the result may not be to strengthen them, but rather restrict access to a variety of retail formats. Submitter **109** states that large format retail can be accommodated in corridors and inclusion of a new policy supporting high traffic generating activities. The Panel does not support the prescription of types of business and/or activities to be located in high density centres and corridors.

Evidence presented by Submitter **300** (IMF New Zealand Ltd) supported the officer's recommendations for submissions **109/17, 110/17, 111/17**.

Submissions **107/20** and **108/21** seek that a new policy be included that discourages to location of high traffic generating activities adjacent to congested corridors. The Panel consider that the existing framework contained within the RPS adequately addresses the location of high traffic generating activities. In terms of congested corridors, this will be addressed through the integrated transport assessment process.

In summary, the Panel considered substantial evidence including submissions and evidence presented at the hearings in regard to the appropriate location of high traffic generating activities in centres and corridors. The Panel considered that a more comprehensive approach was necessary to address this issue, as noted in the Key Issues Report attached ("centres and corridors" discussion). A new method (2.6.12.10) is now proposed which outlines the development of a classification framework for centres and corridors; this framework will seek to provide guidance on appropriate activities in these locations. Submissions **111/15, 109/15, 110/15, 109/17, 111/17** and **110/17** are therefore accepted in part in so far as the Panel recognises the need for more clarity in the RPS on this issue.

Panel Recommendation:

5.73 The Panel recommends:

5.73.1 Submissions **111/15, 109/15, 110/15, 109/17, 111/17** and **110/17** are accepted in part.

5.73.2 Submissions **107/20** and **108/21** are accepted in part. No changes to the RPS are required.

5.74 That the further submissions made in support of or in opposition to the submissions noted in 5.73.1 and 5.73.2 above, are accepted or rejected in whole or in part, accordingly.

5.75 That the Auckland Regional Policy Statement is amended in the manner indicated in the revision of the ARPS attached to this Recommendation Report, in satisfaction of 5.73.2 above. That is, *method 2.6.12.10*.

APPENDIX 1

Recommended amendments to RPS Change 6

See the attached Panel Recommendation Version of RPS Change 6, which forms Appendix 1 to this report. Appendix 1 incorporates the amendments to RPS Change 6 resulting from all Panel recommendations.