

under: the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

in the matter of: appeals against the decision of the North Shore City Council on Proposed Plan Change 6 and Variation 66 to the North Shore City District Plan under Clause 14(1) of the First Schedule of the RMA

between: **Landco Limited** (ENV-2006-AKL-000902)

Long Bay – Okura Great Park Society Incorporated (ENV-2006-AKL-000894)

Auckland Regional Council (ENV-2006-AKL-000901)

SB and LA Singleton (ENV-2006-AKL-000903)
Appellants

and: **North Shore City Council**
Respondent

and: **New Zealand Historic Places Trust**

Okura Environmental Group

Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara

R Woodroffe

A Segar

Ministry of Education
Section 274 parties

Statement of Evidence of James Talbot Baines, called by Landco Limited

Dated: 3 May 2007

Chapman Tripp *Barristers & Solicitors*

23-29 Albert St
PO Box 2206
Auckland NZ

Tel +64 9 357 9000
Fax +64 9 357 9099
DX CP24029

A R Galbraith QC
Shortland Chambers
Auckland

D A Kirkpatrick
Park Chambers
Auckland

Reference: V J C Rive / C J Somerville

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	SCOPE OF EVIDENCE.....	2
3	BACKGROUND	2
4	OVERVIEW	3
5	FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO SOCIAL WELLBEING.....	4
6	POLICY AND PLANNING FRAMEWORK	6
	Resource Management Act 1991	6
	Auckland Regional Policy Statement	7
	North Shore City District Plan.....	8
7	OBJECTIVES RELATED TO SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING .	10
	Comparison of Objectives	10
	Suite of Residential Zone Objectives	12
	Differences in Objectives	12
8	COMMUNITY OF INTEREST AND STUDY AREA.....	13
9	ASSESSMENT OF THE TWO PROPOSALS ON SOCIAL WELLBEING... 	16
	Features common to both proposals	16
	Features particular to Landco SP	17
	Features particular to NSCC SP	18
	Access to education and lifelong learning	19
	Access to goods and services, local employment and public facilities.....	21
	Access to leisure and recreational opportunities, and implications for physical health	26
	Access to transport (mobility) options.....	28
10	DISCUSSION OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO SOCIAL WELLBEING	31
11	COMMENTS ON THE EVIDENCE OF NSCC	33

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JAMES TALBOT BAINES, CALLED BY LANDCO LIMITED

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My name is James Talbot Baines. I am a founding director of Taylor Baines & Associates and a specialist in social assessment. I hold a Bachelors Degree with Honours in Chemical Engineering from the University of Canterbury and a Post Graduate Diploma in Teaching from Wellington Teachers Training College.
- 1.2 Between 1983 and 1988, I was employed as a lecturer and researcher at the multi-disciplinary Centre for Resource Management at Lincoln University.
- 1.3 I have undertaken basic and advanced training courses in Social Assessment, and have been a member of the International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA) for the past ten years and the New Zealand Association for Impact Assessment for the past twelve years. Between 2000 and 2006 I was Chairperson of the IAIA's Social Impact Assessment Section. During this time I have also been engaged both in New Zealand and in South East Asia to provide professional training in Social Assessment and to develop Social Impact Assessment implementation programmes in Malaysia on behalf of the United Nations Development Programme.
- 1.4 In total, I have had eighteen years experience in applied social research and Social Impact Assessment work. This has included participation and leadership in several multi-year social research programmes under contract to the Foundation for Research Science and Technology, as well as a wide variety of consultancy contracts for both public and private sector clients.
- 1.5 My professional practice has included the design, implementation and analysis of approximately 30 surveys over the past 10 years, many of which have examined aspects of social impact arising out of environmental conditions, or aspects of residential amenity values.
- 1.6 I have in the past been called upon as an expert witness in a variety of settings including resource consent hearings, appeals to the Environment Court, and hearings before the Local Government Commission and the Casino Control Authority.
- 1.7 I confirm that I have read and agree to comply with the Environment Court Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (Consolidated Practice Note 2006). This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I

state otherwise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

2 **SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

2.1 In my evidence, I:

- (a) Discuss the various elements that contribute to social wellbeing;
- (b) Review the policy and planning framework for the consideration of social wellbeing in the context of this proceeding;
- (c) Analyse the common objectives relating to social wellbeing under the Landco Limited (*Landco*) and North Shore City Council (*NSCC*) Structure Plans;
- (d) Discuss the concept of 'community of interest' and the study area;
- (e) Assess and discuss the Landco SP and NSCC SP as against the elements that contribute to social wellbeing; and
- (f) Draw conclusions on the implications for social wellbeing of each proposal.

2.2 In my evidence, unless otherwise stated, my reference to:

- (a) The NSCC's Structure Plan relates to the amended Structure Plan dated 28 February 2007 and circulated with NSCC's evidence in chief on 14 March 2007 (*NSCC SP*); and
- (b) Landco's Structure Plan relates to the Structure Plan dated March 2007 and circulated with Landco's evidence in chief on 3 May 2007 (*Landco SP*).

3 **BACKGROUND**

I was engaged by Landco in 2006 to assess and compare social wellbeing implications of the Landco SP and NSCC SP. I have visited the Structure Plan area (*SPA*) on several occasions and am familiar with the site. In conducting my assessment I have liaised with representatives of Landco and key consultants assisting Landco in developing its proposed structure plan, including, in particular, Mr Tansley, Mr Greenaway, Mr Clark and Mr Egerton.

4 OVERVIEW

- 4.1 Social wellbeing is a key element of sustainable management under the Resource Management Act 1991 (*RMA*), and an important consideration in the structure planning process for a greenfields residential development such as that proposed at Long Bay.
- 4.2 International and New Zealand research on social indicators has identified a number of areas of social life which shape wellbeing. Key factors relevant to the Long Bay Structure Plan assessment include influences on physical health, access to education opportunities, access to goods and services, local employment and public and community facilities, influences on social contact, interaction, support and participation in community, access to leisure and recreational opportunities, access to transport (mobility) options, and outcomes for personal safety, or autonomy, neighbourhood and physical environment.
- 4.3 The promotion of positive social wellbeing outcomes is reflected in a number of statutory planning and policy instruments which are relevant to the assessment of the two structure plans at issue in this proceeding.
- 4.4 The relevant "community of interest" which requires consideration in this proceeding extends beyond the physical catchment boundaries of the Long Bay SPA, and also includes areas of adjacent existing residential development. The catchment identified by Mr Tansley represents an appropriate, if conservative, representation of the relevant community of interest.
- 4.5 For the reasons outlined in this evidence, I have concluded that in a number of key respects, the Landco SP is likely to produce significantly better outcomes than the NSCC SP from a social wellbeing perspective. In summary, the Landco SP:
 - (a) Results from an appropriate consideration of social, cultural, environmental and economic factors, and achieves a balance of outcomes, whereas the NSCC SP appears to be driven primarily by environmental constraints at the expense of social and economic outcomes;
 - (b) Will increase the number of households/people that will benefit from living in what should become a very well served urban area;
 - (c) Will provide a greater potential for gains in social wellbeing that come as a result of a more substantial village centre;

- (d) Will better provide for recreation experiences and subsequent physical health benefits by its provision and use of reserves/parks, and walking/cycling opportunities;
- (e) Is more likely to achieve a sense of community for the SPA and its neighbouring residential areas, based on the important new community focal point, a proposed village centre, and by having more positive features in common, as opposed to being equally under-provided; and
- (f) Makes better use of the greenfield opportunity to provide for additional urban residential population and a consolidated urban community.

4.6 The formulation of a structure plan to guide development of the Long Bay SPA provides an excellent opportunity to deliver significant benefits to a community that may include up to approximately 7,800 additional local residents. In my view, the Landco SP will allow those benefits to be delivered, as well as having positive spill-over effects for a similar number of residents in adjacent areas enhancing social cohesion between existing residential areas and new residential areas by creating and consolidating common interests.

5 **FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO SOCIAL WELLBEING**

5.1 The conceptual framework for social analysis, which has been adopted in a range of other Social Impact Assessments¹ and social research contexts in New Zealand in recent years, comes from social indicators work in the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)² and closely parallels the framework adopted by the New Zealand Ministry of Social Development.³

¹ For example, assessment of the effects of project Aqua on local communities and development of community mitigation proposals, for Kurow Aqua Liaison Committee, 2003; SIAs carried out by Taylor Baines & Associates on several wind farm proposals in 2005 and on the Wairau Valley HEPS in 2005; social analyses carried out by Taylor Baines & Associates for assessing the social implications of commercial retail strategy development in Christchurch City between 2003 and 2005.

² OECD, 1998. Living Conditions in OECD Countries: a compendium of social indicators. OECD Social Policy Studies No.5. Paris.

³ For example, Ministry of Social Development, 2003. The Social Report 2003: Indicators of social well being in New Zealand. Wellington.

5.2 The OECD study identified areas of social life which shape well being as follows:

- (a) the state of physical and mental health;
- (b) the quality of housing, shelter, neighbourhood and living places;
- (c) opportunities for formal education and lifelong learning;
- (d) opportunities for income, employment and the quality of working life;
- (e) opportunities for leisure and recreation, time to enjoy them, and access to quality outdoors/open space;
- (f) access to public facilities, transport, communications, and access to goods and services;
- (g) the quality of the physical environment, a clean environment with aesthetic appeal;
- (h) influences on family life, social attachment, social contact, interaction and support;
- (i) influences on participation in community and society, including participation in organised groups and social activities; and
- (j) influences on personal safety, public safety, autonomy or freedom from too much risk.

5.3 I have generally adopted this conceptual framework in my assessment of the likely social effects of the competing structure plans for Long Bay.

5.4 In conducting my analysis, I have considered the following particular factors of influence:

- (a) The nature of the resulting urban environment can provide to a greater or lesser extent for active, healthy lifestyles by encouraging walkable neighbourhoods and for positive mental health by creating pleasing residential amenities;
- (b) Enabling the establishment of primary health services/medical centres that are easily accessible to local residents is an element

of community facilities which is manifestly important in practically every residential community in the country;

- (c) Access to local schools or, in the case of Long Bay, the relationships with established schools, will be important options within the formal education system and for adult education activities, as well as providing facilities for other community uses out of school hours. The provision for local library/learning centre facilities are also relevant considerations;
- (d) A commercial centre within the SPA, with mixed uses, can cater to several of these wellbeing factors - local employment opportunities, leisure opportunities to socialise locally, convenient access to goods and household services, public open space for community events and related social interaction, shared facilities for people to participate in organised community groups, or for social services; and
- (e) Focussed urban design can be used to enhance personal safety on private property and neighbourhood streets, as well as safety in public spaces. Similarly, urban design can promote autonomy and choice of mobility options, as well as influence the nature of pedestrian-vehicle interactions.

6 **POLICY AND PLANNING FRAMEWORK**

6.1 In this section of my evidence, I consider the policy and planning framework within which elements of social wellbeing are provided for, including the:

- (a) RMA;
- (b) Auckland Regional Policy Statement (*ARPS*); and
- (c) North Shore City District Plan (*NSCDP*).

6.2 The RMA provides a general mandate for the enabling of social wellbeing. The ARPS and the NSCDP make explicit references to social and community wellbeing, with both documents focussing primarily on the role of community facilities and commercial activities or shopping centres, adopting different but complementary perspectives.

Resource Management Act 1991

6.3 As I have already stated, section 5(2) of the RMA provides a general mandate that the enabling of social wellbeing is a relevant consideration

in planning. Section 5(2)(a) highlights the importance of sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources - in this case, land for residential development - to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations, implying a particular importance to the efficient use of land for urban development in the context of creating opportunities for people and communities to provide for their social wellbeing. In this greenfields setting, I understand this section of the RMA to be directing attention specifically to optimising opportunities for enabling social wellbeing and efficient use of land for urban development.

Auckland Regional Policy Statement

- 6.4 The ARPS focuses on the creation of community well being. Its policy on Urban Growth Management at section 2.6.1 states that:

Planning for intensification should also encourage activity patterns which enhance the amenity values and convenience, thus contributing to community wellbeing through clustering of social and community facilities at accessible locations often in association with commercial centres...

...Changes should be planned and managed so that activity patterns which provide appropriately for social, economic and cultural wellbeing and the health and safety of the community are reinforced, and opportunities to make better provision for those matters and to improve amenity values, are realized...

- 6.5 Section 2.4.3 of Proposed Plan Change 6 (*PC6*) to the ARPS addresses the need to improve urban amenity in situations of higher-density residential development as follows:

As residential densities increase, some aspects of amenity that are naturally provided by low density developments, must be carefully considered and designed for (e.g. access to outdoor space and buffering from the noise of adjacent activities).

Some intensification has lead to poorly located and poor quality developments often with limited privacy and amenities, which lack diversity in design and in unit size. Attention needs to be paid to good urban form and design outcomes in order to maximise economic opportunity, social wellbeing, cultural diversity and environmental health.

Good urban form and building design is critical to ensuring that developments provide a high quality urban living experience, with sufficient amenities, a range of housing to accommodate a diverse population within mixed use, vibrant and coherent high density centres and corridors.

Improving the quality of urban living includes considering such issues as accessibility (including access to and via the passenger transport network), pedestrian circulation, connectivity, streetscape, and coordinated planning for provision of open space, schools and other community facilities.

- 6.6 Further, the Strategic Direction outlined in section 2.6 of PC6 directs that consideration be had to the role of conscious urban design in maximising social wellbeing as follows:

Urban design is critical to the development of a network of connected communities, an effective passenger transport system, and the layout of buildings, roads, open spaces and physical and social infrastructure. Quality urban design should maximise economic opportunity, social wellbeing, cultural diversity, environmental health and choice for residents. Particularly important to the Growth Concept is the design of walkable, safe, convenient and attractive communities that meet the diverse needs of people, and which are adaptable to future change.

North Shore City District Plan

- 6.7 In its policies on Urban Expansion in the Residential Expansion Zone, the NSCDP requires the boundaries of structure plans to be determined by *“having regard to the likely community of interest, topographic features, primary roading and open space network”*.⁴
- 6.8 Community of interest considerations were also important in determining the study area for this assessment of the social effects of the two proposals.
- 6.9 The NSCDP focuses on avoiding the potential for adverse effects on existing communities. Its policy on Business Development in section 15.3.1 states that:
- ... to ensure that the adverse effects of activities are avoided, remedied or mitigated by ensuring that new business development does not result in adverse social and economic effects by causing a decline in amenity in existing centres or the positive contribution made by existing shopping centres to the social and economic wellbeing of people and communities in the city.
- 6.10 This approach is consistent with NSCC’s centres-based approach for retail activities, which is articulated further in section 15.3.3 of the NSCDP.

⁴ NSCDP, section 17.4.1, Policy 5.

- 6.11 Proposed plan changes to the NSCDP, also provide insights into current thinking on issues to do with social and community wellbeing.⁵
- 6.12 Proposed Plan Change 2 (PC2) to the NSCDP specifically discusses the fostering and strengthening of community wellbeing in section 5.4.4, as follows:

Increasing population and intensity of land use must be carefully managed to ensure that the community continue to have an ease of access to community facilities for recreation, the arts, health, education and housing for the needy.

- 6.13 PC2 also makes reference to the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy, highlighting the need to provide an effective social infrastructure to support community wellbeing as follows:

A liveable community and region requires co-ordinated and effective social infrastructure - a system of social services, networks and facilities that support people and communities. Growth in the region means forward planning in terms of access to facilities like social support services, emergency services (police, fire, ambulance), affordable health care services, a range of employment opportunities, educational opportunities (schools, tertiary, adult/community), indoor and outdoor recreational facilities (parks, swimming pools, sports grounds).

- 6.14 PC2 also notes, in section 5.4.4, the importance of town and village centres as social infrastructure, and their applicability to new residential communities, as follows:

As the city changes so will the patterns of leisure and lifestyles. Town and village centres have the greatest capacity to provide the facilities needed to provide for our city's social infrastructure. This infrastructure needs to be closely aligned with the specific communities of need, designed as safe public environments and easily accessible to all including those living in the newly developed parts of the city.

⁵ I note in this regard that Plan Change 2 is subject to 3 outstanding appeals relating to treatment by the plan of the Albany Town Centre, terminology of transport efficiency and whether to adopt a centres or corridors based approach. In all other respects the provisions of Plan Change 2 are effectively operative. Plan Change 12, on the other hand, is at a much earlier point in the planning process, being in response to the Local Government (Auckland) Amendment Act 2004, on which decisions have yet to be released.

- 6.15 PC2 also includes a section (section 6) on Managing Growth and Development which contains a goal statement about Community Wellbeing, as follows:

A city which provides a wide range of easily accessible community facilities which satisfy the diverse social and cultural needs of the community. A high level of pedestrian amenity, personal safety and the potential for crime is recognised in the design of these public places, with the overall result being an increase in the usage of public spaces, community facilities and the parks network.

- 6.16 Related goal statements in PC2 include:

- (a) in the Built Environment section:

... a wide variety of housing forms which reflect the demands of its ageing population and increases the accessibility to employment and community facilities.

and

- (b) in the Ease of Movement section:

... the development of an urban form which is less reliant on the private motor vehicle.

7 **OBJECTIVES RELATED TO SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING**

Comparison of Objectives

- 7.1 Neither the NSCC SP nor the Landco SP proposal makes explicit references to social and community wellbeing in their objectives. However, many of the objectives refer to factors that underpin the creation of social wellbeing.

7.2 Certain of the objectives for each proposal, while containing minor textual differences, carry similar implications for social wellbeing outcomes.⁶ A comparative table of the objectives of the two proposals is set out below.

Objective	NSCC SP	Landco SP
9A 3.1	Integrated and Sustainable Development - refers to "community" and the desirability of "a high degree of liveability and amenity".	Integrated and Sustainable Subdivision and Development - refers to "urban community" and the desirability of "a high degree of liveability and amenity" for the future community.
9A 3.5	Urban Form and Design - seeks to promote "choice in living environments" and "accessible, safe integrated living areas of high amenity with a sense of community".	Urban Form and Design - seeks to promote "choice in living environments" and "accessible, safe integrated living areas of high amenity with a sense of community".
9A 3.6	Staging, Infrastructure and Development Contributions - emphasises the importance of coordinating sub-division development with "provision of the main infrastructure needed to serve the area", although the inclusion of social infrastructure is not made explicit.	Staging, Infrastructure and Development Contributions - emphasises the importance of coordinating sub-division development with "provision of the main public infrastructure needed to serve the area", although the inclusion of social infrastructure is not made explicit.
17B 3.3	Building Design and Development - highlights the need "to ensure there is a sense of place and a high level of residential amenity".	Building Design and Development - highlights the need "to ensure there is a sense of place and a high level of residential amenity".
17B 3.4	Housing Choice and Efficient Use of Land Resources - calls for "a diverse range of housing opportunities".	Housing Choice - calls for "a diverse range of housing opportunities".

⁶ See Housing Choice and Efficient Use of Land Resources (17B 3.4), Urban Form and Design (9A 3.5) Building Design and Development (17B 3.3), and Integrated and Sustainable Development (9A 3.1).

Objective	NSCC SP	Landco SP
17B 4.3 –4.5	Suburban Residential/Urban Neighbourhood/Urban Village - all emphasise the importance of good urban design in providing high quality living environments at various densities.	Suburban Neighbourhood/Urban Neighbourhood/Urban Village - all emphasise the importance of good urban design in providing high quality living environments at various densities.

Suite of Residential Zone Objectives

- 7.3 A comparison of the various objectives covering the residential zones of each proposal indicates that both NSCC SP and the Landco SP allow for the same range of urban residential densities, but the quantum of land devoted to each type of residential density differs between the two proposals. This has consequences for the total number of future residential lots, the size and composition of the future community, street layout and street-scape, residential amenity and walk-ability, and the likely composition of activities in the village centre. A discussion on how these differences impact social well-being is set out in Section 9 below.

Differences in Objectives

- 7.4 There are other objectives that differ between the two proposals, which may result in potentially significant outcomes on social wellbeing factors, as follows:

Objective	NSCC SP	Landco SP
17B 4.6	Village Centre – specifies “a neighbourhood centre to meet the day-to-day needs of the residents living in the area”.	Village Centre – specifies “a vibrant and functional neighbourhood centre to meet the day-to-day needs of residents living in the area”.
17B 4.8	Heritage Protection – “to protect the significant historic heritage landscape along the southern headland overlooking the Long Bay Regional Park.	Recreation and Heritage Protection – “to protect a representative sample of the historic heritage landscape along the southern headland overlooking the Long Bay Regional Park” and emphasises actively “promoting community awareness of cultural heritage values” and “providing public open space in close proximity to the Long Bay village centre and Regional Park”.

- 7.5 The additional requirement for a *"vibrant and functional"* neighbourhood centre (in Objective 17B 4.6) in the context of the Landco SP indicates Landco's intention to establish a more substantial village centre with greater and more varied contributions to social wellbeing.
- 7.6 Further, in Objective 17B 4.8, the NSCC SP proposes the protection of all historic heritage resources *"from the adverse effects of inappropriate subdivision, use and development"*, while the Landco SP focuses on protecting *"a representative sample of the historic landscape"* and *"promoting community awareness of cultural heritage values"* and linking this into the activities of the future community by *"providing public open space in close proximity to the Long Bay village centre and Regional Park"*. The Landco SP, in my view, constitutes a more substantial basis for contributing to social wellbeing.

8 COMMUNITY OF INTEREST AND STUDY AREA

- 8.1 In his evidence, Mr Tansley notes that the spatial boundaries of the SPA do not define a coherent entity in social and economic terms, even if they do reflect a discrete hydrological catchment. He also notes that *"In many respects, notions of community are conferred by the distribution of shopping centres."*
- 8.2 I have considered the issue of spatial boundaries against the concept of *"community of interest"*, which I explain in the remainder of this section. For the following reasons, I endorse Mr Tansley's observation and conclude that the SPA has been influenced primarily by considerations of the physical environment with little regard to the social and economic context.
- 8.3 In my opinion, the concept of community of interest is relevant to the assessment of the social wellbeing implications of each proposal for two reasons:
- (a) Firstly, the wording of section 5(2) of the RMA refers explicitly to *"people and communities"* when describing the enabling of social, economic and cultural wellbeing; and
 - (b) Secondly, the phrase *"sense of community"* is referred to in a range of documents before this Court.⁷

⁷ For example, NSCC Proposed Variation 66 Section 9A.2 Subdivision and Development Issues; Section 9A.3.5 Urban Form and Design Objective; Evidence of Mr Brown (para.3.74).

- 8.4 Mr Tansley has commented that "*The prospective addition of the Long Bay SPA (LBSPA) to the north of Torbay creates an extended swathe of residential and related urban zonings in which there would be no significant provision for suburban shopping.*"
- 8.5 From this I understand Mr Tansley to mean that all the residential areas in this "extended swathe" have in common the attribute of currently and potentially being under-provided for access to shopping, but with the corresponding common potential to benefit from the future development of a supermarket-led Long Bay Village. Mr Tansley has indicated on his Maps 1 and 2 (with the blue dashed line) the contiguous residential area which would logically be served in this way. This I take to be Mr Tansley's expression of an appropriate local economic entity for the purposes of defining a Study Area.
- 8.6 Earlier studies of community of interest for local government boundary purposes⁸ have ranged widely over the multitude of factors that overlap and combine to a greater or lesser extent to support individuals' perceptions of community of interest and communities' sense of identity. These factors have included proximity or place, ownership of property, age and length of residence, children's education, patterns of service delivery and access to goods and services, patterns of employment and business relationships, matters of identity to do with kinship or ethnicity, religious affiliations, and sporting, recreational and cultural activities.
- 8.7 In analysing patterns associated with accessing shops and other co-located commercial services, it is evident that Mr Tansley's analysis fits within this framework.
- 8.8 In late February 2007 I visited Torbay and Long Bay for the purposes of familiarising myself with the layout of the community. I interviewed a range of people representing educational services from pre-school to college, health services and churches, for the purposes of assessing other elements of this community of interest framework. All eleven organisations represented are currently providing their services from physical bases located in Torbay or Long Bay.

⁸ For example, Ward, M 1998. Communities of Interest on the Banks Peninsula. A preliminary review of the Banks Peninsula District. Report prepared for the Local Government Commission. Taylor Baines & Associates 1997. Communities of Interest in the Waitaki Valley – a preliminary assessment. Prepared for the Canterbury Regional Council, August 1997. Taylor Baines & Associates 2005. Communities of Interest on Banks Peninsula. Prepared for the Local Government Commission, January 2005.

- 8.9 With one exception, all of these social services have existing residential catchments which extend from Okura in the north down into the long-established East Coast Bays suburban belt, between East Coast Bays Road and the coast. Generally, their geographical coverage is similar (4 out of 11) or somewhat more extensive (5 out of 11) - in a southerly direction - than Mr Tansley's Study Area, while one is much more extensive and another is rather less extensive. The predominant characteristic is that the 'communities' already being served by these social service providers do not recognise the southern boundary of the SPA as a social boundary.
- 8.10 This indicates that the logical social context in which to assess the two proposals is more geographically extensive than the SPA itself. For practical purposes, Mr Tansley's Study Area is a useful, if conservative, approximation. As he notes, "*The SPA's integration with the established Torbay community will be strengthened by the future roading pattern*", an observation I would endorse.
- 8.11 In my view, there are several implications of adopting this wider geographical area as the associated community of interest and therefore the Study Area:
- (a) Firstly, it enables the assessment of the two proposals to reflect the broader sustainability policy framework. As already noted, the RMA incorporates within its purpose the enabling of people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing as well as the protection of natural physical resources and environmental systems;
 - (b) Future development resulting from either of the proposals provides an opportunity to consider alternatives that will create good outcomes, not just for the future residents of the SPA, but also for the existing residential communities which have geographical proximity in common as a result of being on the outer metropolitan limits;
 - (c) As Mr Tansley has explained the outcomes for households and their access to jobs and day-to-day shopping needs, it is in my opinion appropriate to adopt a similar approach when considering outcomes related to the provision of social infrastructure, including access to community facilities. Torbay and Browns Bay are examples of how commercial and community infrastructure is integrated to mutual advantage. Consequently, providing for future social and community infrastructure that may be located within the SPA should recognise the extent and nature of the

relevant community of interest, and not be based on a socially artificial construct;

- (d) Mr Tansley's analysis of household numbers indicates the quantitative implications of assessing just the SPA growth potential or the growth potential of the wider community of interest, which he refers to as the LBSA Growth Potential. He concludes that the difference is critical in terms of the kind of centre that can be supported. This has direct implications for the range and scale of social services and community facilities likely to be available within this community in the long term;
- (e) One final implication of adopting this wider geographical area as the associated community of interest is the importance of discussions between NSCC, Landco and established stakeholders such as schools, the Ministry of Education, the relevant Public Health Organisations and other existing local service providers in order to optimise aspects of the plan and maximise potential benefits from this development opportunity.

9 **ASSESSMENT OF THE TWO PROPOSALS ON SOCIAL WELLBEING**

9.1 In this section I firstly identify features, both common and particular, of the NSCC SP and the Landco SP proposals that inform my analysis of their respective contributions to social wellbeing in the SPA.

9.2 I then assess each structure plan against the relevant factors contributing to social wellbeing that are outlined in Section 5 of my evidence and for which supporting analysis is available, in particular, having regard to:

- (a) Access to education and life long learning;
- (b) Access to goods and services, local employment and public and community facilities;
- (c) Access to leisure and recreational opportunities, and implications for physical health; and
- (d) Access to transport (mobility) options.

Features common to both proposals

9.3 Features common to both proposals include:

- (a) The physical location and geographic extent of the SPA;

- (b) Topographical features, view and proximity to Long Bay Regional Park; and
- (c) A new, more central road entrance to the Park will be created to take regional visitors through the Village Centre.

Features particular to Landco SP

- 9.4 Landco's proposal provides for a range of dwelling densities and types in the various zones of the SPA.
- 9.5 Zones 1A and 1B are described as 'large lot residential', and are associated with larger dwellings averaging 3.64 persons per dwelling. There are already 39 occupied dwellings in these zones and Landco's proposal aims to add a further 96 residential lots.
- 9.6 Zones 2A and 2B are described as 'suburban neighbourhood' with household size varying between 2.44 and 3.64 persons per dwelling.
- 9.7 Zone 3 is described as 'urban neighbourhood' and involves a mix of stand alone housing, 'terrace lot' town houses and apartments, with household size in the range 2.04 to 2.47 persons per dwelling.
- 9.8 Zone 4 is described as 'urban village' and involves 4-storey apartments with average household size expected of 1.89 persons per dwelling, while Zone 5 is described as 'village centre' with mixed land use involving retail and commercial activities on the ground floor and three storeys of residential apartments above with average household size expected of 1.74 persons per dwelling.
- 9.9 Based on his estimates of population densities and dwelling yields, Mr Egerton has estimated the total additional population for the SPA at the end of the development scenario to be in the range of 7,271 to 8,205 persons.
- 9.10 Mr Egerton has described how the Landco proposal has been designed having specific regard to:
 - (a) establishing direct visual connections to significant natural landmarks to contribute to visual amenity values around the new urban area;
 - (b) proximity to major recreational nodes and large areas of open space providing compensating factors for occupants of higher density residential formats;

- (c) the layout of major roads, providing road connections into the existing network, connecting the two largest concentrations of future local residents on the north and south sides of Vaughans Stream close to the regional park, linking with the proposed new entrance to the Long Bay Regional Park for visitors, and connecting to the end of Vaughan’s Road on the northern boundary of the SPA;
- (d) the location of the Village Centre, influenced by walking catchments, public transport routes, the major road hierarchy and access to the Regional Park;
- (e) an internal movement system, including a road hierarchy, pedestrian and cycle network and public transport catchments; and
- (f) an Open Space Network and public parkland, and walkable access to open spaces for residents within the SPA.

9.11 The Landco SP also allocates 2.4 ha⁹ of land as the basis for a Village Centre accommodating commercial, retail and community facilities within a mixed-use concept.

Features particular to NSCC SP

9.12 Like the Landco SP, NSCC SP also provides for a range of dwelling densities and types across the various zones of the SPA. The range of densities proposed under the NSCC SP is similar to the Landco SP, however, the quantum of land zoned under each density is markedly different. Annexure A to my evidence illustrates the differences in areas allocated for different densities between the two proposals. As stated in Ms Davison’s evidence¹⁰ the density allocation corresponds to a total population estimate of 4,500 people for the NSCC SP under NSCC estimates, although I am aware that Mr Egerton disputes the likelihood of achieving such a population.

9.13 Other features of the NSCC SP include:

- (a) the allocation of “around 1 ha”¹¹ for the Village Centre (compared with 2.4 ha by Landco); and

⁹ In total, the Landco SP allocates 3.02ha for a village centre. However, 2.4ha represents the area of actual developable land with roading excluded.

¹⁰ See paragraph 3.1.

¹¹ Evidence of Mr Mead, paragraph 11.14.

(b) the allocation of 33.4 ha to public reserves, compared with 68.3 ha by the Landco SP¹².

- 9.14 The social analysis framework which guides the assessment of contributions to social wellbeing is summarised in Section 5 of my evidence. I will now describe the expected outcomes in terms of the elements of that framework which are most relevant to this situation.
- 9.15 In doing so, I am mindful of the fact that implementation of any Structure Plan will occur over a period of some 10-15 years, and that the full extent of the potential developments will not be realised until the end of this period. Physical building, occupation by residents, and the evolution of commercial and social infrastructure can be expected to occur progressively over this period. For example, I note that Mr Tansley indicates the likelihood of a supermarket establishing under the Landco SP proposal by 2016, with a lesser service provision establishing prior to that.
- 9.16 For the purposes of this assessment and comparison of the two proposals, I will consider the potential social needs and potential social outcomes expected by the end of this period.
- 9.17 While some additional commercial and social infrastructure will be required even in the early years of development, the opportunities, particularly the necessary space for future developments of this kind, should be incorporated into any plan from the outset in order to have a realistic chance of occurring at a later date.

Access to education and lifelong learning

General

- 9.18 A unique feature of the SPA is that there are already two well-established schools in the area, being Long Bay Primary School and Long Bay College.
- 9.19 Pre-school education services are also an important element of residential communities and contribute to the social wellbeing of those living in the area.
- 9.20 I held discussions with the various education providers in the SPA for the purposes of my assessment of the two structure plans. A record of

¹² As reported by Mr Greenaway in his Table 2, in both cases, 22.6ha of this allocation comprises a single block of land at the northern end of the SPA, adjacent to the Regional Park and more distant from most of the new residential areas within the SPA. Thus a comparison of public reserves areas embedded within the residential areas of the SPA shows 45.7ha under Landco and 10.8ha under NSCC SP.

these discussions is attached as Annexure B. These discussions, together with my research of the SPA area have informed my assessment of the two proposals, as follows:

Landco SP

- 9.21 The two existing schools have the capacity to cater to the increase in population likely to be generated under both proposals. However, my assessment indicates that pre-school facilities are likely to come under pressure unless additional facilities are provided.
- 9.22 Future demand for pre-school facilities is usually assessed in relation to the number of under five-year-olds in the residential catchment. I have estimated¹³ the likely size of the additional under five-year-old population, assuming a total resident population of 7,800 in the SPA under the Landco SP.
- 9.23 My assessment indicates the long-term need for between four and five additional pre-school facilities¹⁴ within the SPA under the Landco SP. The provision of space for pre-school education facilities is, therefore, an important element of social infrastructure in the context of the Landco SP. I conclude therefore that access to additional space for pre-school education facilities, either private or public, will be required within the SPA if parents are to avoid driving long distances for this service. I note that the NSCDP (Rule 16.3.3.3) allows for the establishment of small childcare centres in residential areas (catering for 6-10 children) as permitted activities and that both the NSCC SP and the Landco SP make provision (in Table 17B.1) for child care centres with different service levels in the Long Bay 1 – 4 zones. Established pre-school services catering for more than 10 children per session, tend to be larger, purpose-designed premises or larger institutional buildings such as church halls, implying a degree of public investment. In practice, there does not appear to have been a proliferation of small pre-school services throughout the residential areas of Torbay and Glamorgan. Consequently, some provision for additional pre-school education facilities in the proposed Village Centre is also likely to be necessary, whether privately owned and occupied or available for lease or part-time use. This finding is reinforced by the views expressed during my interviews with pre-school providers. The Landco SP appropriately provides both the space and flexibility within its Village Centre zone to allow for such centres.

¹³ See Annexure C for details.

¹⁴ Assuming 2 sessions per day and up to 50 children per session. This would correspond to many more facilities if they were of the smaller variety (i.e. <5 children or 6-10 children)

NSCC SP

- 9.24 Having already noted that the existing schools have the capacity to cater for an increase in local population resulting from the level of development proposed by Landco, from a social wellbeing perspective, this highlights the fact that fewer households will experience this benefit and these facilities under the NSCC SP proposal.
- 9.25 My assessment indicates the long-term need for between two and three additional pre-school facilities within the SPA under the NSCC proposal¹⁵. In respect of the demand that will be created for pre-school facilities resulting from new development, the greatly reduced Village Centre under the NSCC SP (around 1 ha as opposed to 2.4 ha under the Landco SP) may restrict opportunities for providing pre-school facilities to the required level. This aspect of social infrastructure does not appear to have been the subject of particular planning attention under the NSCC SP.

Access to goods and services, local employment and public facilities**Landco SP**

- 9.26 Mr Tansley's evidence details the level of retail and commercial services he believes is appropriate in the context of the Landco SP, taking into account the demand from established communities south of the SPA that are presently under-provided for due to their peripheral location.
- 9.27 The components of retail and commercial services include, under the Landco SP, the provision of a supermarket and a range of other convenience stores and services, including non-supermarket grocery stores for food and beverage, fast food outlets and bakeries for takeaway service, cafes, restaurants and bars, shop front financial and insurance services, personal services such as real estate, hair care and beauty parlours, dry cleaners, repairers, copy centres, pet groomers and other similar activities, and medical activities.
- 9.28 Shopping centres provide more than just access to individual shops. They provide important elements of social amenity as well - a range of personal services; efficient use of time with multi-purpose trips, locations for social contact in the form of cafes, bars and restaurants as well as entertainment venues and public open spaces; they are also places of local employment. Various sources of research¹⁶ confirm that

¹⁵ See footnote 14.

¹⁶ Taylor Baines & Associates, 2003a. An analysis of host community experience of the Woolworths supermarket in Ferrymead, Christchurch. Working Paper FS33, Public Good Science Fund Contract TBAX0203, April 2003. Taylor Baines & Associates, 2003b. An analysis of host community experience of the upgraded New World supermarket in St Martins,

residents and centre users value this source of social amenity in shopping centres.

- 9.29 This research indicates that the size of a centre influences the scope for these opportunities. The fact is that, if opportunities exist, businesses and public agencies and the activities of voluntary groups co-locate in physical proximity to take advantage of the numbers of people visiting a centre. The opportunities arise as a result of several factors, namely the people-drawing power of regular and frequent supermarket shopping, the availability of suitably-zoned land to accommodate other activities, and the availability of buildings or facilities to occupy or use occasionally, as the physical base for commercial or community activities.
- 9.30 Mr Tansley's analysis focuses on the kinds of commercial activities which typically co-locate in neighbourhood and suburban centres. In terms of social amenity, other types of facilities need to be considered as well. These would typically include premises dedicated to activities such as a public kindergarten, a Citizens Advice Bureau, or community centre-type facilities providing shared premises for use by a range of community groups such as private pre-school education providers, senior citizens groups, local sports and recreation clubs (e.g. indoor bowls; garden clubs) or private teachers (e.g. ballet or kick-boxing), voluntary agencies providing social services such as counselling, or church-based activities. In this regard, I note that Long Bay College already uses 'satellite' locations within its community to offer adult education courses.
- 9.31 NSCC may want to consider the long-term community needs for facilities such as a library/information centre or a community centre or community house. At present there are no community centres or community libraries north of Browns Bay, although a mobile library currently visits Okura and Torbay for half an hour each fortnight.
- 9.32 Many established urban residential communities around the country derive considerable social amenity from their relationship with a local shopping centre and community focal point. Torbay and Browns Bay are examples of how this occurs at differing scales of centre.

- 9.33 The Structure Plan is an important instrument in planning for the future development of such community focal points. Anticipating future demands and providing adequate space for this to occur - irrespective of who is subsequently involved in developments on the ground - is an essential ingredient.
- 9.34 In my interviews, I encountered several types of organisations in Torbay which expressed an interest in access to land or premises in the future Long Bay Village Centre. These included two churches and a health services provider.
- 9.35 My discussions with the Funding Manager at the Waitemata District Health Board established that the board is responsible for funding services but not for acquiring new premises in areas of growing demand as this is the responsibility of health providers themselves. Typical GP/population benchmark ratios in the past have been approximately 1400 people within a 3km radius of a medical practice for one GP. Consequently, an additional 7,800¹⁷ resident population is certain to put pressure on existing primary care services in the Torbay/Glamorgan area. Furthermore, he pointed to a growing trend - part of an emerging primary care strategy - of increasingly multi-disciplinary, multi-service practices¹⁸, which will require larger, dedicated buildings rather than converted residential dwellings as has sometimes been the case in the past.
- 9.36 Mr Tansley's assessment of the commercial space needs for a future Village Centre based on Landco's proposal found¹⁹ the potential demand for 5-6,000m² of gross floor area at the ground floor level. When factored up to include off-street parking, footpaths, and streets, Mr Tansley confirmed that these commercial space requirements alone, are sufficient to justify, as Landco has done, an allocation of more than 2ha of commercial land in the proposed Village Centre.
- 9.37 Further, the incorporation of other potential space demands such as public agencies, community facilities (either dedicated or for shared use), early childhood facilities, and public open space for the purposes of strengthening the sense of place and identity or for outdoor leisure and community events, serves to strengthen the case significantly for

¹⁷ This figure reflects Mr Tansley's estimate of households, as distinct from Mr Egerton's estimates of dwellings.

¹⁸ For example, the Apollo Centre for Health and Wellness in Albany which provides medical, surgical, diagnostic laboratory and nutrition services, etc. staffed by a wide range of professionals on a single site.

¹⁹ See paragraph 5.6.7.

the 2.4ha of commercially-zoned land in Landco's proposed Village centre.

- 9.38 Landco's Village Centre will better provide for the social wellbeing of the future residents of the SPA as well as residents in adjacent residential areas and integration of the two communities, not just in terms of providing an appropriate level of access to commercial goods and services, but also to providing access to public facilities and underpinning social contact, social interaction and participation in local community activities.
- 9.39 Access to employment in reasonable working environments is another contributing factor to social wellbeing. While the overall structure of cities dictates that not everyone is able to work in close proximity to their place of residence, it is possible, for those who are able to work from home, or in situations where jobs are created within the local commercial zone. In the latter circumstance, Mr Tansley has estimated) the employment potential of the village centre under the Landco SP at approximately 360 full-time or part-time jobs, or approximately 270 Full-Time Equivalent jobs (FTEs).

NSCC SP

- 9.40 At paragraph 3.80 of Mr Brown's evidence, he explains that the proposed Village Centre was:
- ...originally envisaged as comprising a restaurant and café or two, together with perhaps a medical centre, superette, bakery and other small scale retail premises. That vision has now expanded somewhat to also encompass office activities of a limited scale. Yet the 5000-6000 potential residents of Long Bay are certainly not viewed as being sufficient to sustain much more than this.
- 9.41 This represents somewhat less of an offer than is currently available in the long-established community of Torbay but is consistent with the guidelines on community/social facilities presented as an annexure to his statement, which indicates that "*The village centre will be small in scale (1500m² to 5000m²).*" It is also consistent with the allocation of around 1 ha of commercially zoned land under the NSCC SP.
- 9.42 These extracts suggest that any assessment of the future retail demand in Long Bay has not included consideration of the neighbouring residential areas which are currently under-provided.
- 9.43 The NSCC SP appears to constrain the scope of the proposed Village Centre in two ways:

- (a) by allocating a relatively small area of land to commercial zoning;
and
 - (b) by limiting the scale of future residential development so that a larger centre would barely be viable, even if more commercially zoned land were to be available.
- 9.44 Under this more constrained scenario, Mr Tansley has concluded that a supermarket would not be viable in the SPA. As a result, I agree with Mr Brown that few other shops and facilities are likely to co-locate. Furthermore, new residents will have to travel even further than existing residents for their main shopping and many of their service needs, which will mean greater reliance on motor vehicles. It will also mean that new residents will have fewer opportunities and less time to meet and socialise locally.
- 9.45 The 4,500 residential population estimated under the NSCC SP will still put pressure on existing primary care services in the Torbay/Glamorgan area, but the size of the commercial zone may restrict opportunities to establish additional primary care facilities.
- 9.46 The relatively low level of local convenience offered under the NSCC SP removes one important compensating factor for those who might otherwise be attracted to live in higher-density residential circumstances.
- 9.47 In my opinion the NSCC SP is likely to be considerably less effective in establishing a community focal point and sense of community than the Landco SP. Further, it is unlikely to achieve the intended 'live/work/play' environment articulated by Mr Brown in his evidence at paragraph 3.80(a).
- 9.48 It is possible that NSCC could try to encourage the evolution of a community focal point by investing in a multi-use building or space in the small village centre in order to facilitate community group activities in much the same way as the Torbay Community Association has done in the past. However, Mr Brown's evidence as noted above gives no indication of such an intention.
- 9.49 Consequently, I believe that the NSCC SP is likely to entrench a peripheral status on the new residential area of Long Bay in respect of access to goods and services and community facilities, thereby extending the geographical area which currently experiences this status. There will thus be less opportunity to merge the new residential community with the existing residential community.

- 9.50 Despite its smaller scale, the village centre under the NSCC SP will have the potential to provide approximately 50 full-time or part-time jobs, or approximately 40 FTEs, as estimated by Mr Tansley. This is not an insignificant contribution to social wellbeing, but very much less than under the Landco SP.

Access to leisure and recreational opportunities, and implications for physical health

Landco SP

- 9.51 Leisure and recreation cover a wide range of activities. Mr Greenaway notes that walking is New Zealand's most popular form of outdoor physical activity, closely followed by cycling.
- 9.52 These and other informal recreational activities make use of public recreation reserves and neighbourhood playgrounds and parks. Some recreational activities may require special facilities, such as flat playing fields for team games as in the case of Long Bay College and the Ashley Reserve, courts as in the case of the Torbay Tennis Club, or a climbing wall and fitness equipment, also located at the College.
- 9.53 In the public domain, leisure also extends to social and cultural activities such as meeting friends for a drink, dining out or attending the theatre. All of these opportunities are presently available close to or in Long Bay.
- 9.54 As I have pointed out in the previous section of my evidence, the proposed Village Centre will be an important community focal point and contributor to leisure activities, if it has a sufficient allocation of land to allow it to develop and cater to the mix of uses described.
- 9.55 Mr Greenaway has assessed the provision of public recreation and open space in his evidence. He notes that, because under the Landco SP more extensive areas of higher density residential development are proposed, its proposal is based around relatively large areas of public land associated with landscape protection and enhancement, particularly on Vaughan's Slope and College Ridge.
- 9.56 Mr Greenaway has also assessed the likely effects on the recreational experience of Long Bay Regional Park resulting from the urbanisation of the SPA. He estimates that the Landco SP will ultimately increase Park visitor numbers by between 41% and 46% on present levels of usage, due largely to the relatively frequent use of the Park which can be

expected from a proportion of new local residents - he estimates this proportion as 25%²⁰.

- 9.57 The Landco SP will ultimately enable the majority of the 7,800 additional local residents to derive recreational and amenity benefits from living in close proximity to Long Bay Regional Park.
- 9.58 Outcomes for physical health are one element contributing to social wellbeing. The extent to which residents are encouraged to walk, both as a form of exercise and also as a means of getting about, has a bearing on this outcome. Furthermore, the extent to which residents are encouraged to walk is influenced by appropriate infrastructure and by the range of attractions located within walking distance.
- 9.59 Research carried out in North Shore City by researchers from the Auckland University of Technology²¹ points to higher residential densities, mixed-use centres and high-connectivity street and walkway networks being influential in encouraging people to walk to the extent that it significantly increases their overall activity levels and improves corresponding health indicators.
- 9.60 In my opinion, the Landco SP offers a high likelihood of achieving these positive health outcomes for the majority of its future residents since Zones 2, 3 and 4 incorporate the three characteristics described. Mr Egerton has stated that a 400 metre catchment was adopted as an approximate neighbourhood cell and local park catchment. Mr Greenaway also notes that the Landco SP *"provides ample connectivity between the Regional Park and the new community. Pedestrian access is available along contours and more directly from the Village Centre and the proposed 'vista park' south of Vaughans Stream."*
- 9.61 I also note that the evolving school catchments will tend progressively to encourage more walking to the schools than currently occurs, with the schools being largely at the edge of their respective catchments at the moment.

²⁰ Refer to Mr Greenaway's evidence.

²¹ Entitled 'Active Friendly Environments: Physical Activity and the Built Environment. A study of physical activity and the urban environment in North Shore City'. The report was completed in January 2007, under contract to Sport and Recreation NZ (SPARC) and the North Shore City Council, but has yet to be released publicly.

NSCC SP

- 9.62 Important recreational resources accessible to future residents in Long Bay under the NSCC SP will be those associated with the Regional Park, the two existing schools and the Ashley Reserve. These are the same as the Landco SP and residents will generally enjoy a similar standard of access. There will however be fewer new residents who enjoy this benefit. Mr Greenaway estimates that the NSCC SP will ultimately increase Regional Park visitor numbers by between 22% and 24% on present levels of usage, due largely to the relatively frequent use of the Park which can be expected from a proportion of new local residents.
- 9.63 Two points of difference in terms of leisure and recreational access under the NSCC SP will be the reduced range of leisure opportunities likely to be available in a substantially smaller Village Centre and the smaller area of new public reserves, as noted by Mr Greenaway in his evidence.
- 9.64 Given that the number of attractions within the Village Centre is one of the motivators for walking - and there are likely to be fewer such attractions in a smaller centre, it can be expected that the proportion of new residents likely to experience the health benefits of more walking under the NSCC SP will be less than under the Landco SP; it will certainly be less in absolute numbers. Mr Egerton estimates that *"the Landco structure plan places approximately 2,500 additional people (based on a rudimentary calculation of less than 2.5 people per dwelling) within walking distance of the Centre."* This will nevertheless be an important source of social wellbeing for new residents under the NSCC SP. However, the relatively greater car-dependency expected under the NSCC SP will mean that most new residents will have less time for leisure and recreation generally.

Access to transport (mobility) options

Landco SP

- 9.65 Mr Constable's evidence (at 8.1) indicates that the Long Bay area is currently well served by public transport with seven existing bus services terminating at the Long Bay Regional Park and a further five services currently terminating at the Torbay shopping centre.
- 9.66 Mr Clark notes that while these services currently turn around/terminate in the Long Bay Regional Park or the Torbay shopping centre, *'it is proposed that this terminus will be relocated to the proposed Long Bay village centre, to allow the bus services to serve the town centre area.'*

- 9.67 Mr Constable (at paragraph 8.5) refers to discussions amongst experts as to the desirability of a bus layover area with possible options including *"the north end of Beach Road extension where it meets Vaughans Road, or in the proposed new main carpark in the Regional Park, or elsewhere in close proximity to the Village centre."* I mention this because it is relevant to considering ease of access to public transport for those living on the northern side of Vaughans Stream. The first layover option would better cater for this.
- 9.68 Mr Constable (at paragraph 8.6) states that *"the proposed road network within the SPA should be flexible enough to provide good public transport options for the future."* He then expresses the view (at paragraph 8.6) that the road network proposed in the NSCC SP would provide that flexibility, and (at paragraph 16.23) that the road network in the Landco SP would be equally as flexible – *"that there is little to differentiate between them."*
- 9.69 Mr Constable (at paragraph 8.4) and Mr Clark agree that the growth in future bus services to the Long Bay area will depend on the future population growth.
- 9.70 In discussing Travel Demand Management, which involves reducing the need to travel, providing for travel choices, influencing travel choices, and creating financial disincentives for private car use, Mr Clark concludes that the Landco SP *"is consistent with the regional objective, to encourage an urban form which minimises the demand for travel"*.
- 9.71 Increasing the viability of public transport services that are easily accessible to the future residents of the SPA as well as residents in adjacent residential areas south of the SPA, is an important contribution to their social wellbeing. When considered alongside the provision of walking and cycling opportunities that arise from proximity to shops, schools, parks and reserves, this suggests a high degree of autonomy, that is to say, individual choice over modes of mobility. These circumstances are likely to cater to the widest range of demographic characteristics including age, income and household composition. Mr Clark reinforces that the concept of internalising trips will confer similar benefits to existing residents in the surrounding areas.
- 9.72 I have discussed with Mr Clark the issue of ensuring that access to public transport is provided to future residents living in the northern part of the SPA. He agrees that this can be catered for by ensuring that the route for public bus services incorporates a loop up to Vaughans Road.

- 9.73 Long Bay College students are likely to comprise a significant bus user group at certain times of day²², because much of the College's zone lies well south of the SPA and therefore a substantial proportion of its students will continue to come from areas such as Northcross, Browns Bay and Waiake.
- 9.74 Changing the location of the bus terminus from Long Bay Regional Park to the future Long Bay Village Centre is therefore beneficial from the perspective of student access to public transport. However, this implies that for substantial numbers of college students, the village centre is likely to be on the route home each afternoon. The college pointed out that a larger, more vibrant centre will be important as a moderating influence on the behaviour of large groups of students, and that this will be important to the culture of the area and the social amenity for other users of the centre at these times.
- 9.75 It also points to the importance of the needs of major user groups, being general commuters, school students and Regional Park visitors, when considering the specific bus terminus location and its physical characteristics.

NSCC SP

- 9.76 I have already referred to Mr Constable's conclusions about the flexibility of the roading network to support future public transport options under the NSCC SP. The relocation of the bus terminus is common to both proposals.
- 9.77 To the extent that additional bus services in future depend on population growth in the area, the NSCC SP must be considered likely to result in fewer additional services over time, or, as Mr Clark observes, less viable additional services, which may mean less certainty.
- 9.78 The other principal difference, discussed by Mr Clark, relates to the fact that the NSCC SP proposal, by providing for a much smaller village centre, and one which does not cater so extensively for the day-to-day convenience needs of local residents, will have far less potential to internalise trips and far less potential for local residents to avail themselves of the walking option for shopping trips or indeed for multi-

²² The College Principal informed me that, at the present time, about 13 buses arrive at the college each morning, between 8.00am and 8.45am, with the bulk between 8.20am and 8.35am. A few of these are scheduled bus services, but only college students appear to use these services.

purpose trips which incorporate shopping with visits to other personal services or community facilities.

- 9.79 Mr Clark has also pointed out that “students will need to travel further, on average” under the NSCC SP proposal, because fewer of them will live within the Long Bay SPA.
- 9.80 In summary, while there will be good public transport options available to local residents under both proposals, the options for additional services are likely to be more viable and therefore more certain with the higher-population outcome under the Landco SP. Furthermore, these social wellbeing enhancements will apply to those living in existing residential areas for whom the new Village Centre will become a community focal point under the Landco SP.
- 9.81 The larger Landco SP Village Centre, catering to a higher proportion of day-to-day convenience needs, as described by Mr Tansley, enables more mobility options locally, including walking and cycling for a higher proportion of local residents and much shorter car trips for all residents in the “extended swathe” referred to by Mr Tansley. It is important to remember that similar conclusions apply to non-shopping trips as well.

10 **DISCUSSION OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO SOCIAL WELLBEING**

- 10.1 Landco’s new design features relate to a compact, higher-density residential development, built around a mixed-use village centre, and the effective application of urban design principles. In my view, this takes better advantage of the greenfields opportunity to develop and provide for additional urban residential population and a consolidated urban community.
- 10.2 An important characteristic of the Village Centre proposed by Landco is that it is of sufficient scale (i.e. sufficient land is provided) to accommodate a supermarket anchor store capable of redressing the level of under-provision of such services to the existing northern-most residential areas of Torbay, Glamorgan and Awaruku (as described by Mr Tansley) and thereby also avoiding a similar fate for the new residents of Long Bay. As stated, my evidence elsewhere leads me to believe that such an anchor store will, in time, attract numerous other outlets and facilities to co-locate to the extent that there is space available.
- 10.3 These features of Landco’s proposal have the potential to combine to deliver high levels of social amenity, resulting in positive effects on physical health, vibrant commercial activity, social contact,

opportunities for participation in local community activities and events, and a network of community focal points (around the Park, heritage site and the schools) linked to the Village Centre. In the long term, the Village Centre is more likely to be thought of as a town centre, as anticipated in the NSCC's Plan Change 12.

- 10.4 From a social wellbeing perspective, there are clear reasons that justify aiming for a higher dwelling yield and resultant population, as proposed by Landco, so long as this can be achieved without compromising the environmental amenity values of the principal features such as Vaughans Stream, Awaruku Stream, the Regional Park and the marine reserve. I endorse strongly the conclusion of Mr Tansley *"that in weighing all the pros and cons of this appeal, there are strong and positive reasons why the Landco strategy of a higher residential yield is preferable, if not essential. It is the only approach which can result in a more self-sufficient community, in which the Village Centre would provide a measurable social and economic focus."*
- 10.5 The Landco SP, with its higher density, will allow a greater number of households/people to benefit from living in a very well served urban area, and an area that will have the potential for an abundance of factors to compensate for higher density urban form such as proximity to the Long Bay Regional Park and the coastal views.
- 10.6 Unlike the NSCC SP which appears to result from environmental constraints, the Landco SP results from an appropriate consideration of social, cultural, environmental and economic factors and achieves a balance in respect of each outcome.
- 10.7 Having regard to the policy and planning framework identified in section 6 of my evidence, I conclude that the proposed Landco SP is more likely to achieve the social outcomes intended than is the NSCC SP.
- 10.8 In summary, the specific findings underpinning these conclusions about social wellbeing are that:
- (a) Access to primary and secondary schools and the facilities they offer for students and other community members is similar under both structure plan proposals, but has the potential to benefit more new residents under the Landco SP;
 - (b) While additional demand for pre-school facilities will be greater under the Landco SP, opportunities for establishing such facilities will be more constrained under the NSCC SP;

- (c) Access to commercial goods and services under the Landco SP is likely to be at higher levels of choice and convenience that redress existing deficits in the wider area while the NSCC SP is likely to entrench under-provision and car dependency;
- (d) Opportunities for accessible community facilities within the village centre will be greater with Landco's provision of 2.4ha than with NSCC's provision of around 1 ha, and demand is already being expressed by several educational and social service providers for access to such opportunities;
- (e) The scale of commercial activity within the Landco village centre is likely to generate five times the number of local jobs and seven times the number of FTEs that would be likely under the NSCC SP;
- (f) Access to leisure and recreational opportunities at the schools and the regional park are similar under both proposals, but has the potential to benefit more new residents under the Landco SP. The Landco SP also involves considerably more public open space than does the NSCC SP, and the potential for leisure opportunities in the new village centre will be greater as well and apply to residents in existing nearby residential areas;
- (g) While both proposals involve high-density residential zones near a mixed-use village centre, the Landco SP has the potential to accommodate some 2,500 additional residents within easy walking distance of the village centre and thus living in circumstances that have been found to induce higher levels of physical activity and better health outcomes;
- (h) The greater additional residential population expected under the Landco SP will enhance the viability of additional, end-of-line bus services to the benefit of residents in the SPA and also in the adjacent residential areas.

11 COMMENTS ON THE EVIDENCE OF NSCC

- 11.1 I have read the evidence of Mr Brown, Ms Davison and Mr Mackie. Collectively, the statements provide a comprehensive description of the processes and thinking which are now encapsulated in the NSCC SP.
- 11.2 I have endeavoured to reconcile the process, as detailed in the statements of evidence, with various stated objectives from regional and district policy and planning documents, as well as with higher level

national policy and legislation. My particular interest has been to assess the extent to which social dimensions have been considered and assessed.

- 11.3 I noted earlier (at paragraph 6.7) that in its policies on Urban Expansion in the Residential Expansion Zone, NSCC requires the boundaries of structure plans to be determined by "*having regard to the likely community of interest, topographic features, primary roading and open space network.*" (my emphasis). I have not been able to find any discussion of the relevant community of interest in the statements of these witnesses.
- 11.4 Mr Mackie's statement (at paragraph 6.5) indicates that the boundaries of the NSCC SP were determined primarily by water catchment areas, with no apparent acknowledgment of 'community of interest' considerations. But even the water catchment principle appears to have been applied in a somewhat arbitrary manner²³. Indeed, had the Awaruku Stream catchment been included in the SPA, this would in my view have been a closer approximation to a 'community of interest' boundary, as I explained earlier in my evidence.
- 11.5 "Integrated and Sustainable Development" is the first theme addressed in the NSCDP's section on subdivision and development - see Objective and Policies under s9A.3.1 (I refer here to Annexure TM04 in Mr Mackie's evidence). The Government articulated a set of principles for policy making and decision making when it initiated its Sustainable Development for New Zealand: Programme of Action in January 2003²⁴. It is evident that the 'integration' being referred to in the Government's Programme of Action is integration across "*social, economic, environmental and cultural spheres*" and that a key principle involves "*seeking innovative solutions that are mutually reinforcing, rather than accepting that gain in one area will necessarily be achieved at the expense of another*".
- 11.6 Mr Mackie (at his paragraph 6.22) describes how "*North Shore City Council also made some decisions relatively early in the process that have acted as parameters for later decisions. The minimal earthworks and low impact (stormwater) design approaches are examples of*

²³ In his para.6.5 Mr Mackie states "*The Structure Plan area covers the stormwater catchment of the Vaughans Stream, except for the headwaters of the catchment Also, part of the catchment of the Awaruku Stream, which is the next stream south from the Vaughans Stream catchment, is in the Structure Plan area.*"

²⁴ Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, ISBN 0478-263260, p.10.

these." When I review the process as described by Mr Mackie, Ms Davison and Mr Brown, there seems to me to be a clear priority given to environmental considerations at the expense of social considerations. For example, Mr Brown (his paragraph 2.10) describes a range of assessments commissioned by NSCC including *"...geotechnical assessment of the Long Bay catchment and a range of specialist reports ... to address key environmental values and sensitivities of the Long Bay catchment"*. There does not appear to be any consideration of community of interest or social assessment of social outcomes. Similarly, when outlining additional design and development principles (his paragraph 3.4) the seventh bullet point articulates the principle to *"use the results of landscape and ecological surveys to determine the carrying capacity of the land in order to manage, in a sustainable and environmentally sensitive manner, the impact of human activity in the area."* In this context, I take the term "carrying capacity" to refer in some way to the numbers of people/households/dwellings that represent the level of human activity being planned for.

- 11.7 I have no difficulty accepting the proposition that environmental considerations should have some influence on the carrying capacity. However, it appears that the NSCC's assessment has been made without recourse to any form of social assessment. In my view this is not consistent with Objective 9A.3.1 - *"A new community where resources are managed in an integrated way so that the natural environment is enhanced and there is a high degree of liveability and amenity for future residents."*(my emphasis).
- 11.8 Ms Davison (in her paragraph 3.3) points out that *"over 90 reports were commissioned or prepared by Council to inform the Structure Plan"* and she provides a list of these in her Annexure CD01. The majority of these documents concern ecological, technical, engineering and infrastructure assessments, including traffic assessments. I note that recreation, particularly relating to Long Bay Regional Park and a potential reserve network within Long Bay, is mentioned. However, I can find no social assessments commissioned to determine what might be necessary in order to *"create a sense of community"*²⁵ or *"a high degree of liveability and amenity for future residents"*.²⁶

²⁵ See Table 1 at Ms Davison's para.3.6 - text under the objectives for s9A.3.1 and 9A.3.5.

²⁶ For example, the kind of inter-agency and inter-sectoral discussions which have produced several versions of the "liveable Neighbourhoods Community Design Code" in Western Australia - Development Planning Strategies Pty Ltd, 1998. *Delivery and Integration of Community Facilities in new walkable neighbourhoods*. Prepared for the West Australian Ministry of Planning, July 1998.

- 11.9 Mr Brown (in paragraph 9.2) refers to the "*careful evaluation of the community benefits and opportunities associated with different development scenarios*". I have been unable to find his description of this evaluation, let alone any discussion of a framework for making such an evaluation.
- 11.10 In my opinion, there is some inconsistent thinking in the process described by Mr Brown. His paragraph 3.74 refers to a number of Urban Design Objectives including "(a) a high level of residential amenity";(c) functional efficiency;(g) a sense of community;(h) close interaction of residential areas with a village core/centre (commercial/community/recreation)". I agree that these are desirable objectives from a social perspective.
- 11.11 I believe the scale and composition of the commercial centre should reflect the likely needs of the resident community as well as the expressed intentions of creating a sense of community. It is also, in my opinion, inconsistent to express (at paragraph 3.80(a)) "*the desire to ensure that Long Bay truly affords a 'live, work, play' environment:*" in which "*those living at Long Bay don't need to travel to other parts of Auckland to work or recreate*" and then propose (at paragraph 3.80(b)) "*the new centre*" which "*would very substantially rely on the new Regional Park entry for survival*". Not only do I believe these two scenarios to be mutually inconsistent, the latter statement (i.e. the extract from para.3.80(b)) represents the faulty assumption that it is the new resident population of the SPA alone that will sustain the commercial viability of the Village Centre, and the failure to consider the relevant community of interest in a meaningful way.
- 11.12 Ms Davison (in row 3 of the Table following paragraph 4.1) when discussing the rules and methods for achieving the objectives of the NSCC SP appears to imply that simply providing for a village centre will, of itself, ensure a sense of community. I would challenge this simplistic assumption. In my view, achieving a sense of community will depend on the scale and composition of the village centre and the opportunities it provides for a mix of activities that engender a sense of community. The arbitrary decision to constrain the size of the commercial centre is not supported by any social assessment. In my view, this is a matter equally deserving of proper assessment as all the other RMA matters.
- 11.13 In my opinion, the process described by these three expert witnesses is not an integrated approach in the sense intended by the Government's expressed sustainable development principles. It is an approach that appears largely driven by a consideration of environmental constraints, with very little, if any, explicit social analysis input. As such, it does not

reflect the balance of objectives contained in the purpose of the RMA; nor does it reflect the objective of the Long Bay zone in the partly operative NSCDP ...*"to enable extension of the urban area to occur in a manner that responds to the environmental constraints and opportunities associated with the land and enables the efficient use of natural and physical resources."* (my emphasis).

James Talbot Baines

3 May 2007

ANNEXURE A:

AREAS OF LAND ZONED FOR VARIOUS RESIDENTIAL DENSITIES UNDER THE NSCC SP AND THE LANDCO SP

The data presented below were provided to me by Landco. Estimates of dwelling yield and population for each option are derived from the evidence of Mr Egerton.

	NSCC Var66	Landco Structure Plan
AREA²⁷	(ha)	(ha)
Zone 1A - Large Lot	60.7	38.2
Zone 1B - Large Lot	138.7	45.0
Zone 2A - Suburban Neighbourhood	33.3	71.6
- Zone 2A Private Landscaped Yards	n/a	2.6
Zone 2B - Suburban Neighbourhood	4.7	27.0
- Zone 2B Private Landscaped Yards	n/a	3.8
Zone 3 - Urban Neighbourhood	10.0	13.7
- Zone 3 Private Landscaped Yards	n/a	0.7
Zone 4 - Urban Village	4.9	5.2
Zone 7 - NSCC Heritage Protection	15.1	n/a
Residential sub-total	276.4	207.6
Zone 5 - Village Centre sub-total	0.9	2.4
Existing Public Reserve	11.7	11.8
Proposed Public Reserve	33.4	68.3
Public Reserve sub-total	45.3	80.1
Dwelling Yield Forecast		
NSCC estimate	1,999	
Landco estimate	1,262 -1,800	2,607-3,130
Population Forecast		
NSCC estimate	4,500	
Landco estimate	3,828 -4,835	7,271-8,205

²⁷ Areas are net areas, excluding roads.

ANNEXURE B:

RECORD OF DISCUSSIONS WITH EDUCATION PROVIDERS IN THE SPA

- 1 There are two well-established schools located within the SPA being Long Bay Primary School and Long Bay College. These schools were established in anticipation of future urban growth on the northern boundary of the East Coast Bays. With the implementation of either Structure Plan, the primary school will ultimately find itself positioned relatively centrally to its recently-designated residential zone. The College will ultimately find itself positioned more centrally to its population base than is presently the case.
- 2 Long Bay Primary School did not previously have a zone and, as a result, it has traditionally drawn students from a wider area to the south, almost as far as Browns Bay. The school now has a zone²⁸, which will assist in managing and accommodating future students from nearby, as the new zone omits a sizeable area of its current catchment. As the Long Bay residential development proceeds, Long Bay Primary School will progressively draw more of its pupils from its zone and fewer from out of zone. Long Bay College has also yielded some of its westerly catchment to the recently opened Albany Junior High and will yield more when Albany Senior High opens in 2009.
- 3 Although Long Bay College is operating at close to the design capacity of its existing buildings, my enquiries indicate that there is sufficient scope to increase local capacity to meet the needs of the larger student population projected under the Landco SP, using land already owned by the Ministry of Education. This may involve a restructuring of the College into two parts, a junior high school and a senior high school. The Ministry of Education advised me that more detailed planning will not be carried out until the outcome of this appeal is known
- 4 Long Bay College has an established programme of adult education classes offered at the school as well as at other nearby community facilities such as the Baptist Church Hall off Glenvar Road. Long Bay College has a new sports facility including a fitness centre, dance studio and climbing wall. It is used by the school during the day and available for use by members of the public after school hours. The administration of this sports facility is aimed at fostering such community use. The hall and playing fields at the Primary School are also used by local groups from time to time.

²⁸ Zones for Long Bay Primary School and Long Bay College are shown in Annexure D.

- 5 The urban residential development north of the schools will make them a visible part of their community. The schools will be within walking distance for students living in areas on the south side of Vaughans Stream.
- 6 Through the adult education programmes and access to its sports facility, Long Bay College will provide local education and recreational opportunities for non-student members of the proposed residential community. This is a unique feature of these structure plan proposals as greenfields urban developments are rarely able to provide such a level of access to these types of facilities. Similar benefits can also be expected from on-going access to the Long Bay Primary School facilities.
- 7 The schools raised two issues, in my discussions with them, that will require consideration in the context of both of the structure plans, namely:
 - 7.1 The schools' desire for some degree of buffer between the boundaries of the school property and the nearest residential neighbours; and
 - 7.2 To ensure that adequate consideration is given to the need for off-street student parking, which occurs at present along Ashley Avenue for some 30-40 vehicles daily.
- 8 Secondary school students are likely to be a significant user group of future public transport services in and out of Long Bay.
- 9 Pre-school education is also an important element of educational services to residential communities. Pre-school education, in the form of kindergartens, playcentres and playgroups, is generally catered for by a mix of public and private providers.
- 10 In the area between Torbay and Okura there are presently two public kindergartens and two private kindergartens, as well as two playgroups and a playcentre. Some providers own their own premises while others rent the use of community buildings such as church halls.
- 11 In my discussions with the Torbay Kindergarten, I was informed that both Torbay Kindergarten and Glamorgan Kindergarten currently have long waiting lists. The Early Childhood Coordinator at the Ministry of Education informed me that the two private kindergartens have few spare hours available for additional children, and that the overall participation rate in early childhood education in the Torbay and

Glamorgan area is 97%, compared with a national figure of 94%. The Ministry of education also pointed out that securing land for new pre-school facilities is often a major issue for the Ministry in areas of high population growth.²⁹

²⁹ In greenfield developments it is usual for the Ministry, when purchasing land for primary and secondary schools, to allocate a small proportion of this for early childhood facilities, typically at approximately 1500m² for each kindergarten or playcentre that caters up to 50 children per session.

ANNEXURE C:

ESTIMATE OF ADDITIONAL POPULATION AGED UNDER FIVE WHEN THE SPA IS FULLY DEVELOPED

The following estimate is based on 2001 census data, the most recent data available at the time of writing.

Data for Torbay, Awaruku and Glamorgan - Census Area Units adjacent to the Long Bay SPA - have been compared with average data for the North Shore City and also with data for Harbourview, a master-planned residential development on the Te Atatu Peninsula, referred to by Ms Skidmore in her evidence.

Area	Total Usually Resident Population	Usually Resident Population aged 0-4 years	% Usually Resident Population aged 0-4 years
Torbay	4,431	252	6%
Awaruku	3,489	243	7%
Glamorgan	3,066	189	6%
North Shore City	184,821	11,817	6%
Harbourview (Te Atatu)	432	24	6%
Long Bay SPA under Landco SP	assume 7,800	estimate 470	assume 6%
long Bay SPA under The NSCC SP proposal	assume 4,500	estimate 270	assume 6%

ANNEXURE D:

ZONES FOR LONG BAY PRIMARY SCHOOL AND LONG BAY COLLEGE

Enrolment Schemes - surrounding Long Bay

