



*Foundation for Research, Science and Technology
Learning Sustainability – OPSX0303*



Manaaki Whenua
Landcare Research

Report on Local Community Perceptions of Liveability

Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan

**Final Draft for Auckland City Council use
22 December 2005**

by Kathryn Scott* and Angela Shaw^o

*Landcare Research
Private Bag 92170
Auckland, New Zealand

Telephone: +64 9 574 4100

^oOpus International Consultants Limited
Environmental
Level 3, The Westhaven
100 Beaumont Street, PO Box 5848
Auckland, New Zealand

Telephone: +64 9 355 9500
Facsimile: +64 9 355 9584

Date: December 2005
Reference: 520951.02
Status: Draft

This document is the property of Opus International Consultants Limited.
Any unauthorised employment or reproduction, in full or part is forbidden.

Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Purpose.....	1
1.2	Research Aim.....	1
1.3	Rationale.....	2
1.4	Research Design.....	2
2	What is Liveability?	3
3	Legislative Context.....	4
3.1	Local Government Act, 2002.....	4
3.2	Resource Management Act, 1991.....	5
3.3	Land Transport Management Act, 2003.....	5
4	Policy Context.....	6
4.1	Summary of the Key Components of the Policy Context.....	6
5	Socio-Economic Context	7
5.1	Population.....	7
5.2	History.....	8
6	Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan Process	9
6.1	Rational for Selection of Glen Innes.....	9
6.2	History of Council Involvement in Glen Innes.....	9
6.3	Liveable Community Plan Process.....	10
6.4	The Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan.....	12
6.5	Residential 8 Zoning.....	12
7	Discourse Analysis.....	14
7.1	Introduction.....	14
7.2	Vitality.....	15
7.3	Form.....	16
7.4	Safety.....	18
7.5	Accessibility/ Mobility.....	20
7.6	Amenity.....	22
7.7	Local Economy.....	23
7.8	Recreation and Community Facilities.....	24
7.9	Infrastructure.....	26
7.10	Sustainability Principles.....	27
7.11	Social Processes.....	28
7.12	Health/ Education.....	30
7.13	Affordability.....	31
7.14	Design.....	33

Deleted: 16 August 2006

8	Media Comment	35
9	Comparison of discourses	37
10	Conclusions	39
11	References	41
	Appendix A: Learning Sustainability: Research Programme Overview	44
	Appendix B: Policy Context	48

Deleted: 16 August 2006

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this technical report is to identify the dominant themes within discourses around the liveability aspects of urban settlement forms. It is intended to address the following objective, milestone and output of the Learning Sustainability programme¹:

Objective 2	Settlement Form Liveability (Social and Economic)
Milestone 1	Complete preliminary investigation of resident's views of settlement liveability by qualitative enquiry in at least two New Zealand settlements
Output 3	Technical report on findings on local community perceptions of liveability based on qualitative inquiry in a case study area

This report reviews the range of resident and council views on liveability in one location (Glen Innes, Auckland) based on documentation related to a particular consultation process. The aim is to develop an understanding of the key issues in relation to liveability and to investigate these further under Objective Two of the programme. The research findings presented in this report will also contribute towards the broader Learning Sustainability research programme in terms of developing an understanding of liveability aspects of urban settlement form, in particular the way people want to live in the New Zealand context and the factors that drive our preferences.

1.2 Research Aim

The research examines discourses around liveability, as expressed during the development of one strategic planning document at the local council level - the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan in Auckland City. The research involves identifying dominant themes around liveability as expressed by the Auckland City Council (Council) and by the community (those involved in the consultation process) and identifying the factors that underpin these dominant themes. Some comparisons are made between these two stakeholder groups with similarities and divergences in definitions of liveability being identified. The next phase of the research will involve a more in-depth analysis based on interviews and focus groups with key stakeholder groups.

In this report, the discourses are contextualised within the legislative, policy and socio-economic climate in which the Liveable Community Plan was developed. It is recognised that the strategic decision-making process undertaken by Council relies on technical advice, consultation outcomes, budgetary constraints and is bounded by the existing legislative framework.

¹ The Learning Sustainability research programme is a six-year programme (2003-2009), funded by the Foundation for Science, Research and Technology, aimed at identifying how getting the right forms of settlements will enable the delivery of the best mix of environmental, economic, and social performance (see Appendix A). The research is led by Opus International Consultants, with Landcare Research and the University of Auckland as project partners.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

The research does not judge the merits of any particular view on liveability, but rather focuses on gathering the views and understanding their basis. Subsequent phases of research will identify any variance or convergence of view with other stakeholders e.g. developers or the public/governance sector.

1.3 Rationale

Liveable communities or neighbourhoods are increasingly a focus in planning literature, including concern for suitable urban design, transport options, housing choice and local employment. In relation to settlement form, Council is developing Liveable Community Plans for those areas of Auckland which have been targeted for intensification based on proximity to town centres and transport nodes. Community consultation is one part of the process in developing these plans, giving members of the public an opportunity to express their views on how they want their urban environment to look and the type of neighbourhoods they want to live in.

Community consultation has become a significant component in legislative frameworks, particularly the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) and the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA). This is based on increasing acknowledgement of the need for communities to articulate their views of social, cultural, economic and environmental sustainability and the elements that they perceive as important in shaping local futures.

This research examines discourses on liveability as expressed during the process of development of the Liveable Community Plan for Glen Innes (2000- 2004). Considerable controversy surrounds intensification plans in Glen Innes and, as a case study area, it is therefore useful for identifying and examining the diverse discourses around the liveability aspects of urban settlement forms.

1.4 Research Design

This research involved the review of documentation associated with the development of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan (Auckland City, July 2004b) using a process of discourse analysis. The documents and processes reviewed are specified in section 6.4 of this report below and included planning documents, written submissions, records from public hearings held and media reports.

In the first instance, the researchers liaised with Council staff involved in the consultation process and the development of the Liveable Community Plan. It was agreed that the development of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan would provide a suitable process for analysis of liveability, although Council staff considered that there were differences between the issues expressed in Glen Innes and those expressed in relation to other Liveable Community Plans (e.g. Avondale or Newmarket²). Council gave consent for the researchers to review all relevant documentation, and provided office space for the initial review of documents to take place. Documentation was then

² For example, the submissions received for the Avondale Liveable Community Plan were less concerned about intensification and more focused on the quality of design, possibly because due to a high migrant population in Avondale who were more accustomed to higher density living.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

reviewed over a series of visits and the discourse analysis undertaken. The documents and processes reviewed are outlined in sections 4 and 6 of this report.

Discourse refers to all the ways in which people communicate with one another using a system of signs, symbols and practices through which we make sense of the world (Gregory, 1994; Pratt, 1996). Discourse analysis focuses on the structure, content, and language of people's attitudes and perceptions. In this research, we analysed the popular and professional discourses of liveability as expressed in a specific consultation process (Jones, 1995)³. The analysis involved the identification of common themes and differences in the way people expressed themselves in relation to liveability, and the underlying structures of attitudes, perceptions, expectations and aspirations were also considered. This was done by firstly identifying key words in the text, and then by examining connections between key words to develop themes.

A process of mind mapping was also used to assist with analysis of connections between themes, and the way themes were ordered or prioritised in the different discourses. The key themes in the Council's discourse were arranged on a "floating" mind map, with the themes then ordered according to priority given in the discourse. This process was then followed for community discourse, and comparisons made.

During the process of the research, relationships were built with key representatives of Council and the Ka Mau Te Wero community development project in Glen Innes. This has been vital to the research process and will contribute towards the development of a case study area for the wider research programme in the future.

2 What is Liveability?

In the last 10 to 15 years the term liveability has been adopted by local government authorities, internationally and locally, as a means of articulating desired social and environmental outcomes in urban environments. Liveability is one element of the new urbanist agenda which has had a significant influence on urban development in the last decade or so. New urbanism is based on the principles of compact urban form and enhancing community, with an underlying assumption that alteration to urban form will and can lead to improved social and environmental outcomes (Dixon and Dubuis, 2003; Godschalk 2004; Southworth and Parthasarathy, 1997). Compact, mixed use, pedestrian-friendly developments are intended to provide public places for people to interact, reduce reliance on cars and facilitate improved efficiency and uptake of alternative transport systems (including public transport, walking and cycling). Another related concept is Smart Growth, a predominately US-based concept which focuses on constraining sprawl through growth management legislation.

Liveability refers to a range of features, usually related to the physical environment, which are intended to make a place good to live in. Aspects of public space, transportation systems and building design are commonly associated with liveability (Godschalk 2004). However, a review of the literature reveals that the term is used in a range of ways, usually in reference to place, but often used interchangeably with "quality of life", "amenity", "quality of place", "quality urban design"

³ Private (reflexive self, internal dialogue) and lay (used in everyday lives) discourses were not accessible through this research process. The academic discourse of liveability is reviewed elsewhere (Scott, 2005).

Deleted: 16 August 2006

and/or “sustainable neighbourhoods/communities” (Scott, 2005). While “quality of life” refers to the well-being of the individual and has its roots in psychology, “quality of place” relates to the attributes of a specific geographic area (Van Kemp, 2003; Sawicki, 2002). For this reason, liveability is more often closely aligned with “quality of place”, particularly in its use in land use planning by local government authorities.

In their review of current measures of settlement liveability in New Zealand, Thomas, Cleland and Walton (2004) state that the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE) offers the best discussion on liveability, defining the term as:

“...unique combinations of amenity values (e.g. open space, design features, urban vegetation); historic and cultural heritage; location; and intangibles such as character, landscape and “sense of place” (PCE, 1998:37).

Council (June 2000) states that liveable communities:

- Are safe
- Encourage walking and cycling
- Are attractive
- Offer a choice of lifestyle
- Have mixed use at their core
- Have access to a choice of transport
- Create a sense of belonging.

The PCE definition holistically connects social and environmental sustainability goals, while the Council definition places particular focus on design and amenity planning and is underpinned by issues of spatial scale of the built environment.

3 Legislative Context

The Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan was developed in the context of the LGA, RMA and the LTMA. All of these Acts have requirements for community consultation. The key influences of each of these pieces of legislation are discussed below.

3.1 Local Government Act, 2002

The purpose of the LGA is to:

- Provide frameworks and powers for local authorities to decide which activities they will undertake and the manner in which they will undertake them
- Promote the accountability of local authorities to their communities
- Provide for local authorities to play a broad role in promoting the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of their communities, taking a sustainable development approach.

Under the LGA, local authorities must prepare Long-Term Council Community Plans (LTCCPs) which cover a ten-year period. LTCCPs must include:

- Community outcomes – Including a description of how the outcomes have been identified
- Identification of how the local authority will contribute to the achievement of outcomes
- Outline of how the local authority will work with other agencies to achieve the outcomes
- The measures to be used to assess progress against the community outcomes.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

Following on from the development of the LTCCP, local authorities then develop an implementation plan that sets out how the council will achieve the identified community outcomes that they are responsible for. It is important to note that the outcomes identified in the LTCCP are community outcomes and therefore the responsibility for achieving them does not rest solely with Council. An issue that this raises is who the partners actually are that are responsible for delivering on the community outcomes. Central government, non-governmental organisations, the private sector, Māori and other groups are all involved in the promotion and delivery of community outcomes through various formal and informal arrangements.

3.2 Resource Management Act, 1991

The purpose of the RMA is specified in section 5 and is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. This means managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way or at a rate which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety; while

- Sustaining the potential of resources to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations
- Safe-guarding the life supporting capacity of air, water and ecosystems
- Avoiding, remedying and mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.

The RMA establishes broad principles within which councils are free to develop their own approach to sustainable management on the basis of avoiding or mitigating adverse environmental effects. Regional councils are responsible for managing water, soil, air and coasts, mitigating natural hazards and hazardous wastes, managing contaminant discharges and land transport, while district and city councils have a much wider mandate for district planning, noise control, hazard mitigation and land subdivision.

The RMA provides a hierarchy of plans. This includes provision for national and regional policy statements that set a statutory framework within which regional and district plans are prepared. Regional policy statements and regional coastal plans prepared by regional councils, and district plans prepared by district and city councils, are mandatory. In effect, Council plans developed under the umbrella of the RMA determine the policy framework within which specific development proposals are considered. Consultation is always undertaken in the preparation of RMA plans and there is always an opportunity for formal submissions.

3.3 Land Transport Management Act, 2003

The purpose of the LTMA is to contribute to the aim of achieving an integrated, safe, responsive, and sustainable land transport system. To achieve this the Act sets up a framework that provides an integrated approach to land transport funding and management and improves social and environmental responsibility in land transport funding, planning, design and management. Put simply, the LTMA broadens the scope of the transportation industry beyond roads to include:

- Walking, cycling, cars, trucks, trains, coastal shipping, ferries, barges
- The infrastructure, goods, and services facilitating that transport
- Public transport.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

The Act also introduces the concept of sustainability to all levels of decision-making. To obtain subsidies or funding from Land Transport New Zealand project proponents need to take into account how their project/activity:

- Assists economic development
- Assists safety and personal security
- Improves access and mobility
- Protects and promotes public health
- Ensures environmental sustainability.

4 Policy Context

4.1 Summary of the Key Components of the Policy Context

Table One below contains a summary of the key components of the policy context (as described in more detail in Appendix Two below). It is acknowledged that there are also a number of other strategic plans that the Liveable Community Plan is required to adhere to (e.g. related to open spaces, transport, etc.).

Table One: Summary of Key Components of the Policy Context

Auckland Region	Auckland Regional Growth Strategy: 2050	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth will be managed by promoting quality, compact urban environments (intensification) • Most growth will be within the existing metropolitan area • Most urban growth will be focussed around town centres and major transport routes to create higher density mixed use communities
	Central Sector Agreement	<p><u>Auckland City Council</u> will pursue the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A compact city offering a range of lifestyle choice, high environmental values and quality compact urban living • Concurrent and related economic and population growth • Growth in the CBD, town centres, major public transport nodes and at significant road intersections • Pedestrian-friendly streets • Complete and strong communities • A transport system that delivers access and mobility • Quality urban design, streetscape and maintenance of amenity • Protection of heritage, character and natural features <p><u>Auckland Regional Council</u> will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a regional open space strategy for the management and acquisition of open space • Develop a regional approach to the management and retention of employment/business capacity • Work with others to deliver a comprehensive transport system to give improved access to areas of growth
Auckland City	Focus on the Future (2004) - LTCCP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a framework for resource allocation decisions • Key outcomes to be achieved are defined as being Auckland leadership, effective transport, celebrating and recognising diversity, unique and valued environment, economic prosperity, strong and healthy communities and urban intensification
	Growing our City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The aim is to accommodate growth in Auckland City over the next 50

Deleted: 16 August 2006

	through Liveable Communities 2050	<p>years while preserving liveability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liveable communities are safe, encourage walking and cycling, are attractive, offer a choice of lifestyle, have mixed use at their core, have access to a choice of transport and create a sense of belonging
	Auckland City Growth Management Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key messages include that Auckland is a growing city, growth must be planned for, building a compact city, identifying where growth should happen (areas of stability and areas of change, the role of urban design and the link to transport) • Implementation is through Liveable Community Plans
Suburb	Tamaki Edge Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An urban regeneration project that provides context and guidance for the Liveable Community Plan process • A response to the Regional Growth Strategy, under the umbrella project of Smart City, which aims to manage and grow Auckland City holistically • Involves five work streams: transport, liveable communities, catchment management plans, social infrastructure, and equipping the community for change
	Liveable Community Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liveable Community Plans provide the specific planning framework for managing growth and will be developed for each community within an area of change
Site	District Plan, Design Guides	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certain components of Liveable Community Plans will be able to integrated into the regulatory framework (e.g. Residential 8 zone and Residential Design Guide)

5 Socio-Economic Context

5.1 Population

Glen Innes is a suburb in East Auckland which has relatively low standards of living in comparison to the rest of Auckland, and particularly in comparison to adjacent suburbs (Glendowie, St Heliers, Remuera and St Johns). Census data from 2001 indicates that Glen Innes and Point England rate in the highest decile of deprivation in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2001).

Disparities in social statistics also exist within the four census unit areas of Glen Innes (Glen Innes North, Glen Innes East, Glen Innes West, Point England). The 2001 census showed:

- The median personal income for Glen Innes ranged from \$11,300 in Point England to \$23,500 in Glen Innes North (compared to \$23,300 for Auckland City)
- The unemployment rate ranged from 19.9% in Point England to 6.1% in Glen Innes North (compared to 7.9% for Auckland City)
- One-parent families accounted for 36.1% in Point England and 16.9% of all families in Glen Innes North (compared to 19% for Auckland City)
- In Point England 16.1% of people aged 15 years and over had post-school qualifications compared to 41.5% in Glen Innes North (compared to 32.2% for Auckland City)
- 49% of homes in Glen Innes were rented or leased (compared to 36% for Auckland City) and 24% were owned with a mortgage (compared to 32% for Auckland City).

Glen Innes has a youthful population, with 18% percent being in the 0 - 9 age group (compared to 13% for Auckland City). It is an ethnically diverse suburb, with a considerably higher Māori and Pacific population than in the Auckland City as a whole, as shown in Table Two below.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

Table Two: Ethnicity of Glen Innes Population Compared to Auckland City

Ethnic Group	Glen Innes	Auckland City
European	50%	66%
Māori	17%	8%
Pacific	34%	14%
Asian	10%	19%
Other		1%

Source: New Zealand Census, 2001

Glen Innes is characterised by a predominance of state housing, accounting for around 60 percent of housing in Glen Innes (and up to 90% in some streets). State housing developments include the much-maligned “Star flats” - three-storied multi-duplex buildings situated near the town centre – as well as terrace houses and many stand-alone houses.

Between 1991 and 2001, the Glen Innes population increased by 1440 people, with 231 additional homes being built (Auckland City, 2004b). The population of Glen Innes is projected to increase by approximately 3000 people, with an additional 900 homes, over the next 20 years. Council aim to cater for this increased population and to provide for housing choice through intensified development.

5.2 History

Glen Innes is situated on the northern fringe of Tainui territory. In pre-European times, Māori built a strongly fortified pā called “Taurere”, meaning “the Loved One Flown Away”, the loved one being Pare-Huia, the handsome young daughter of the chieftain Titahi. Taurere was situated on a multi-peaked scoria cone now known as “Taylor’s Hill”, and had the capacity to hold 2000 people. The pā was served by the port on Tahuna Torea (the Sandspit), where hundreds of canoes could be pulled up at one time. Tahuna Torea was an important junction in trading routes between Māori from Manukau (for their smoked eels) and Mahurangi (for their smoked mullet) (Gunn, 1994).

Glen Innes takes its name from William Innes Taylor, who settled in Auckland in 1843 and farmed in Glen Innes for 50 years. The post-war baby boom, migration of rural Māori to Auckland and planning policies contributed to a significant increase in the population in the broader Tamaki area (Shirley, 1979). As a suburb, Glen Innes was developed in the 1950s as a state housing area, including Auckland’s first comprehensively-planned town centre (Auckland City, 2004b). Many of the new migrants to Glen Innes came from Freeman’s Bay, an inner-city suburb which had undergone an urban renewal programme in the 1950s which led to many existing residents leaving the suburb. Other migrants to Glen Innes in the fifties and sixties came from Grey Lynn, Ponsonby, Westmere, Panmure and Arch Hill - all low socioeconomic areas at that time (Shirley, 1979).

Deleted: 16 August 2006

6 Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan Process

6.1 Rational for Selection of Glen Innes

The formal process for preparing the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan began in 2000. Council selected Glen Innes as a priority one area for change that could accommodate future growth, based on the following attributes (Auckland City, 2004b, 7):

- Good access to Central Auckland and to Manukau City by road and rail
- A growing population
- A well-established community and town centre
- The availability of some vacant or underdeveloped residential and business sites
- Natural features and open spaces
- Existing infrastructure can be upgraded to support growth.

This decision was made despite some previous concern within Council that Glen Innes may not be suited to intensification because of the low socio-economic status of residents. The *Glen Innes Community Development Study* included the following comment:

“There is an uncertainty at [sic] to the possible social impact of intensifying the housing stock and increasing the concentration of lower socio-economic groups in the area (Auckland City Council, 1986:4).

This same report also claims that there was little demand for housing for older people in Glen Innes at that time as most elderly people are living there not by personal choice (Auckland City Council, 1986:5).

A more recent social impact assessment of the overall intensification strategy commissioned by Council (Nemec, 2000) also expressed concerns about Glen Innes being targeted for intensification⁴, making the following points:

- Intensification of poorer areas may lead to exacerbation of existing problems, including overcrowding, communicable diseases, limited free or low cost social and recreation facilities, and lack of space and privacy
- Appropriate design of housing and surrounds (planning of communities) may mitigate some of these problems through creating opportunities for extended family to live near each other and share resources, and by providing neighbourhood parks, playgrounds, accessible and safe open spaces, and attractive streetscapes
- It is recommended that intensification be concentrated in relatively well-off areas
- In the poorer areas, it is recommended in the short term, that ways to improve community and social facilities be investigated.

6.2 History of Council Involvement in Glen Innes

Glen Innes, as a predominantly state-housing area with relatively low socio-economic status, has long been regarded as challenging to social service providers and town planners alike. Glen Innes has been the recipient of numerous research and implementation programmes aimed at improving social and economic and outcomes for residents of Glen Innes, as well as to enhance the built environment.

⁴ It is important to note that this is the opinion of the consultant contracted by Council to complete the social impact assessment of the intensification strategy and not the opinion of the Council itself.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

At the commencement of the process for preparing the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan in 2000, Council was able to draw on a range of these research and programmes for information and guidance. These included:

- Glen Innes Mainstreet - Village Improvement Programme (1994) - Initiated by the Glen Innes Business Association
- Glen Innes Community Questionnaire (1997) - A random survey with 1005 households in Glen Innes to obtain community perceptions on community issues, and to gauge knowledge of and use of community facilities
- The Glen Innes Charette (September 1998) - A three day hui where 1500 people discussed change in Glen Innes
- Community and Recreation Facilities Needs Assessment: Tamaki and Otahuhu - Identified the need for a recreation centre which has since been built
- Penrose Ward Safety Audit (1999) - Identified fear of crime and personal safety are increasingly important issues in Glen Innes and in ward as a whole.

Council decided to use existing information from the above sources to begin identifying residents' views about their community and the main issues affecting them, and then engage with the residents and other local stakeholders from this basis of understanding. This decision to begin by examining existing consultation and documentation was made in an effort to reduce consultation overload in the community.

6.3 Liveable Community Plan Process

The Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan process aimed at providing a framework to guide the growth and revitalisation of Glen Innes (Auckland City, 2004b:5). Based on a participatory approach to planning, council undertook consultation with the community throughout 2000, and included:

- Community Group Meetings (February 2000) - Meetings were held with community groups to introduce the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan process
- Drop in Days at Glen Innes Town Centre (March 2000)
- Project newsletters (April, June and August 2000) - Three newsletters were produced to provide project updates
- Visual displays at Glen Innes Easter Festivals (April 2000 and April 2001) - To raise community awareness and interest in the project
- Stakeholder Workshops (May 2000) - 100 stakeholders attended from schools, church groups, iwi groups, businesses, health and welfare organisations, government departments, New Zealand Police, utility and transport operators, Glen Innes Business Association and Tamaki Community Board
- Technical Design Workshops (May 2000) – Development of creative ideas and designs to address issues and concerns raised
- Consultation with representatives of Ngati Whatua o Orakei Trust Board and Ngati Paoa Whanau Trust (May and June 2000) - Key concerns raised were the impacts of growth on stormwater quality, the coastal environment, and cultural heritage sites.
- Box City/Youth Forum (June 2000) - 500 children from four local primary schools were invited to construct their future city of Glen Innes using boxes and other recycled materials
- Planning Open Days (June and July 2000) - 250 people of Glen Innes commented and voted on the ideas and designs from the technical design workshops.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

Following this consultation there was a delay to the process which was caused by issues with the Panmure Liveable Community Plan and the subsequent diversion of Council staff resources. A first draft of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan, *Glen Innes into the Future*, was released by Council in October 2003. A summary was displayed at the Glen Innes Community Library between in October and November 2003 and members of the public were invited to give feedback.

Council received 52 submissions to the draft strategy from residents, the Glen Innes Business Association, Ruapotaka Marae, the Housing Lobby, Housing New Zealand Corporation (HNZC) and Progressive Enterprises Ltd. A hearing was held for oral submissions in April 2004. Key concerns raised in the submissions were the social and economic implications of higher density housing, particularly the increased presence of HNZC tenants, public safety and security, inadequate consultation with the community, and a strong call for improved shopping facilities.

In response to feedback, some additions were made to the draft plan, including:

- An outline of HNZC's responsibilities in relation to community renewal
- Council commitment to advocate for improved state housing allocation policy and housing choices, in collaboration with other stakeholders, including HNZC and Ruapotaka Marae
- Council support for the Glen Innes Business Association to host events and festivals which celebrate the identity and diversity of the community
- Council commitment to advocate for and collaborate towards improved crime prevention
- Council support for iwi relationships and traditional kaitiakitanga associations with the environment
- Council to work collaboratively towards building sustainability into the design of residential housing, to investigate the concept of an integrated waste recovery centre, and to support business practices that reduce waste generation and air pollution
- 11 design elements to control the quality of housing e.g. to prevent overlooking into neighbouring private spaces and living rooms.

Unlike some other Council plan preparation processes, e.g. the preparation of the district plan under the RMA, submitters to the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan had no rights of legal appeal. The Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan is a non-statutory document⁵.

The quality of Council's consultation process has been called into question by some people within the community. A petition signed by 24 people was submitted to council during the submission phase on the draft plan (2003) demanding "meaningful consultation". Some submissions to the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan also stated that inadequate consultation had taken place and that the plan should not proceed until this issue was addressed.

A related and alternative community consultation process has also been undertaken. A local community development project, Ka Mau Te Wero - Rising to the Challenge, undertook a visioning exercise in 2004 and 2005. Ka Mau Te Wero is funded by Ministry of Social Development and is co-managed via Community Partnerships section of the Recreation and Community Services department of the Auckland City Council. The visioning project was initiated on behalf of Glen Innes residents who, despite feeling overloaded by the consultation process, said that they felt that they had had no meaningful input into the LTCCP or to the Liveable Community Plan process.

⁵ The subsequent implementation of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan occurs in part under the RMA, however, and this particular implementation method does allow for appeal to the Environment Court (refer to Section 6.5 below).

Deleted: 16 August 2006

Key priorities identified by Ka Mau Te Wero were Enhancing Community Leadership, Harnessing Glen Innes Pride, Strengthening Community Well-being, and Working Together. The overall aim of the visioning project is to broker the best possible deal for the community based on these priorities (pers. comm, T. Liew, Sept. 2005).

6.4 The Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan

The final Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan is called *Glen Innes Into the Future* and was released in July 2004. The document adopts the seven core principles of the liveable communities strategy and relates them to local Glen Innes situation. The vision outcomes identified for Glen Innes include:

- An attractive, safe and vibrant town centre
- Local employment opportunities
- A variety of housing types to meet the needs of a diverse and growing community
- Improved public transport facilities and services to make it easier to get around
- Pedestrian and traffic safety
- Easy and safe access to community facilities and open space, which meets local needs
- Strengthening community identity and improving public safety
- Protection and enhancement of the natural environment.

The summary of community feedback in the final *Glen Innes into the Future* document summarises the key issues and concerns as:

- For the town centre
- For housing
- For the community
- For transportation
- For community facilities and open spaces
- For the environment.

These are quite different from the summary of community feedback that is outlined in Section 7 of this report below. It is of particular note that the community concerns do not relate to health, education or social processes but instead have been summarised to include references to community spirit, identity, cultural diversity, creative talents and concerns about crime, graffiti, vandalism, security, lighting and lack of local employment opportunities.

6.5 Residential 8 Zoning

The creation of a new Residential 8 Zone is the key implementation method in the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan. The zoning changes are aimed at enabling higher density housing (including town houses, terrace housing and low-rise apartments) within 10-minutes walking distance from the Glen Innes Town Centre and public transport services, within the context of urban design guidelines. These guidelines include criteria for visual and acoustic privacy, landscaping, private open space, energy efficiency and neighbourhood character. Council claims that Residential 8 zoning will put an end to 'battery hen' apartments by requiring a minimum floor area of at least 40m² (Auckland City, 2004b:35). The critical height and density controls for the Residential 8 Zone are shown in Table Three below.

Table Three: Residential 8 Zoning - Height and Density Controls

Deleted: 16 August 2006

Zone	Height	Density
Residential 8a Adjacent to residential areas, within 10 minute walking distance of town centre	Up to 3 storeys (max. 11m.) Town houses and terrace houses	Density up to 1 unit per 150m ²
Residential 8b Adjacent to town centre	Up to 4 storeys (max. 14m.) Multi-unit development consistent with existing town centre commercial buildings	Density up to 1 unit per 100m ²

Source: www.aucklandcity.govt.nz

Council requires all applications for multi-unit developments of eight or more units, and planned unit developments on Residential 8 zoned sites, to be reviewed by the Urban Design Panel. The Urban Design Panel is an advisory body, made up of practitioners and academics, with specialised knowledge of urban design, architecture, landscape architecture, development and property. The panel gives Council decision-makers professional urban design advice and evaluation of key developments within the city.

The first changes to the Auckland City District Plan to introduce Residential 8 zoning to Glen Innes were adopted in 2004. The initial plan change was promoted by HNZC and only applied to an area of state housing known as Talbot Park to accommodate the Talbot Park Renewal Project, including the refurbishment of 108 Star Flat units and the provision of 98 new homes⁶. This community renewal project seeks to address issues of community and personal safety, local employment opportunities, community health concerns, education and social service provision and community pride (HNZC submission to draft *Glen Innes Into the Future* plan).

Council subsequently notified a comprehensive plan change in 2005, known as Proposed Plan Modification 61 (PPM61), to introduce new Residential 8 zoning to Glen Innes. PPM61 affects approximately 481 privately-owned and 684 publicly-owned residential properties⁷. HNZC owns 60% of the land in the area to be zoned for Residential 8.

A total of 586 submissions were received on PPM61. Of these, 466 were pro forma submissions and, of these, 215 came from outside the Glen Innes/ Point England area e.g. from Mount Wellington, Panmure and Glendowie. A cluster of approximately 12 submitters want to see the proposed zone changes extended, to encompass their own properties (and neighbouring properties, in some cases). Residents are concerned that the effect of PPM61 will be considerably more HNZC tenants in the community (David Wong, pers. comm, August 2005). The process of making changes to the Auckland City District Plan is a statutory one and a hearing will be held for all those submitters who wish to make oral submissions. There are legal rights of appeal to Council's decision to the Environment Court.

⁶ Refer to the HNZC website <http://hnzc.co.nz/aboutus/initiatives/communityrenewal/talbot.htm>.

⁷ Proposed plan modification 61 is a plan change that seeks to introduce new Residential 8 zoning to Glen Innes and also to rezone some areas to existing zone Residential 6A. The purpose of this is to provide a buffer area between the more intensive residential 8 zone and the lower density residential 5 zone.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

7 Discourse Analysis

7.1 Introduction

The discourse analysis involved the identification of common themes and differences in the way people expressed themselves in relation to liveability, and the underlying structures of attitudes, perceptions, expectations and aspirations were also considered. This was done by firstly identifying key words in the text, and then by examining connections between key words to develop themes.

In preparing the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan Council undertook an extensive consultation process (as has been outlined in this report). Council have summarised and interpreted the discourse in one way, which is best summarised in Section 6.4 of this report. This section represents the researchers' discourse analysis, which differs from Council's. The source documentation for the discourse analysis was contained in Council's own files and records of the consultation process. These files have been analysed and interpreted. However, because the documentation is Council's the researchers could not always be sure about what were the verbatim words of the discourse and what were those words that reflected Council's interpretation.

The discourse analysis has identified thirteen main themes that Council, the community and other key stakeholders talk about when they consider what liveability means to them. A theme is a cluster of comments related to a common idea. These themes are (in no particular order of importance):

- Vitality
- Form
- Safety
- Accessibility/ mobility
- Amenity
- Local economy
- Recreation and community facilities
- Infrastructure
- Sustainability principles
- Social processes
- Health/ education
- Affordability
- Design.

Each of these themes is discussed in more detail below. Generally, there is a description of the theme before the specific detail for the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan is covered. The themes around liveability as expressed by Council and the community are focussed on in the first instance, although the voices of the University of Auckland (a major land owner and tertiary education provider), Housing New Zealand Corporation (a major landowner and landlord), Ruapotaka Marae, and the Glen Innes Business Association were also able to be separately identified in the desk-top analysis.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

While the “community” talks about the thirteen main themes, it must be recognised that the community discourse identified in this section is not one clearly identifiable voice, but rather a multitude of voices and opinions. Furthermore, those represented as the community in this report includes only those people who took part in the consultation process, and therefore could be skewed towards views held by vocal, articulate residents. The consultation file material held by Council reflects particularly the voices of some individual residents, youth, property owners and community workers. Accordingly, it is these voices and opinions that are presented here as the community discourse on perceptions of liveability.

7.2 Vitality

The theme of vitality encompasses a variety of concepts which seek to express the sense of community wellbeing which primarily exists in public spaces or the public realm. Words used to express the vitality theme include a sense of community, vibrancy, conviviality, cultural diversity, pride of place, belonging, cohesiveness and mix of people. There is a sense that people are talking about the public realm and not the private home when vitality is discussed.

During the preparation of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan the Council, the community and other key stakeholders had the following to say about vitality:

Council

- Greater opportunities for people to use their creative talents
- Support for events that celebrate the cultural diversity of the community
- Desire for a busy/ vibrant atmosphere in the Town Centre
- Reinforce civic value attached to the Town Centre, the public nature of spaces –These need to co-exist with commercial and other land uses and activities.

Community

- The community atmosphere, friendly people and multiculturalism are positive aspects of Glen Innes
- Diversity of cultures and diversity of the Glen Innes Community
- Community pride and spirit
- Links to the University of Auckland Tamaki Campus are important
- Family/ Whanau orientated
- Ideas of a Saturday market and community festivals
- There needs to be a youth focus
- Arts are important
- The motto of Point England School is “Strive to Succeed” – We think this is important for everyone in our Glen Innes Community
- Community for everyone and all ages - It is important that older people are cared for and the young ones have a safe, happy community to grow up in
- We would like Glen Innes to be a community where families do well
- Living together as multi-cultural community
- People who care about each other.

Housing New Zealand

- Retain and enhance key physical features that contribute to community self-identity, such as public spaces and trees
- Creating a positive perception of Glen Innes as a place to live.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

Glen Innes Business Association

- Income mix of residents is important
- Need to attract affluent people and more employment for the whole community to enjoy.

Council's comments about vitality in Glen Innes fall squarely in the market place or public realm, specifically the Town Centre. This reflects their sphere of influence and appears to be activity focussed. The community have an inclusive take on vitality in that it should encompass all people whatever their age or culture. The community is particularly concerned with those aspects of vitality that relate to overall community wellbeing.

7.3 Form

The theme of form is a primary driver of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan process. Form relates specifically to the built environment and how space is used – what goes where. It includes the shape of a settlement and street patterns, the density of housing, the amount of open space within a settlement and the extent to which settlements are single-centred or multi-centred with more than one activity hub. With the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan, the implicit deal being offered by Council is a liveable community in return for the intensification necessary to absorb projected population growth and to offer housing choice. The purpose of the planning process is therefore to determine what liveable means in the Glen Innes context in order to proceed with intensification.

During the preparation of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan the Council, the community and other key stakeholders had the following to say about form:

Council

- Glen Innes is strategically positioned between eastern and south-eastern suburbs on a major arterial
- Provide for more people to live near the Town Centre
- Higher density housing provides a greater range of housing choice and affordability
- Higher density housing is appropriate around reserves
- Town Centre currently lacks dominance as a place - Its low structures do not identify its location or importance, there is no visual unity and it is bland and uninteresting
- Town Centre could be a focal point for retail, business, social and community activities
- Importance of gateway features
- Develop high quality public spaces that: contribute to the experience and use of area and of Auckland City as "First City of the Pacific"; attract and serve as destinations in their own right; satisfy the requirements associated with a wide range of public activities and functions including gathering and outdoor events
- To stimulate appropriate development of areas adjacent to public open spaces, including the street environment, to create active and exciting edge conditions
- Connections are important e.g. between Mayfair Place shops and bulk retail area
- Visual linkages are important e.g. Mayfair Place with Pak'n Save, Tamaki Estuary and Maungarei
- Wide streets encourage dangerous driving and speeding.

Community

- The Town Centre requires upgrading and an integrated shopping centre is necessary

Deleted: 16 August 2006

- More accommodation is required as there is housing overcrowding
- Variety and options are needed in housing to meet multicultural needs – There are a wide variety of living situations
- Dislike intensification of housing and high rise apartments – “No intensification, no infill housing, no pepper-pot rentals, no ghettos”.
- Intensification will create cheap, shoddy housing with insufficient greenery and space
- Intensification could jeopardise community spirit
- A mix of private and public housing is necessary
- Support HNZC upgrading existing state houses to ensure a clean, safe place to live instead of more tenement buildings
- Proximity to school and work is important
- Families and friends being close by is important
- “The location of Glen Innes is good as it is not quite the city and not quite the suburbs – Just that nice in-between”
- Box City is a child’s vision of form – Colourful, wide streets with trees, flowers, a lolly factory and a movie theatre
- Houses are too close together and better quality housing is needed.

Housing New Zealand

- The condition of the built environment itself has become a marker of social exclusion
- Intend scattering houses around a variety of locations
- State housing that looks like any other modern, medium-density development
- Develop a range of housing responses e.g. apartments for singles and couples, family houses, housing for elderly
- Variety in street frontages
- Some HNZC stock is inappropriate in that it does not have off-street parking or garages, is on steep sections or is old and run-down
- Create housing forms that reflect current and future demand for social housing rather than refurbishing
- Family and extended family accommodation is not as easily integrated as one and two-bedroom units – some of the demand for larger homes is being dealt with by infill housing but this is a short-term solution as sites are limited
- HNZC’s plan change request for the Talbot Park Precinct sought to provide an urban structure of walkable neighbourhoods clustering around centres of compatible mixed uses, in order to reduce vehicle dependence for access to employment, retail and community facilities (reflecting the aims of the Residential 8 zone)⁸
- Support an upgrade of town centre and redevelopment of train station.

University of Auckland Tamaki Campus

- Keen for university housing to be provided but generally by the private sector
- Quality urban design is a key part to liveable communities.

During the consultation stage of the development of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan , the Glen Innes community appears to have been reluctant to engage in a debate about settlement form in advance of a resolution to the question of whether Glen Innes is a suitable area for growth and intensification. The community has therefore made few comments about form specifically and are certainly opposed intensification in whatever form it might take. The community only really began to engage in a debate about form when submissions were called for on the proposed

⁸ The Talbot Park Precinct plan change request was granted and is currently being implemented.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

Residential 8 zone – a relatively late stage in the process. The submissions included the following comments:

- *If you truly wish Glen Innes to improve then houses which people could turn into homes would be far better for the community than multi-storey housing.*
- *We feel that by building high density housing in a poor neighbourhood, no matter how well built they are, we will have a slum in just a few years and our neighbourhood will be ruined. It seems from examples overseas that high density works in wealthy or middle class areas but not in poor areas.*
- *At the moment the flats at Talbot Park are being re-vamped. They all look really nice than the tenants move in and they now look like a ghetto. There [sic] verandas look ugly, people drinking outside them and sitting under trees, throwing rubbish outside. It is a waste of money if people are not going to look after them and bring the area down. And now you want to put more of the flats in the area, bring in more people who don't care. On my street there is one area there a lot of housing are put close together. It is the messiest, noisiest area on the whole street and you want us to say yes to more of this. NO THANK YOU.*
- *People are not designed to all live in close proximity to each other. Especially if through circumstances the tenants are at home all day, with not a lot to do. It causes friction and problems. The only shops that will benefit through the extra people in the neighbourhood are the TAB, takeaways, Lotto and pub.*
- *It should not be considered or put in place until the existing issues have been addressed. You are going to put more bricks on a foundation of sand. We do not want it to go ahead at all, we do not agree with the smart city.*
- *Were the 500 children (who participated in Box City) told that in the future they could end up on a 3rd or 4th floor storey of a crime-infested slum?*
- *Need room for children to play, space to socialise.. No money for recreation*

7.4 Safety

Safety was a key theme identified in both the policy and community discourse of liveability. Concerns about threats to personal safety of residents and to property were paramount (theft, vandalism), both at home and in public places such as park and reserves, and in the Glen Innes Town Centre. Safety at night was seen as a particularly important issue to be addressed. Other aspects of safety referred to were safety on and near roads. Community-based approaches to crime prevention, such as Neighbourhood Watch, are not operating in Glen Innes, although Māori wardens have a strong presence in the community.

Council

- Safety is mentioned in four of the eight vision outcomes sought in the Liveable Community Plan, *Glen Innes into the Future* - these relate to safety in the Town Centre, on and near roads, in community facilities and open spaces, and more generalised public safety
- Underpinning the Council discourse around safety is the principle that compact development, with careful attention to design, will lead to improved public safety
- *Glen Innes into the Future* outlines a range of strategies to address safety and crime in Glen Innes, including:
 - Improving public safety and reducing crime by working with New Zealand Police and Māori Wardens
 - Applying Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) techniques to improve the surveillance and visibility of parks, streets, and walkways

Deleted: 16 August 2006

- Improving safety at the railway station by upgrading the station (already completed), and by providing a secure Park and Ride facility
- Designing new housing developments to avoid creating unsafe areas
- Investigating the use of traffic management and streetscape works to reduce traffic speeds along key local roads, and improving pedestrian safety at intersections around the Town Centre
- Council are responsible for reviewing safety aspects related to footpaths, roads, and lighting.

Community

- Drugs and bullying are serious community issues
- Greater housing density, particularly state housing, will lead to increased crime levels
- Greater safety measures needed in reserves, parks and other public spaces, particularly through increased police presence (especially at night time) and improved lighting
- Fence playgrounds for safety of little children
- There is a strong sense of dissatisfaction with policing in Glen Innes e.g. reported local crime was often not recorded or followed up making reporting a futile exercise - *"Police use excessive violence"*
- Different forms of policing are recommended such as community constables and traffic patrol officers
- Graffiti and other forms of vandalism are a problem as they contributed to the general "run down" feel of the place
- Traffic calming techniques needed to improve pedestrian safety.
- High levels of unemployment, lack of money and excess of time availability are felt to increase crime in the community
- The physical environment with poor lighting, especially along walkways and in reserves, contributes to crime
- Lack of safety has a negative impact on the development of a "community spirit".

Glen Innes Business Association

- Concern that retailers are carrying the costs of vandalism, burglary and graffiti e.g. one store closed down after having been burgled three times in one week
- Security cameras are a solution
- There needs to be more balanced allocation of state housing to increase the number of working families in the neighbourhood.

Housing New Zealand

- Safety and security issues are key issues for Glen Innes
- The redevelopment of Talbot Park (higher density housing) will create a safer community e.g. through better streetscapes, improved access connections, better public reserve configuration and upgrading of infrastructure.

Concerns about safety and security issues were mentioned repeatedly during the consultation process and in submissions (including from residents, property owners, youth, community workers and from Ruapotaka Marae). There was a lot of concern about the high crime rate being a feature of a lower-socioeconomic neighbourhood. The following comment reflects this concern:

- *I have been in my place for 15 years and I have been broken into 6 times...A neighbour lost all her money and jewellery etc, and another neighbour was in her lounge with her grandchild when someone came in through the window in her bedroom and took her bags.*

Deleted: 16 August 2006

There is a close correlation between the safety concerns expressed by local stakeholders and those safety issues Council seeks to address through the Liveable Community Plan. However, while Council and HNZN express faith in the principles of CPTED particularly (together with broader crime prevention strategies including policing and education), local stakeholders appear to be unfamiliar with these principles and have considerable concerns about the safety implications of additional lower socio-economic residents living in Glen Innes.

7.5 Accessibility/ Mobility

Transport allows people to access a wide range of work, education, health, social and recreational activities. Lack of access to transport, or lack of convenient and affordable transport choices, can reduce individual or community ability to participate in these activities. The level of mobility people experience with each transport mode - e.g. the private car, walking or public transport - depends on the destinations within reach, as well as the overall quality of the journey. In certain situations transport can impede movement and community interaction, particularly where there are high traffic volumes, severance, transport noise and emissions.

During the preparation of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan the Council, the community and other key stakeholders had the following to say about accessibility and mobility:

Council

- Physical linkages from the town centre to other areas are important e.g. Tamaki Campus, business areas, community centre
- Quality of pedestrian access ways is important e.g. existing underpasses
- There is low use of train station
- Quality of public transport infrastructure needs addressing, including the train station
- Frequency and convenience of public transport services is important, especially to and from work
- Improve footpath standards and maintenance
- Provide good quality routes and facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.

Community

- There needs to be more regular bus services – 24 hour public transport
- There is a need for public transport within Glen Innes as well as to adjacent employment areas e.g. East Tamaki
- Cross-city routes are important
- Train services need to be upgraded as a means of increasing patronage, including on the weekends
- Cheaper fares and integrated ticketing
- Upgrade the bus centre and railway station
- Need better physical connections between town centre, the railway station and Tamaki Campus – These need to be well sign-posted with safe means of crossing the road
- Bus stops have poor design and construction and there needs to be more bus shelters
- Getting to Auckland hospital requires 2 buses – A direct route is required
- Some expressed a high level of satisfaction with transport
- Cycling is unsafe
- There should be space for bikes on trains
- Footpaths require physical upgrades

Deleted: 16 August 2006

- Freight truck routes need to be redirected away from Glen Innes to the motorway or to rail
- Severance needs to be reduced between the shopping centre and Tamaki Campus
- Doubt that transport services will be able to cope with increased population from intensification
- Need to design and construct overpasses or underpasses properly – to plan for bad weather, no blind corners etc.
- Very limited pedestrian crossings in Glen Innes.

Housing New Zealand

- Renewal relates not only to housing but infrastructure and amenities, particularly roading and connectivity with adjacent precincts
- Improved train services on weekends
- Park and ride facilities
- Trucks should be diverted from town centre.

University of Auckland Tamaki Campus

- Physical links to Glen Innes are poor –Dark, overgrown, ugly, unsafe
- Currently a bus service runs between the Tamaki and City campuses – With the University of Auckland establishing at Manukau Institute of Technology there is potential for rail access
- Physical barriers/ severance between Glen Innes and the University.

Ruapotaka Marae

- Improved public access and use of coastal area
- Improved train services on weekends
- Park and ride facilities
- Linkages between train station, bus interchange, town centre and residential areas
- Pedestrian and cycle routes.

Glen Innes Business Association

- Better connections between town centre, railway station and Tamaki Campus
- First priority is road linking Pak 'n Save with Mayfair Place to create a visual link with the Town Centre and encourage vehicle circulation
- Improved train services on weekends.

Improved transport to facilitate accessibility and mobility forms a strong component of the Council's vision of a liveable community. This is evidenced by Councillor Harland's comment at the beginning of the process that "(l)iveable communities' will make it feasible to use a train or bus, or even cycle to where they want to go" (City Scene, 1999). The community and other key stakeholders have a lot to say about the accessibility/ mobility theme and have clearly articulated improvements to the existing transport system, including roading links and not limited to public transport, walking and cycling. This may be because accessibility/ mobility concerns are immediate and current. Some of the other identified liveability themes e.g. infrastructure concerns (storm water, sewerage, water supply) don't always immediately affect daily life meaning that accessibility/ mobility concerns are expressed earlier in the debate over what constitutes a liveable community.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

The Council and the Glen Innes Business Association wanted improved connections between the main retail areas, but while Council wanted to improve pedestrian and cycle links between the areas, the Business Association wanted the areas linked by roads.

7.6 Amenity

Amenity has a communal aspect in that it relates primarily to the public realm or at the neighbourhood scale. It is defined in the RMA as “*those natural and physical qualities and characteristics of an area that contribute to people’s appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes*”. Obviously such a wide ranging definition encompasses a very broad range of often subjective attributes, which are not only challenging to achieve but also to measure progress against.

As a separate component of the broader Learning Sustainability research programme a desktop review of 12 city and district councils has been undertaken to identify what methods are currently being implemented to manage settlement form and spatial arrangement (Shaw, in draft). The most frequent outcome being sought by councils through the control of settlement form was the preservation and enhancement of amenity.

During the preparation of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan the Council, the community and other key stakeholders had the following to say about amenity:

Council

- Provision of shelter, plantings and seating in Town Centre is necessary
- Concerns about graffiti and vandalism
- Rubbish/ litter problems increasing with a growing population
- The Town Centre is visually chaotic and looks tired, dirty and uncared for
- There is a need for consistency in verandahs and signage
- Colour theme and tiling work in Town Centre
- Canopy structure for shelter
- The natural physical environment in Glen Innes is a pleasant one which contrasts with the built environment which is often described as run-down
- Improving the quality of the streets and parks with appropriate landscaping
- Provide for community gardens and improved amenities such as artwork, playgrounds, picnic/barbecue areas and toilets
- Poor maintenance of toilets and poor lighting in parks and reserves are particular problems.

Community

- Graffiti is of concern - People should be aware of how much removing graffiti costs and how much it ruins the appearance of the area
- Neglect of physical environment – Footpaths, rubbish
- General appearance of environment needs improvement
- Private properties have rubbish, need maintenance and are generally untidy
- Much of the HNZN stock is rundown and HNZN should do a better job of cleaning up yards
- To make Glen Innes look really beautiful we would like Council to plant trees and flowers
- Encourage residents to plant up their gardens and look after their verges
- There should be more spaces for performances and more chairs
- Open space and park land is important.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

Housing New Zealand

- Reserve maintenance, rubbish removal, footpath maintenance and appropriate lighting are all important.

Council and residents alike expressed dissatisfaction with the high level of graffiti and vandalism around Glen Innes, contributing to a “run down” feel to the place. There was also general agreement that footpaths, streets, Town Centre, parks and reserves needed vast improvement to complement the very attractive natural environment of Glen Innes.

7.7 Local Economy

This theme is particularly focused on the need for a thriving town centre, and other opportunities to enhance local businesses and employment. Local business is currently mainly situated in the Town Centre and in a small industrial area to the west and south of the Town Centre. The Tamaki Campus of the University of Auckland and Landcare Research are situated adjacent to the industrial area, approximately one kilometre from the Glen Innes Town Centre.

During the preparation of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan the Council, the community and other key stakeholders had the following to say about the local economy:

Council

- Town centre needs to be the retail heart with a stronger tenant mix, a variety of shops that meet the needs of local people and less reliance on a few bulk retailers
- Increasing competition from other retail centres and closures of local retail and business services, including banks, encourages people to shop elsewhere
- Town Centre has five distinct retail destinations, which are not connected, restricting pedestrian access between shops, and collaboration and dialogue between retailers.
- Reconfigure the Town Centre to overcome physical barriers and to create a pedestrianised heart
- Town centre is run-down and dirty in places – It needs physical revitalization to build and support the local economy and to respond to changing social, technological and economic conditions
- Need to maintain and expand the local employment opportunities provided in the industrial area of Glen Innes, particularly through the upgrade of the town centre, renewal of HNZZ’s housing stock, and the expansion of Tamaki Campus
- Build amenities for students to attract them from the Tamaki Campus
- Non-retail activity, e.g. entertainment or recreation, would provide an appropriate and complementary function to the Town Centre.

Community

- Employment opportunities are very limited in the area and a high number of people are not in workforce or are earning a low income – This creates dependency cycles
- Youth made a strong call for local employment opportunities in the GI Youth Forum (2000)
- Shops are close by but lack variety – There are too many liquor stores and bakeries and more clothing and cheap foods shops are needed
- Need to have a town centre that is a vibrant and busy market place
- A few residents expressed a desire for a big shopping mall, offering more variety of shops and a safer feel

Deleted: 16 August 2006

- Residents generally felt that intensification of housing in Glen Innes would not lead to greater vibrancy of the town centre - *"The only shops that will benefit through the extra people in the neighbourhood are the TAB, takeaways, Lotto and pub"*.

Ruapotaka Marae

- Local business and employment opportunities are important.

Housing New Zealand

- Promoting community and economic development is important
- HNZC aims to maximize opportunities for employment and skills development for residents, especially young people, during housing redevelopment in Glen Innes - *"Contractors we employ have to whenever possible employ from the local community. We have a community officer who is specially to work with the community to develop these projects"*.
- Low employability is an issue with many HNZC tenants due to policy of housing those with the greatest need.

Glen Innes Business Association

- Local economy issues are crucial
- Intensification and population growth will be good for business
- There is no retail core, buildings are bland and safety is an issue
- Roothing access is needed to integrate the different retail areas
- Recreation and socialization opportunities are lacking in the Town centre – There is a lack of cafes and meeting places.
- Sign posted walkways between town centre, rail station and Tamaki campus are needed.

Council and the Glen Innes Business Association viewed growth, and a higher density of people near the Town Centre, as good for the local economy because local retail businesses would be more viable. This was a key reason why they favoured intensification of housing. Residents, on the other hand, were more concerned with existing unemployment and low incomes and felt that intensification would bring a higher density of people living on very low incomes. HNZC also identified problems with their housing allocation policy to house those with the greatest need, indicating that many will lack the capacity to take up employment. Council have acknowledged local concerns about unemployment, and state that the growth of the local economy was a means to enhance local employment opportunities (including work being undertaken at Tamaki Campus, NZ Netball Courts, Talbot Park and the Town Centre).

Council and residents wanted to see a greater variety of shops and an upgrade of the town centre. The Council has developed a plan to upgrade and improve access to the town centre, and the first stage has been completed. Other stages will occur as funding becomes available.

7.8 Recreation and Community Facilities

Recreational and community facilities include outdoor facilities such as parks, reserves, sports grounds and playgrounds, and other facilities such as the library, marae, events venues, swimming pools and halls. This theme has a strong link to community processes (see section 7.11 below). The recreation and community theme focuses, however, on "something to do" or "something to use". The social aspect is that these are the places where "community" happens.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

During the preparation of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan the Council, the community and other key stakeholders had the following to say about recreation and facilities:

Council

- Glen Innes has a range of community facilities and parks - As the population grows there is a need to ensure that they remain accessible, safe, visible, usable and meet diverse cultural needs
- Council is committed to providing new and better facilities
- Library is a community focal point
- Glen Innes lacks a music/arts space, an informal drop-in place for young people and a venue for family music events
- Council plans to promote and develop a community facilities precinct at the corner of Line Road and Taniwha Street by improving the community centre and library and providing additional community facilities
- All existing halls and centres have the capacity to increase use
- Council aims to develop new linkages to improve access to and connections between major parks
- Council also intends to work with the community to investigate options for enhancing recreation opportunities at Point England Reserve and along the Tamaki estuary and coastline to cater for a growing population
- Insufficient and inadequate recreational opportunities in a supported or supervised environment for youth
- Trend to ethnic segregation and lack of communication between groups.

Community

- There is not enough for people to do in Glen Innes, particularly for youth
- More appropriate recreational facilities would alleviate problem of transport/ costs
- Glen Innes has some good outdoor facilities, e.g. open spaces, parklands, beaches, close proximity to Tamaki estuary and Mt Wellington – However, outdoor spaces are run down and need upgrading
- Playgrounds for children and open grassy areas for everyone would make Glen Innes a community for families
- Play equipment is limited in Glen Innes reserves
- More pressure will be placed on reserves with increased population
- Reserves need fencing for safety of kids, especially drainage reserves
- Kids reported that they don't like dogs wandering loose
- More sports fields are needed
- Facilities are close by e.g. library, halls, marae
- Marae a focal point for Māori and can be used for education and learning about being Māori
- Lack of variety in recreational facilities – A cultural arts centre is needed
- No venue is big enough for large gatherings – the existing community centre is often booked out
- Awareness and use of facilities is low
- Cost and access barriers to facility use (e.g. swimming pool)
- Types of programmes are not always appropriate
- Most existing facilities have the capacity to increase use
- Need more things for youths to do e.g. skate park, basketball courts, market days, night activities, places to hang out, youth radio, more community events, concerts, children's playgrounds (Youth forum, 2000)

Deleted: 16 August 2006

- A need for personification of community facilities because they are not just “bricks and mortar” - *“It’s a fine building but if you don’t actually have anyone there to run things out of it, it’s just going to stand empty most of the time (community constable)”* – *“...we are not short of Council buildings no I don’t think so - But I think sometimes its like you’ve a building you’ve got a cup with nothing in it (Youth Worker)”* (Forsythe Research, 1999:62)

Ruapotaka Marae

- Upgrading of reserves/parks and community facilities is important.

The Council, residents and Ruapotaka Marae all advocated improvement in recreational facilities in Glen Innes. The Council acknowledged a need to increase facilities as the population grows, and has developed the Tamaki Open Space Strategy, including a priority list of action and potential reserve acquisitions list. The residents perceived a lack of appropriate facilities at present and therefore wanted immediate action. Residents also felt that council had a responsibility to contribute to process of “adding life” to community facilities.

7.9 Infrastructure

Infrastructure as a theme refers primarily to utilities infrastructure and services including stormwater, sewerage and water supply. Often the infrastructure associated with these services is built to cater for a certain population at a specified level of service or standard. When population growth is anticipated the capacity and level of service of utilities infrastructure and services requires review and often upgrading.

During the preparation of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan the Council, the community and other key stakeholders had the following to say about infrastructure:

Council

- Infrastructure (e.g. stormwater, sewerage, water supply) needs to be upgraded to cater for population growth.

Community

- Physical environment upgrades are more important
- Infrastructure needs upgrading.

Infrastructure does not feature strongly in the debate on liveability as it took place during the preparation of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan. The community became more focussed on the capacity of infrastructure during the Residential 8 submission process, perhaps when it became apparent to them that population growth in Glen Innes was likely to be a reality. This later focus on infrastructure concerns (storm water, sewerage, water supply) may be because infrastructure does not always immediately affect daily life, especially where there is sufficient capacity.

At the key stakeholders workshop, held relatively early in the process and before public consultation, the issues of improving the quality of stormwater discharges was raised with stormwater being identified as the major problem. The following comment was made at the key stakeholders workshop - *“intensification is a positive thing because it will make significant improvements by requiring separation of water, sewerage and wastewater systems”*.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

7.10 Sustainability Principles

Sustainability principles include protection and enhancement of environmental, cultural and heritage features. The theme also includes the integration of sustainable design principles into building design e.g. energy efficiency, insulation or rain gardens to treat stormwater. During the preparation of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan the Council, the community and other key stakeholders had the following to say about sustainability principles:

Council

- Accommodate more people with medium to higher density housing to achieve sustainable urban growth
- Working with architects, builders and developers to add sustainability into the design of residential housing e.g. energy efficiency, recycling and waste minimisation, on-site stormwater management
- Value Omaru Creek as a key environmental feature
- Tamaki River and coastline are highly valued natural resources
- Improve the water quality of Omaru Creek and Tamaki River
- Protection of the natural environment is important
- Protecting cultural and heritage features is important.

Community

- Glen Innes is surrounded by the natural boundaries of parklands and is in close proximity to Tamaki estuary and Mount Wellington
- Community wants to be involved in caring for the environment e.g. cleaning up streams
- Green is good
- The Residential 8 zone does not meet RMA requirements for sustainable resource management.

Housing New Zealand

- Refurbishment occurs where the existing housing stock is of good standard and worth keeping
- Wants to promote environmentally sustainable urban forms, particularly with regard to water cycle management and energy conservation.

Ruapotaka Marae

- Improved water quality is important
- Improved stormwater treatment and water quality at Omaru Creek is important.

Beyond the protection and enhancement of key environmental features, the sustainability principles theme does not feature strongly in the debate on liveability in Glen Innes. The integration of sustainable design principles (e.g. energy efficiency, on-site storm water management) into building design has not been raised at all. The lack of focus on sustainability principles might be a function of the fact that while it would be a “nice to have”, sustainability does not feature highly on the list of issues to be dealt with in Glen Innes.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

7.11 Social Processes

This theme includes issues related to community, how the community works, civic engagement, community capacity building, social processes, community development and sense of pride in the neighbourhood and in personal property. This theme cuts across most of the other themes as it is about what aspects of a place bring people together, promote active citizenship and community initiative to create change and a feeling of belonging.

During the preparation of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan the Council, the community and other key stakeholders had the following to say about social processes:

Council

- A strong sense of community is achieved through participation in community issues, events and projects
- Council's role is to facilitate and strengthen inter-agency links, co-ordinate links between community and welfare services, support youth participation in community events, and establish a support forum to identify issues for people with special needs
- Physical revitalisation must be closely related to economic and social revitalisation if it is to enhance the vitality of the Town Centre and foster long-term viability – this revitalisation should nurture and define community identity
- Obstacles to improved sense of community include lack of community participation, fluidity of important stakeholders in the community and lack of integration between the University of Auckland Tamaki Campus and the Glen Innes community.

Community

- Lots of community groups exist
- Marae is a focal point for Māori
- *"Pacific Islanders have community centre, family first and church"*
- Youth and parenting issues are vital to address – Activities, counselling, abuse, sports, venues, employment, direction
- Strength of Glen Innes is that it is a family/ whanau-oriented community
- Diversity in ethnicities in Glen Innes is a barrier to building strong sense of community spirit and an inclusive community - *"There is discrimination because of race and colour"*
- Lower socio-economic characteristics exacerbate social problems - It is essential to address the huge socio-economic issues before considering major changes for the area
- Funding is seen as the key – *"Inject more money to help our community"*
- Desire for more community involvement and working together to address local social issues - *"The community needs to work for themselves and build"*
- Māori submitters were particularly vocal on the need to empower community to do things for themselves, making the following comments:
 - *Community spirit, independence and ownership of own ideas*
 - *Kotahitanga, whanaunatanga, choice*
 - *Not focusing on dependence.*
 - *Community knows what we need, outside agency doing our thinking for us*
- Need for more role models and mentors. Concern that active community members will be overloaded with increased densities of low income residents
- Need for an enhanced sense of pride in Glen Innes
- Frustration and hurt at the extremely poor reputation that Glen Innes has and the impacts of this on the capacity to build a sense of community - As one resident put it, *"attitudes towards GI suck"*.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

- Quality of social services needs improvement to meet local needs - *“There should be places to go when people need support or advice”*
- Need for enhanced interaction between the agencies – opinions were divided over amalgamation of community services
- Access to and location of community services and agencies is important
- *“I’d like to see Glen Innes become an example of how an integrated and cohesive community can become, having overcome history and maximising the region’s natural beauty”*
- Underlying racism, perceptions of new migrants – *“A cultural open day could be a way to allay racism fears”*
- Need for improved community consultation processes by Council as feeling expressed was that council had already decided what was going to happen, then consulted with the community to meet requirements only - strong dissatisfaction expressed by a number of residents through both the Liveable Community Plan and Residential 8 Plan Change processes
- Concern about the quality of relationship with HNZC with more meaningful community consultation required
- Better links and relationship needed with Tamaki Campus.

Ruapotaka Marae

- Educational opportunities for local community are important
- Local community management of community facilities is important
- Call for three way partnership between Glen Innes community, Auckland City and HNZC to implement meaningful consultation
- Consultation for the Liveable Community Plan was conducted between 1998 and 2000 and the community has changed since then.

Housing New Zealand

- The aims of HNZC’s community renewal initiative include creating a safer community, involving community in planning, working with other affordable housing providers and developing a range of housing options
- Those most in need of housing assistance are also likely to have the highest health needs, low employability, and fixed incomes that can barely sustain the household in times of personal crisis
- Actions to improve dwelling standards will not improve resident wellbeing unless accompanied by other activities that promote personal safety, employment opportunity, better health, stronger families and stronger community networks
- Community renewal requires an interactive approach with regular consultation with the people who live there, community groups and agencies - *“It is all about consulting the community and listening and planning with the community of what we want to do”*
- Seek to maximise opportunities for employment and skills development for residents, especially young people - *“Contractors we employ have to whenever possible employ from the local community. We have a community officer who is specially to work with the community to develop these projects”.*
- Seek to increase HNZC level of service to tenants, including integrated case management with other agencies.

University of Auckland Tamaki Campus

- Community is fragmented and therefore difficult to maintain relations with.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

There a strong sense that community engagement in local activities, events and socio-economic initiatives was vital to make sustained changes in Glen Innes. Residents who took part in the consultation process were, however, more likely to be people who are already active in the community. Residents and marae representatives identified community capacity to collaborate with other key stakeholders to address local socio-economic issues, but with a sense that that process needed to be well-supported. The rich diversity of ethnicities was seen as a key positive feature of Glen Innes but also a challenge to developing an inclusive, engaged community.

Submissions from some residents and Ruapotaka Marae criticised Council and HNZN consultation processes, while Council and the University stated that the high turn over of residents in Glen Innes meant that it was difficult to meet the needs of local people. Council acknowledged the existence of many strong community networks and considered that progress should be made through building on these networks. Residents were concerned that Council was focused on the physical attributes of Glen Innes rather than the people that lived there.

7.12 Health/ Education

Council did not directly consider health and in the Liveable Community Plan process as these elements are not part of the 'core business' of Council. The lack of relevant courses offered at the University of Auckland Tamaki Campus for Glen Innes residents was considered an obstacle to participation and collaboration between the community and the University. A social impact assessment of the intensification strategy commissioned by Council (Nemec, 2000) did identify a number of issues in relation to health and education, although these must be considered as the author's view and not necessarily Council's. These issues were as follows:

- The main health issues in Glen Innes are health care and women's health, both for themselves and as primary caregivers
- While there are sufficient health care providers, meeting health needs is about increasing access to and awareness of health care
- Affordability of health services is a particular problem
- The main education issue in Glen Innes is access to information and knowledge
- There are issues with the quality of educational provisions in Glen Innes e.g. teachers are acting as social workers as a consequence of the high social needs of the children and young people
- There is a lack of mentors and a lack of support at home for education
- Glen Innes schools are seen to lack status and are not perceived to be as attractive in appearance as those in other areas.

During the preparation of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan the community and other key stakeholders had the following to say about health and education levels and the impact on liveability:

Community

- Residents were concerned about extremely poor health levels and the negative impact that this had on people's quality of life and the ability of health services to meet needs
- Improved standards of housing are seen as an important precursor to improved health
- Projected increased housing density was generally seen as a major threat to health - *"Causes of health problems (mental and physical) need to be explored as intensification changes will lead to additional stress which will otherwise aggravate health issues of present population"*.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

- Cost of health care services is a concern, affecting accessibility
- Some concerns were expressed about the quality of local educational services

Housing New Zealand

- Those most in need of housing assistance are also likely to have the highest health needs, low employability, and fixed incomes that can barely sustain the household in times of personal crisis.

University of Auckland Tamaki Campus

- Low income, rental housing means strong links are unlikely to be established with Glen Innes residents as compared to the higher socio-economic areas proposed for Mount Wellington Quarry
- The University has tried to establish connections, especially via the use of the sports field complex, but the community is fragmented and difficult to maintain relations with.

Health and education are not part of Council's core areas of responsibility and therefore do not feature in their discourse of liveability. In contrast, residents clearly articulated a connection between the health and liveability. These concerns were most commonly expressed in the submissions on the Residential 8 Plan Change where intensification was seen as a further threat to people's health and well-being. Poor health standards, together with other relevant socio-economic indicators, were seen as vital to be addressed before further growth takes place in Glen Innes. Concerns were expressed that higher density living would lead to an exacerbation of health problems. One Glen Innes resident made the comment that it is considered "...a hotspot for meningitis and other diseases where overcrowding is high". HNZA also identified the high demand that high-need tenants place on health services.

Residents did not have a lot to say about education, suggesting either feelings that existing educational facilities are adequate or residents having limited focus on education.

Glen Innes is not part of the primary catchment population for students for the University of Auckland's Tamaki Campus due to low levels of preparatory qualifications in the local population. However there may be opportunities for employment in service industry activities related to the University.

7.13 Affordability

The theme of affordability refers to a range of social issues to do with housing, including the availability of affordable housing, who gets to live in Glen Innes and who does not, the percentage of HNZA tenants/ properties, property prices, gentrification, and social equity. During the preparation of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan the Council, community and other key stakeholders had the following to say about affordability:

Council

- Higher density housing will provide a greater range of housing choice and affordable housing options
- Higher density housing is expected to meet the population's changing accommodation and lifestyle needs as not everyone wishes to, or can afford to live in, a detached house on its own section

Deleted: 16 August 2006

- Aim to advocate to HNZN that a mix of people from different socio-economic backgrounds be housed in Glen Innes to avoid concentration of social disadvantage and build stronger more self-reliant community - Maintain or increase number of working families.

Community

- A stronger mix of public and private housing is required - *"The answer to Glen Innes' problems lies not with intensification of housing, but with addressing the income mix of its residents"*
- A greater concentration of state housing will lead to the creation of a "ghetto" - *"Our private dwelling is surrounded by HNZN houses whose fences are broken, covered with convolvulus, and allow neighbours to enter our property unobserved to steal from our garden...More HNZN houses will mean existing houses will receive even less maintenance (if that is possible) and an increase in the number of people who will treat private property with lack of respect"*
- HNZN's policy of housing those with the greatest need is likely to contribute to demands on social services and to the crime rate and won't contribute to enhanced community spirit
- Gentrification is a major threat - *"As happened in Ponsonby in the 1960s", "fear of being pushed out to Otara", or as one person said in an oral submission, "I am afraid this is shorthand for moving some of the community out"*.
- Fear of gentrification is heightened by close proximity to comparatively wealthy suburbs - *"Glen Innes is next to higher quality areas, and the area is near the Tamaki River (prime land), fear that the area will get redeveloped and be too expensive. Has started already – high rents"*.
- Many HNZN tenants have lived in Glen Innes since the 1950s
- Rents and house prices had risen considerably in recent years, making housing less affordable
- Affordability dominated the issues related to housing for attendees of the youth forum (2000), including the need for cheaper rents, their inability to afford to buy their own homes, and *"too many state houses"*.

Submissions to the Residential 8 Plan Change also focused on the resident mix and the possibility of a "future urban slum" being created. Some of the Residential 8 submissions expressed concern that the plan change would devalue their properties. Comments made in submissions included the following:

- *I strongly oppose further development of high density state housing in this area. I suggest that many of the state owned properties should be sold so that private high density housing can be developed.*
- *[Opposes plan due to] "...creation of unfair and forced resident mix not a healthy environment"*.
- *If the population of GI is to increase by adding many more houses, find a way to ensure that private property owners are protected from trespassers, taggers, thieves.*
- *The Maybury [Place] experiment is the sort of abysmal result that could be duplicated across the Pt England and Glen Innes area, should the Isthmus plan be followed. What a social disaster! What a neighbourhood nightmare!...Glen Innes does not need, nor do I support or want, any similar eyesores and social disasters. STOP plans of possibilities now for another Maybury! Glen Innes, and Pt England have the potential to be a district and suburb of high quality and attractiveness. I for one am sickened by the fact that the neighbourhood I so love and appreciate, will likely as not, turn into a residential fiasco, a*

Deleted: 16 August 2006

ghetto, a slum. Whose interests are being served other than policy makers who seem set on making their mark in someone else's patch?

Glen Innes Business Association

- Concerned about the potential for HNZA to considerably increase their holding in Glen Innes through rezoning to Residential 8 - A reduced proportion of state housing is necessary to allow a greater income mix in the area
- "Pepper potting" of state housing is supported rather than a concentration in one area.

Housing New Zealand

- Aim is to develop a range of housing responses, including apartments for singles and couples, large family houses, and housing for older people
- Housing allocation policy is based on housing people with the highest need first, although there is some room for negotiation - *"...the policy is to house in any available house to people with greatest need, however at the same time there is a subjective overview of the housing offered considering the broader community"* (verbal submission).

It is somewhat perverse that the theme of affordability should appear so strongly in a suburb in which state housing dominates. However, residents of privately-owned homes clearly felt threatened by the dominance of state housing and the likelihood that zoning changes will result in an increased number of people "of highest need" in Glen Innes. It appears that residents who live in state houses were less inclined to make written submissions, and were perhaps more likely to complete pro forma submissions circulated by the Housing Lobby. The threat of increasing numbers of "highest need" tenants is likely to be of concern to existing tenants also. This raises the issue of whose needs should be prioritized in the allocation of affordable housing – those of new residents or those of existing residents.

During the development of the Liveable Community Plan, a common concern expressed by residents was that increased property values would force them out of Glen Innes. In contrast, in response to the Residential 8 zone change proposal, some residents expressed concerns that more state houses in the area would lead to a decrease in property values. This shift seemingly reflects the different focus of the two plans, the first presenting a redevelopment of the suburb as a whole, the second focused on increasing densities. The likelihood that more state houses will result from the plans may have come more into focus for residents at the time of the zone plan change.

The council and HNZA policy of developing a range of housing choices to meet the needs of a range of household types, is underpinned by the assumption that people will choose a house that adequately meets their housing needs, rather than be influenced by cost.

7.14 Design

Quality of design is a relatively intangible theme related to liveability. Ultimately the distinction made in this report between form and design may be a matter of scale. When Council discusses design it applies to both the urban design of public spaces and to the development controls and design criteria used for residential developments. The Residential 8 zone introduces 11 design elements which include controls:

- To prevent overlooking into neighbouring private open spaces and living rooms

Deleted: 16 August 2006

- To ensure that living rooms and bedrooms are adequately protected from outside noise
- To ensure that new developments are safe and designed to avoid unsafe areas
- To ensure that adequate private open space is provided which receives sunlight, and can be accessed from a living room
- To raise the energy efficiency of new developments through the orientation and layout of buildings
- To ensure that adequate provision is made for rubbish storage and collection areas, letterboxes, and clothes drying areas.

During the preparation of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan the Council, the community and other key stakeholders had the following to say about design and the impact on liveability:

Council

- *“Our vision is a variety of housing types to meet the needs of a diverse and growing community”* - As the population of Glen Innes grows, there is a need to provide a variety of housing types to cater for the population’s changing accommodation and lifestyle needs
- There will be redevelopments as buildings age and this may be in the form of apartments and terrace houses which some perceive as ghetto housing - *“Not everyone wishes to, or can afford to live in a detached house on its own section”*
- Urban design Guide is being developed to control urban design to avoid ghetto characteristics
- New houses need to be well built and designed
- The low housing quality is an aspect of Glen Innes which needs improvement
- Design for comfort, 24-hour use, safety, maintenance: pedestrian access and movement, vehicular access and movement, street cleaning, artwork, public furniture, lighting, shelter, signage, planting, toilets
- Physical revitalisation should promote a greater sense of comfort, safety, security and foster more meaningful, frequent interaction
- The public/private interface is important for greater safety e.g. see-through fences, lower fences, houses overlooking public spaces.

Community

- Potential for private developers constructing cheap, ill-designed high rise housing
- Will create area of cheap, shoddy housing with insufficient greenery and space.
- Supports HNZC upgrading existing state houses, ensure clean, safe place to live instead of more tenement buildings
- There is a lack of privacy/ private space in design of housing
- HNZC housing is designed for small families
- Need for more housing but designed for the needs of different groups
- Less land/space will be a fact of life, but need to look at good design to overcome privacy issues and have lots of access to public open space
- Multi-level developments are not appropriate for accessibility, e.g. prams, the elderly, safety of the stairs
- Noise of people living and playing too close – good insulation and sound proofing will be needed
- Safety can be increased with good design
- Great potential for developing reserves integrated with housing development
- Acknowledgement of community input into development of facilities is important
- Community have concerns that one rule applies to HNZC and one rule to everyone else
- Need to keep historic feel and architectural features, *“...don’t pull down things just because they are old”*

Deleted: 16 August 2006

- Fences needed for safety for kids
- Carports are ugly e.g. Star Flats.
- Sheds are too small e.g. Maybury

Housing New Zealand

- The days of the one-size fits all state house have gone – customers are diverse and include large families, sole parents or singles affected by disability
- Landscaping, fencing, decks and courtyards are included in the designs – this indoor/outdoor flow is lacking in older designs
- Looking for greater flexibility of rules, particularly with regard to:
 - Roading widths
 - Emphasising the pedestrian environment
 - Releasing more land for development
 - Site coverage
 - Stormwater – what leaves the site
 - Allowing comprehensive redevelopment.

University of Auckland Tamaki Campus

- Quality urban design is a key part to liveable communities.

The theme of design became most apparent in the discourse during the Residential 8 zone submission process. This may be because the reality of intensification became apparent at this stage and the community and key stakeholders had specific design regulations and guidelines to respond to. Quality issues were often mentioned by submitters but with relatively little specificity about what this might mean.

8 Media Comment

This section focuses on comments made about liveability by media commentators, ranging from the year 2000 to 2005. Most of these comments relate to intensification of housing, particularly quality aspects. These comments, expressed in headlines such as High-rise horrors instead of houses and Residents rally against state 'slumification', exemplify some of the concerns about this shift in settlement form.

It is noted that the Council, community and other key stakeholders have also expressed their views through the media, however, these views have been picked up through analysis of the Council records of the preparation of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan and are not repeated in this section.

Vitality

- *Vibrancy out of control in the vision thing: Having shaken and sucked and battered every last breath of life out of the once cheerful adjective "vibrant" could Auckland bureaucrats and their political mouthpieces please leave it to rest in peace. ...it's as though no document is complete without the V word. It litters reports and speech notes like an out of control comma* – Brian Rudman, media commentator

Form

Deleted: 16 August 2006

- *...Talbot Park was a toe in the water for Housing New Zealand and the council but the consequences were dislocation of existing tenants and "slumification" of the area – Sue Henry, Housing Lobby and Glen Innes Resident*
- *There is no intention on the part of council to encourage the building of ghettos or developments that will turn into slums. That would be foolish for the standpoint of the city and damaging to the residents of any area - Auckland Deputy Mayor, Dr Bruce Hucker*
- *...blanket rezoning for most of Glen Innes was excessive and premature. ...not opposed to the concept of residential 8 zoning of three- and four-storeys but ...it remains an as-yet untried and unproven form of zoning, particularly in an area of intensive state housing like Glen Innes - The Tamaki Edge Constituent Group (set up by the council to monitor local plans)*
- *The location of large numbers of people in need of extensive social support into one vast area can never make for a healthy and viable community - The Tamaki Edge Constituent Group (set up by the council to monitor local plans)*
- *High density HNZ homes put pressure on infrastructure and social services – strain on schools, increase in youth crime and violence, clash between different nationalities – Editorial*

Design

- *A recipe for a minimum standard of comfortable living should include each house having its own outdoor living space and privacy from neighbours. Given that, could it be that terraced housing is an acceptable compromise? Modern architectural and building techniques mean that such developments need not smack of Coronation Street. In all likelihood, they would strike more of a chord in a country whose people remain alienated by the prospect of ticky-tacky boxes reaching towards the sky. They would also help to retain Auckland's character – Editorial*
- *...before implementing the zone, the council should go to the Environment Court and seek a declaratory judgment to ensure that the urban design guide [[had] teeth - The Remuera Community Committee*
- *We've heard all the assurances from council over rules and design but at the end of the day it's designed to cram a lot of people into a small area and that's something we are not used to in New Zealand. There's potential for it to go wrong, especially if developers see it as an opportunity to make a killing. There will be major conflict if that happens – Keith Sharp, Panmure Community Action Group spokesman*
- *...fears about rising crime and social problems would not occur because the council would make sure there was good housing through strong urban design controls that would benefit the community - Auckland Deputy Mayor, Dr Bruce Hucker*

Affordability/housing allocation

- *...council would have to offer strong incentives to make it profitable to build cheap housing in suburban Auckland. ...the high cost of land [was] the main drawback to building cheap housing - Tony Gapes, Redwood Group*

Deleted: 16 August 2006

- *We have a social allocation model based on need and therefore we would need to work this through extremely carefully because the criticism would be for Housing NZ not to allocate houses on the basis of need... It is certainly our aim to be good neighbours ... We want to maintain a good mix of people and housing. There [were] challenges in place such as Glen Innes where Housing NZ had a high stock of houses built in the 1950s and 1960s. We don't want to sell stock. There is very little available land for us to work with in the Auckland region and we are under enormous pressure to get more housing - Minister of Housing - Steve Maharey*
- *The aim is to move low-income people from their free-standing homes into "pig pens" – Sue Henry, Housing Lobby and Glen Innes Resident*

Access/Mobility

- *The neighbourhoods zoned for much higher density, Newmarket, Panmure, Glen Innes, Otahuhu, Avondale and others, are all to have upgraded railway stations in the regional transport strategy. The city, in fact, is being designed for a particular mode of transport. The planners need to be quite candid about that, rather than trying to convince citizens there is no alternative. The challenge is not just to assuage their concerns but to demonstrate that well-designed, higher-density developments can enhance their neighbourhood... Planning needs to keep in step with people's preferences, not try to change them outright. Auckland's designers are beating their heads against a brick wall that no one wants next door – Editorial*

Sustainability

- *A big increase in people living nearby and using the volcanic cones for recreational activities will place the pa and burial grounds at risk. So while council will put more people around these areas, where is the converse investment to protect these sites from the strain of increased recreational demand? - Ngati Whatua o Orakei, Ngarimu Blair - Heritage and Resource Manager*

Infrastructure

- *...a considerable amount of work needs to be done to upgrade stormwater and sewage systems in Glen Innes and provide new capacity to cope with higher-density housing. ...Metrowater...would start fixing problems of illegal stormwater connections to the wastewater system and groundwater seepage into the wastewater system - Metrowater*

9 Comparison of discourses

While the themes that emerged in policy and community discourses were common to both, there was a completely different prioritisation of themes within the discourses. Council discourse on liveability started from the point of needing to accommodate growth by increasing housing densities (form) while placing controls of quality (design). Following on from this, other themes of amenity, accessibility, vitality, and infrastructure are prioritized as necessary to create a "liveable" community. As these themes are related to place, they fit within the traditional planning realm and are the "core business" of Council. Slightly less related are local economy and safety, the aims of which will be met by close attention to previously mentioned themes (form, design, amenity, accessibility, vitality and infrastructure). The themes of recreation and community facilities, social

Deleted: 16 August 2006

processes, affordability, and health are acknowledged as important but are not what Council are focussed on in this context. The theme of sustainability appears to underpin the push for accommodating growth through changes to settlement form, but is not a strong focus in the discourse.

In contrast, community discourse starts from the point of safety, health, local economy, social processes, recreation and community facilities, and affordability. Residents who opposed the plans stated clearly that these issues needed to be addressed first before considering introducing more people into this area of extremely high deprivation (especially more “high need” people). This point was made repeatedly in submissions to the Residential 8 plan change, with many submissions describing the dire circumstances that they saw in Glen Innes already, and the likelihood that the plan changes would only exacerbate these problems. These included problems of very poor health, high demand on social services, unemployment, crime, safety and security issues, graffiti, lack of community interaction and engagement in community issues. Residents were focused on these socio-economic issues, and although other themes of vitality, accessibility, quality of design, infrastructure, sustainability and amenity were considered worthwhile, they were not prioritized in the discourse.

The Liveable Community Plan appears to have raised residents' expectations that their concerns about socioeconomic issues will be addressed through this process as priority concerns. This contrasts to the Council's expectations that the community will accept changes in form and in return, will benefit from improvements to the place to be made. Council considers that these changes to the place will lead to improved socio-economic outcomes.

There were stark differences in the anticipated outcomes of the plans for redevelopment according to the Council and HNZN versus the community. Council and HNZN anticipate a greatly improved neighbourhood with a vibrant town centre, a choice in quality homes, better streetscapes, access, connections, and a safer environment. Residents anticipate that the plan changes will lead to increased crime, congestion, concentration of poverty, threats to safety, poor quality high density housing, a "future ghetto".

There was an underlying sense of mistrust among many residents engaged in the consultation process about the Liveable Community Plan process and the Council, together with a dissatisfaction with the way that consultation with the community was undertaken. As was raised at the presentation of the Ka Mau Te Wero Visioning Project draft action plan 2005 – 2010, numerous attempts have been made to revitalise, uplift and invigorate Glen Innes over the years, and residents have seen little evidence of change. For example, programmes to revitalise the town centre, such as the Mainstreet Programme, have yet to reach their goals and it is likely that residents have become jaded by the repeated efforts.

Related to mistrust is the fear of change that is evident in residents' submissions. Change to higher density living requires a major cultural shift and the Council considers much of the objection to be knee-jerk reactions to change. Many residents, however, clearly object to the changes on socio-economic grounds and feel great frustration that their neighbourhood is among the first to be targeted for intensification. Residents hold strongly to cultural expectations for their environment, evident in comments such as "*there is nothing better than watching kids playing in their own backyard on green grass*".

Deleted: 16 August 2006

Fears of gentrification in the early stages of the process were replaced with fears of falling property values in relation to the Residential 8 zone plan change. Meanwhile, some property owners wanted the Residential 8 and 6a plan changes to extend to include their properties, most likely for the anticipated financial benefits. It is acknowledged that closer research will be needed to consider the range of community voices in terms of stake in Glen Innes (eg, local home owners, tenants in HNZN and private rentals, residents of neighbouring suburbs, owners of local rental properties) and demographic differences (eg, youth, older people, ethnic groups, size of households).

Ruapotaka Marae was actively involved in the process and made substantive and broad ranging submissions. Pacific and other ethnic groups were much less involved in the process (although individuals from a range of ethnicities did make submissions).

10 Conclusions

This review examines discourse around liveability, in particular community and policy discourse as expressed during the consultation process in the development of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan. Other related documentation has also been examined, including previous research and consultation with Glen Innes residents, business and property owners as well as submissions to changes in residential zoning (PPM61). The aim has been to develop an understanding of what residents want in terms of settlement form, how they want their neighbourhood to look, feel and function.

A review of the consultation process around the development of the Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan has allowed access to views expressed in a number of forums. While written submissions to both the Liveable Community Plan and PPM61 were limited to a fairly narrow range of respondents, in particular from property and business owners, they encapsulate views expressed in the broader consultation processes that have occurred in Glen Innes in recent years. Furthermore, a large number of pro forma submissions were also received, and while Council has tended to discount these submissions, they indicate a widespread feeling of unease around the planned changes to the neighbourhood. It is likely that many residents were more willing and able to sign a pro forma submission that put pen to paper and draft up a submission themselves.

In this report, the Liveable Community Plan is situated within a broader legislative and policy context, with a focus on national, regional and city level policies and plans aimed at accommodating growth. The Auckland Regional Growth Strategy is key to this framework. The ARG (1999) states that growth will be managed by promoting quality, compact urban environments (intensification) within existing metropolitan areas and focussed around town centres and major transport routes to create higher density communities. Auckland City signed the up to the Central Sector Agreement (2004), undertaking to manage growth in the ways outlined in the ARG. The LGA (2002) also requires local authorities to prepare a Long-Term Council Community Plans (LTCCP), covering a ten-year period, including a process of identifying desired community outcomes, the council's role in achieving these outcomes, and measures to assess progress. At a more local level, Liveable Community Plans are prepared to determine how these outcomes will be achieved at a local community level.

The Glen Innes Liveable Community Plan, developed in consultation with local stakeholders, is intended to provide a framework for accommodating growth and revitalisation of Glen Innes. An examination of the discourse around liveability indicates that while the Council consider the plan to

Deleted: 16 August 2006

be about accommodating growth in return for “revitalization” of the neighbourhood (focused on upgrading the town centre), the community has made a plea for the focus to be on “revitalization” (focused on improved socioeconomic issues). Council’s position is that higher density living with careful attention to design will lead to improved social outcomes. In contrast, the community want to see vast improvements to the socioeconomic well-being of residents before more people (especially “high need” HNZN tenants) are housed there.

This review has revealed little about the form of residential development that residents would like to see in Glen Innes. However, strong themes emerged about what was important to them in terms of liveability. Safety, good standards of health and education, affordable housing, adequate recreational facilities, a strong local economy offering employment, and a strong sense of community were common themes. Issues of amenity, access and mobility, vitality and infrastructure were secondary. Yet it is these aspects that the Council is saying it can offer in exchange for increased housing densities, in line with areas of Council responsibility and influence. Responsibility for action on socioeconomic issues prioritised by the community lies with other agencies.

This mismatch in expectations between what Council is offering and what the community expect is of concern because of the likelihood that the process could be undermined by resistance to changes in form. It needs to be acknowledged that this more than a planning discussion, and broader issues need to be addressed. This raises the question of who else needs to be involved, not just in planning processes but also in the implementation of the plan. What partnerships with other agencies will need to be built in order to address serious socioeconomic issues in Glen Innes? By whom?

The issue of affordability and who gets to live in the neighbourhood emerged as an issue of great concern in Glen Innes. Residents wanted to retain the ability to live (and hopefully buy homes) in Glen Innes, but expressed frustration over HNZN’s housing allocation policies. Residents fear that prioritizing those with the highest need and placing them in higher density housing will lead to increased concentration of people with poor health, more crime, more safety issues and so on. Overwhelmingly, the concern was that the plan would lead to a greater concentration of poor people in a small geographic area, with all the related problems of poverty and disadvantage.

While Council and others identify that social outcomes of intensification will be greatly influenced by design, equally issues related to the tenant mix, tenancy management, and ongoing maintenance will be crucial to address. Council, HNZN, business owners, University of Auckland and community members all identified state housing allocation policies as a key issue for Glen Innes, although all (including HNZN) felt powerless to change this policy of housing those of greatest need (rather than “working families” as happened during the establishment of Glen Innes in the fifties and sixties).

During consultation for the Liveable Community Plan (2000-2004), residents expressed concern that the proposed revitalization process would lead to gentrification in Glen Innes (“we’ll be pushed out to Otara”). However, at the proposed zone plan change (2005) where the focus was on higher density living, in particular a greater density of HNZN housing, some residents expressed concern that property prices would go down. This change reflected the different focus in each of the documents, the first focused on developing a “revitalised” community, the second focused on increasing housing density. Rather than discounting concerns about the impact of higher density

Deleted: 16 August 2006

development as merely uninformed and reactionary, it would be helpful to consider how these concerns can be acknowledged and dialogue initiated with community members.

There are clear points of similarity between issues identified by Council and community members. For example, community expressed considerable concern about safety issues, and Council aims to address these concerns through certain strategies (CPTED) and partnerships (eg. with police). Dialogue with community members may go some way towards allaying concerns and implementation could be greatly enhanced by developing broader localised partnerships.

11 References

Auckland City, 1986. *Glen Innes Community Development Study*, Department of Planning and Community Development, Auckland City Council.

Auckland City, 2000. *Growing our city through liveable communities 2050*. Auckland, City, Auckland.

Auckland City, 2003. *Glen Innes into the Future (Draft)*, Auckland, Auckland City Council.

Auckland City, 2004a. *Focus on the Future*, LTCCP, Auckland, Auckland City Council.

Auckland City, 2004b. *Glen Innes Into The Future*. Auckland, Auckland City Council.

Auckland Regional Growth Strategy: 2050, 1999. Auckland, Auckland Regional Council.

Central Sector Agreement, 2004. Auckland, Auckland Regional Council.

City Scene, 1999. *Liveable communities: Transportation and Integration with Growth*

Dixon, J. and Dubuis, A., 2003. Urban intensification in Auckland, New Zealand: a challenge for New Urbanism. *Housing Studies*, 18 (3), 353-368.

Forsythe Research, 1999. *Community and Recreation Facilities Needs Assessment – Tamaki and Otahuhu*. Market Research Report, prepared for Auckland City Council

Godschalk, D., 2004. Land Use Planning Challenges: Coping with conflicts in visions of sustainable development and liveable communities. *Journal of American Planning Association* 70, 5-13.

Gregory, D., 1994. *Geographical Imaginations*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Gunn, S., 1994. *Glen Innes Village Mainstreet Village Improvement: Project Report*.

Jones, O., 1995. Lay Discourses of the Rural: Developments and Implications for Rural Studies. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 11 (1), 35-49.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

Nemec, K., 2000. *Tamaki Edge – Planning for the 'social infrastructure' and 'equipping the community for change' workstreams*. Report prepared for Community Development Planning, Auckland City Council.

Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE), 1998. *The Cities And Their People: New Zealand's Urban Environment*. Wellington, PCE.

Pratt, A., 1996. Discourses of rurality: loose talk or social struggle? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 12, 69-79.

Sawicki, D.S., 2002. Improving Community Indicator Systems: Injecting more social science into the folk movement, *Planning Theory & Practice*, 3, 13-32.

Scott, K., 2005. *Technical Report: Literature Review of Liveability* (in draft). Auckland, Landcare Research.

Shaw, A. (in draft) Territorial Review Findings Report. Auckland, Opus International Consultants

Shirley, I.F., 1979. *Planning for Community: A mythology of community development and social planning*. Palmerston North, Dunmore Press.

Southworth, M. & Parthasarathy B., 1997. The suburban public realm II: Eurourbanism, New Urbanism and the implications for urban design in the American Metropolis. *Journal of Urban Design*, 2, 9-26.

Statistics New Zealand, 2001, *New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings 2001*, www.stats.govt.nz/census2001.htm

Thomas, J., Cleland, B.S., and Walton, D., 2004. Review of Current Measures of New Zealand Settlement Liveability. Working Paper, Central Laboratories Report 520951.01, Lower Hut.

van Kemp, I., Leidelmeijer, K., Marsman, G., and de Hollander, A., 2003. Urban environmental quality and human well-being. Towards a conceptual framework and demarcation of concepts; a literature study. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 65, 5-18.

Media articles

High-rise horrors instead of houses 29.11.2000
Editorial: High-rise flats are not for Auckland 02.12.2000
Fight brews for high-rise zoning plan 14.07.2003
Council's high-density housing circles spark alarm 01.11.2003
Residents rally against state 'slumification' 01.03.05
High density housing bends the rules 02.04.2001
Editorial: Preferences important in planning 25.11.2003
Keep City's Character – Jun 19 2005
Minister defends housing plans – Jun 17 2005
High-rise plans have the locals steaming – Jun 14 2005

Deleted: 16 August 2006

Residents fear 'ghetto plan' – Jun 13 2005

Brian Rudman: Vibrancy out of control in the vision thing – 12/10/05

Deleted: 16 August 2006

~~3 December 2008~~

43

Appendix A: Learning Sustainability: Research Programme Overview

~~3 December 2008~~

44

Deleted: 16 August 2006

“LEARNING SUSTAINABILITY”
RESEARCH PROGRAMME OVERVIEW

“Learning Sustainability” is a six-year programme (2003-2009) being undertaken to identify how getting the right forms for our settlements will enable them to deliver the best mix of environmental, economic, and social performance. The research is led by Opus International Consultants, with Landcare Research and the University of Auckland as project partners. It is funded by the Foundation for Science, Research and Technology (FoRST). Key personnel include:

Opus International Consultants	Vince Dravitzki, Darren Walton, Angela Shaw
Landcare Research	Charles Eason, Alison Greenaway, Kathryn Scott, Sumita Ghosh
University of Auckland	Jenny Dixon, Henri van Roon

Background

New Zealanders, in common with many communities across the world, are increasingly aware that their settlements are having serious impacts on the environment, which is aggravated by the increasing pace of urbanisation. These impacts are many, and include, for example, impacts on natural ecosystems, and the loss through settlement of productive land or areas of quiet natural beauty that are of importance to us. Yet while we have these environmental concerns, we need our settlements to provide employment and we want to lead lives with a good standard of living, rich in social, cultural, and recreational opportunities.

“Settlement form” is a technical term, not often used by most New Zealanders, but they may quite often discuss some of the parts that go to make up settlement form. For example:

- The shape of a settlement as seen from the air or on a map, and the street pattern.
- The density of housing, such as the quarter acre section, the inner city apartment block, or the small lifestyle block.
- The amount of open space within each settlement, such as town belts, parks and reserves, coastal esplanades or reserves.
- The extent that a settlement is single-centred, for example, with one large central business district, or multi-centred with more than one activity hub.

Councils have always had a number of policies and rules in place that ultimately influence form. However in recent years there has been a move to manage the form of the settlement, with the aim to improve sustainability and especially to limit environmental impacts. There is however considerable debate around this issue, both as to which forms should be adopted, and their effectiveness in promoting sustainability.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

Aims of the research programme

The research programme recognises that for each settlement there may be a number of pathways for sustainability. The research will enable communities to recognise those different pathways and will be relevant to settlements as they currently exist and to new future forms that may be developed. The research programme will provide the evidence of the extent that settlement form determines settlement performance, and develop tools by which communities can:

- modify their existing settlement towards more sustainable forms
- monitor the settlement performance
- Visualise and select from alternative future scenarios.

The research work

There are three main strands to the research work. The first strand will identify the extent that the environmental performance of New Zealand settlements is determined by the form of the settlement. The main research work of this strand is:

- To develop methods by which the form of a settlement can be described and quantified. A combination of measures will be needed and these need to be applicable to both rural and urban settlements.
- To develop improved tools to describe the total environmental performance of settlements. There are some existing tools such as “environmental footprint analysis” and “environmental capacity analysis” but they are limited and improved tools are needed.
- Applying these new measures of form and environmental performance to several New Zealand settlements to identify the relationship between settlement form and environmental performance.

The second strand of the research work addresses settlement liveability. In the context of this programme, settlement liveability includes abstract concepts that are part of amenity, such as pleasant, safe, healthy, but also includes more concrete concepts such as how well the settlement allows us to achieve the economic and social interactions that we wish to accomplish as part of our daily lives. The scale at which we are considering settlement liveability is at neighbourhood, suburb and whole settlement. The main elements of this second strand of the research are:

- To establish the style of life New Zealanders expect from their settlements, their differing views of settlement liveability, and the extent that they relate these to ideas about settlement form and sustainability, with these views being gathered from communities, developers, local government and professional advisors.
- To develop a “New Zealand settlement liveability index”.
- To identify whether the same forms that give us the best liveability also give the best environmental performance.

The third strand of the research will look beyond existing forms and will conceptualise new more sustainable forms. This strand will also develop tools to establish how far and how fast existing settlements can change. The research work of this strand is:

Deleted: 16 August 2006

- Identify innovative designs for future settlement form through a series of professional and community workshops, from 2005 to 2007, to scope potential for sustainable development of existing New Zealand settlements.
- Identify the social capacity of communities to adapt to new settlement forms, (that is how much change and what pace of change is acceptable) including the need for greater inclusion of heritage and cultural values and other influences on the social acceptance of future settlement form.
- Develop new governance mechanisms and practices, in particular tools which help the community participate in strategic planning of their settlements and tools which improve the management of intensified areas having shared ownership
- To develop tools that can be easily used by the communities to monitor settlement form, liveability, and environmental performance.

Part of the research programme is directed at Māori-specific settlement issues. This research is included within each of the three strands. The intended outcome is to provide Māori involved in settlement subdivision and land development with tools to support them to make decisions on settlement form, and to establish and articulate Māori meanings of liveability in both urban and rural contexts.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

Appendix B: Policy Context

Auckland Regional Council

Auckland Regional Growth Strategy: 2050 (1999)

The Auckland Regional Growth Forum was established in 1996 to address the high rate of population growth in the Auckland region. The forum is made up of group of elected representatives from the Auckland Regional Council and the seven local councils. The forum adopted the *Auckland Regional Growth Strategy: 2050* in 1999 to co-ordinate urban growth management over the next 50 years. The stated purpose of the strategy is:

- To ensure that growth is accommodated in a way that meets the best interest of the inhabitants of the Auckland Region
- To sustain strong supportive communities
- To sustain a high-quality living environment
- A region that is easy to get around
- Protection of the coast and surrounding natural environment.

The strategy proposes that growth will be managed by promoting quality, compact urban environments (intensification). Most growth will be accommodated within the existing metropolitan area with development outside current urban limits only where environmental, accessibility and community principles can be met. Most urban growth will be focussed around town centres and major transport routes to create higher density communities, with a variety of housing, jobs, services, recreational and other activities (mixed use). There will be much less emphasis on general infill throughout suburban areas.

In terms of outcomes the strategy specifies that future regional growth should promote:

- Safe, healthy communities
- Diversity of employment and business opportunities
- Housing choice
- High amenity of urban environments
- The protection and the maintenance of the character of the region's natural environment
- Sustainable use and protection of the region's natural and physical resources (including infrastructure)
- Efficient access to activities and appropriate social infrastructure for all.

These outcomes are expanded upon in the strategy document and prioritised because in many situations the outcomes may be in conflict with one another. The strategy recognises that the actual priority given to outcomes may be different in different parts of the region and at different times, depending on analysis at the local or sector level. The stated priorities are as follows:

Table Four: Prioritising the Desired Outcomes

Critical Outcomes	Very Important Outcomes	Important Outcomes
Access and transport efficiency	Business opportunity	Cultural identity
Water quality	Urban amenity	Rural amenity
Coastal environment	Safe, healthy communities	Cultural heritage

Deleted: 16 August 2006

Air quality	Housing choice/ affordability	Habitat
Sustainable use of resources (land/ infrastructure/ energy)	Employment choice	
Open space		
Social and physical infrastructure		

Source: Auckland Regional Growth Strategy: 2050 (1999)

It is suggested in the strategy that three key themes relating to the major issues and growth pressures facing the region emerge from these prioritised desired outcomes (although the basis for this conclusion is not made explicit). The three inter-related key themes are:

- Desirable communities and diversity and choice optimised
- Accessibility optimised
- Natural and physical environment optimised.

The “desirable communities” theme is expanded in the following manner:

The community principles underlying the growth concept are about how we live, work and play in the region and ensuring that liveable communities make up a liveable region (Auckland Regional Growth Strategy, 1999:36).

This is the first use of the term “liveable” in the strategy. The “desirable communities” theme includes outcomes relating to effective social infrastructure, housing choice and affordability, amenity and design, and business and employment opportunities. The strategy therefore uses the term “liveable” to refer both to quality of life and quality of place attributes, however, the term is most fully defined in relation to amenity and design themes. The focus is therefore very much on quality of place, which is inferred to improve social and economic outcomes for residents.

The term “liveable” is tied explicitly and more particularly to amenity and design in the following statement:

A liveable community will be one of high-quality urban and rural amenity where good design helps to create a sense of place, identity and community within an area (Auckland Regional Growth Strategy, 1999:41).

The concept of amenity is described in the strategy in the following way:

Urban amenity encompasses a range of natural and physical qualities and characteristics of an area that contribute to people’s appreciation of its pleasantness. Such qualities include cultural and recreational attributes, open space, heritage, safety, accessibility, the environment (e.g. air and water) and infrastructure. It also includes character, views, privacy, sunlight, traffic, noise, streetscape, lifestyles, people mix, vibrancy, identity and “feel” of urban areas (Auckland Regional Growth Strategy, 1999:41).

Central Sector Agreement (2004)

The *Auckland Regional Growth Strategy: 2050* is implemented by means of Sector Area Agreements. The *Central Sector Agreement* is the agreement between Auckland Regional Council and Auckland City Council as to the location and capacity for sub-regional growth in Auckland City over the next 20 years. Under the terms of the *Central Sector Agreement*, Auckland

Deleted: 16 August 2006

City Council has the responsibility of managing growth in the city and working with partners in pursuit of the following principles:

- Fulfilment of duties and responsibilities imposed by the RMA and LGA
- A compact city offering a wide range of lifestyle choice, high environmental values and quality compact urban living
- Concurrent and related economic and population growth, with retention of enough employment capacity for business development
- Focussing growth on the Central Business District, town centres, major public transport nodes and significant road intersections
- Pedestrian-friendly city streets in urban living communities and town centres
- Complete and strong communities
- A transport system that delivers access to employment, retail, entertainment, education, churches, libraries, community facilities and recreation both locally and regionally
- Quality urban design and streetscape and maintenance of amenity
- Protection of treasured heritage, character and natural features.

Auckland Regional Council also has responsibilities and the key ones that relate to urban form and liveability are as follows:

- Development of a regional open space strategy for the management and acquisition of open space in the region
- Development of a regional approach to the management and retention of employment/business capacity to meet the demands of the region
- Work with others to deliver a comprehensive transport system to give improved access to areas of growth – one which facilitates a better standard of air quality in city streets, lessens the impact on highly pedestrianised precincts, utilises existing rail corridors and facilitates completion of the motorway network.

Liveability is not a term that is explicitly used or defined in the *Central Area Agreement* (although Liveable Community Plans are identified as the implementation method). It is noted, however, that Auckland City Council has a responsibility to accommodate future growth in a manner that does not damage the quality of life of existing residents (Central Sector Agreement, 2004:2).

Auckland City Council

Growing Our City Questionnaire (1998)

As part of their participation in the preparation of the *Auckland Regional Growth Strategy: 2050* Auckland City Council surveyed ratepayers to gain an insight into their views of growth. Half of all respondents said they wanted no further growth in Auckland City, often because Auckland is experiencing infrastructure capacity problems e.g. power, water and traffic congestion. Half of all respondents wanted intensification in specific areas where infrastructure and public transport can cope. This growth was seen as being vital to achieving economic viability and social and cultural vitality. There was concern expressed, however, about urban sprawl taking over valuable farm land and open green spaces. Many people also felt that infill housing contributes to infrastructural problems and congestion. There was a call for strict guidelines for development to ensure that historical or special character areas are preserved.

Respondents felt that the main priorities in devising a growth strategy for Auckland City were:

- Good quality of life – Living in a City that is alive and vibrant while preserving the sanity of residents by maintaining areas of peace and tranquillity

Deleted: 16 August 2006

- Infrastructure – Ensuring that the power, water, sewerage etc. are able to cope with the City's population
- Public transport – An efficient, effective public transport system
- Parks and reserves – Places to relax and places for active and passive recreation
- Schools and hospitals – The numbers of schools and hospitals to be increased to cope with population increases.

Liveable Communities was suggested as a possible growth strategy for Auckland City and people were asked if there was anything they liked or disliked about the approach. The positive features were considered to be encouragement of the use of public transport and the diversity of mixed communities and housing types. The concerns included that possibility of creating slums or ghettos and the possibility that people of the same ethnicity would be encouraged to live in close proximity rather than encouraging ethnic diversity. It was noted in the questionnaire analysis that many respondents had a difficult time distinguishing between the proposed Liveable Communities strategy and infill housing.

First City of the Pacific: Community Vision to 2020 (2000)

Rapid population growth in Auckland City led to Council undertaking a consultation process between 1998 and 2000, culminating in the release of *First City of the Pacific: Community Vision to 2020*. Three guiding principles were identified: Treaty of Waitangi, democracy with participation and equity. Five values were specified to be emphasised in everything that Council does: sustainable environment, diversity, prosperity, accessibility and communication. Key outcomes to be achieved are defined as being:

- Auckland leadership
- Effective transport
- Celebrating and recognising diversity
- Unique and valued environment
- Economic prosperity
- Strong and healthy communities
- Urban intensification.

The definition of the urban intensification outcome was further expanded to mean: liveable communities accommodating growth; an accessible, people-focussed and re-vitalised city centre; and attractive urban design and valued built heritage.

Focus on the Future (2004)

Focus on the Future is Auckland City Council's LTCCP. Defined community outcomes provide a basis for the LTCCP. Auckland City Council was able to use information from *First City of the Pacific: Community Vision to 2020* to specify community outcomes for their first LTCCP.

A new LTCCP for 2006-2016 is currently being developed. This will include how the Council can contribute to outcomes, and how monitoring and reporting of community outcomes will be done on a three-yearly basis. A project called Future Auckland will update the community outcomes that were identified in *First City of the Pacific: Community Vision to 2020*.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

Growing our City through Liveable Communities 2050 (June 2000)

The aim of the *Growing our City through Liveable Communities 2050* document is to accommodate growth in Auckland City over the next 50 years while preserving liveability. Liveable communities:

- Are safe
- Encourage walking and cycling
- Are attractive
- Offer a choice of lifestyle
- Have mixed use at their core
- Have access to a choice of transport
- Create a sense of belonging.

This definition of liveability is used widely in the both the policy discourse and in consultation with the community. Liveability is therefore explicitly aligned with accommodating growth, while also aiming at the:

...creation of attractive living environments that promote social interaction, participation, and a sense of community identity for all residents (Growing Our City through Liveable Communities 2050, 2000:13).

The document specifies seven groups of central principles to form the building blocks of the strategy. These relate to the protection of natural and physical resources, guidance for the location of growth, integration of land use, transportation and infrastructure, strong communities, urban design, economic development and employment and funding. The key outcomes to be achieved are the same as those identified in *First City of the Pacific: Community Vision to 2020*.

The key outputs of the strategy to achieve these outcomes are the identification of Strategic Growth Management Areas, the publication of an Urban Design Code and the development of Liveable Community Plans.

Auckland City Growth Management Strategy (December 2003)

When Council signed the Central Sector Agreement with the Auckland Regional Council, they adopted the *Auckland City Growth Management Strategy* to specify their commitment to the location and capacity for sub-regional growth in Auckland City over the next 20 years. The key messages in the *Auckland City Growth Management Strategy* include that Auckland is a growing city, growth must be planned for, building a compact city, identifying where growth should happen – areas of stability and areas of change, the role of urban design and the link to transport. There is a key change in terminology from *Growing our City through Liveable Communities 2050* (June 2000) in that the term “Strategic Growth Management Areas” has been replaced by “areas of stability and areas of change”.

A number of principles for growth are identified in the *Auckland City Growth Management Strategy*:

- Grow the economy through wealth-creating business investment
- Manage change to quality urban living city form
- Protect the valued natural features and character or heritage areas
- Strengthen communities.

Deleted: 16 August 2006

Implementation of the strategy is through the Auckland Urban Living Programme, with the key component of this programme being the development of Liveable Community Plans. Liveable Community Plans provide the specific planning framework for managing growth and will be developed for each community within an area of change. To date Liveable Community Plans have been developed for priority one areas of change, including Panmure (2002), Glen Innes (2004), Avondale (in draft), and Newmarket (in draft). Work is underway in Ellerslie, and about to commence in Mount Albert, Mount Wellington/ Sylvia Park, and Otahuhu.

The basic components of a liveable community are seen as being an intensive mix of activities, such as businesses, shops, entertainment and housing, located near public transport. In July 2004 Council introduced Residential 8 zoning to ensure that a sufficient population to support this mix of activities and a high frequency efficient public transport system can be accommodated around town centres in areas identified by the Council for intensification. The zone allows medium to high density housing, specifically town houses, terrace housing and low-rise apartments. The change to Residential 8 zoning requires a process of public consultation including notification, submissions and an appeal process.

Deleted: 16 August 2006