

SUBMISSION HEARING 10/12/19

(1)

(EXAMPLES OF HNZ INTENTION TO ALTER TEXT TO DELETE/WEAKEN THE PROPOSED MINIMAL CONTROLS)

## ① STRATEGIC DIRECTION (SD)

OVERVIEW: 'MANAGING ENABLING GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT THAT IS LIVEABLE, CONNECTED AND AFFORDABLE.'

OBJECTIVES: SD-02 'PROTECT MAINTAIN THE RANGE OF AMENITY VALUES AND CHARACTERISTICS IN THE RURAL AREA AND THE URBAN AREA' WHILE ENABLING APPROPRIATE USE AND DEVELOPMENT. (THIS IS IMPOSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED HDR. THESE AMENITIES NEEDED/MUST BE PROTECTED)

SD-04 'IDENTIFY AND ENCOURAGE THE PROTECTION OF BUILDINGS, SITES, FEATURES AND AREAS WHICH ARE VALUED BY THE COMMUNITY AND CONTRIBUTE TO THE DISTRICT'S UNIQUE IDENTITY AND SENSE OF PLACE?'

SD-05 'AVOID MANAGE CONFLICT BETWEEN INCOMPATIBLE LAND USE ACTIVITIES FROM NEW SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT.'

② HDR POLICIES: HDR-P6 'TO ENABLE A HIGH DENSITY BUILT ENVIRONMENT WHILE APPROPRIATELY MANAGING ADVERSE EFFECTS ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY AND CHARACTER.....'

HDR-P6 3 'AVOID MINIMIZES LARGE CONTINUOUS BUILDING FACADES OR WALLS THAT ARE NOT ARTICULATED OR BROKEN DOWN INTO SMALLER ELEMENTS.'

HDR-P07 2 'MAINTAIN PROTECT AND ENHANCE AMENITY VALUES.'

HDR-P11 3 'THE CREATION OF MULTIPLE TREAT SITES IS LIMITED AND ~~WHERE PRACTICABLE AVOIDS~~ (HNZ WANTS THIS REMOVED)

③ HDR RULES: HDR-R21 'THE MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT IS 11M EXCEPT THAT 50% OF A BUILDING'S ROOF IN ELEVATION, MEASURED VERTICALLY FROM THE JUNCTION BETWEEN WALL AND ROOF, MAY EXCEED THIS HEIGHT BY 1M, WHERE THE ROOF IS

ROOF SLOPES 15% OR MORE.

HDR-23 (BUILDING SET BACKS) SIDE AND REAR 1m  
(NEEDS TO BE 3m) FRONT 2m (NEEDS TO BE 3m)

HDR-24 (H NZ WANT TO DELETE AND AMEND WHOLE RULE)  
BUILDING BULK IN RELATION TO BOUNDARY.

(4) SUB POLICIES : SUB-P2a 'AROUND AND WITHIN EXISTING DEVELOPMENT.'

SUB-P4 'TO ~~PROTECT~~ MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE AMENITY AND CHARACTER BY ~~AVOIDING~~ MANAGING THE SUBDIVISION OF MINOR RESIDENTIAL UNITS.'

HNZ  
PRE-CIRCULATED  
SUBMISSION

FURTHER VERBAL SUBMISSION  
10/12/19

(1)

MATTHEW LINDENBERG: (PAGE 7) STATES HNZ SEEK AMENDMENTS TO BOTH HEIGHT IN RELATION TO BOUNDARY (HIRB) AND TARD SET BACK CONTROLS. WE ARE TOTALLY OPPOSED TO ANY WEAKENING OF THE PROPOSED CONTROLS RELATIVE TO THE ABOVE.

PAGE 8 - "NEED TO SHIFT CURRENT PERCEPTION THAT URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND INTENSIFICATION ONLY HAS NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON AMENITY FOR INDIVIDUALS AND RATHER RECOGNISE THAT DEVELOPMENT CAN ENHANCE AMENITY FOR OTHER PEOPLE COMMUNITIES AS A WHOLE."

- "...POLICY FRAMEWORK THAT SEEKS TO 'PROTECT' AMENITY. IN MY OPINION THE MOST APPROPRIATE MANAGEMENT APPROACH WITH RESPECT TO AMENITY IS ONE OF 'MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT.'"

THIS IS ALL FINE AND LOFTY ONCE AGAIN. THE PROBLEM IS THIS UTOPIAN GOAL CANNOT BE ACHIEVED BY HNZ.

JUST MORE ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AND POORLY MAINTAINED HNZ HOUSING STOCK WITH NO EFFORT BY HNZ TO EITHER MODERATE BEHAVIOUR OR MAINTAIN DWELLINGS TO AN ACCEPTABLE STANDARD.

WE KEEP ON HEARING/READING OF THE SELFISHNESS OF THOSE RESIDENTS (OWNER/OCCUPIERS) IN ESTABLISHED SUBURBS - IN OPPOSING THE CREATION OF HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR THOSE SEEKING HOUSING.

WE WOULD DISPUTE THIS 'SELFISHNESS' WITH DISADVANTAGE PEOPLE WHO HAVE WORKED HARD ALL THEIR LIVES AND ARE NOW ENJOYING THE BENEFITS OF THEIR LIFELONG SLOG. TO TAKE AWAY THEIR WELL EARNED RIGHT TO RELATIVE PEACE AND TRANQUILITY IN LONG ESTABLISHED SUBURBS. BY GIVING THE ADVANTAGE TO OTHERS BY MEANS OF HDR ZONING. IT IS NOT SELFISHNESS (EVEN IF SO IT IS WELL EARNED!) BUT MORE AN APPRECIATION OF THE INTRINSIC VALUES OF THE LIFESTYLE THEIR RESIDENTIAL LOCATION AFFORDS (AND WHY MANY MOVED THERE ORIGINALLY).

MATTHEW LINDENBERG SUMMARY STATEMENT :-

9.13 A (V) ..... "IT IS MY OPINION THAT WITH THE AMENDMENTS SOUGHT BY KAINGA ORA THE PACKAGE OF ZONE PROVISIONS FOR THE GRZ, MRZ AND LCZ WILL ACHIEVE QUALITY BUILT FORM OUTCOMES WITH MANAGEABLE THE POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE EFFECTS ON ADJOINING PROPERTIES."

WE DISAGREE. WILL NOT BE A CONSIDERATION IN REALITY.

9.13 C .... "WHILE SEEKING TO PREVENT THE ABILITY TO PROVIDE FOR PUBLIC HOUSING PROVISION WITHIN WHANGAREI'S RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS (EFFECTIVELY TREATING PUBLIC HOUSING PROVISION AS BEING UNDESIRABLE WITHIN THE RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENT) COULD HAVE POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECTS ON THE WELL BEING OF PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS, IN THAT THEY WOULD EFFECTIVELY NOT BE PROVIDED WITH THE SAME LEVEL OF HOUSING CHOICES AND OPTIONS AS THE WIDER WHANGAREI RESIDENTIAL MARKET."

- WHY SHOULD PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS HAVE THE SAME CHOICES AND OPTIONS? THEY HAVE NOT BOUGHT THE PROPERTY.
- PUBLIC HOUSING IS UNDESIRABLE WITHIN THE RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENT. FOR VERY VALID REASONS.
- POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECTS ON THE WELL BEING OF OWNER OCCUPIERS. FOR VERY VALID REASONS.

9.13 D "IN ADDITION I NOTE THAT THE RECENT ESTABLISHMENT OF KAINGA ORA ..... HAS ALSO BROADENED THE FUNCTIONS, OBJECTIVES AND OPERATING PRINCIPLES BEYOND THAT PREVIOUSLY APPLIED TO HNZ."

PINKIE OSBORNE: 5.3 "I NOTE THAT SINCE THE LODGMENT OF KAINGA ORA'S (FORMERLY HNZ) SUBMISSION TO THE USPC, THAT THE KAINGA ORA HOMES AND COMMUNITY ACT 2019 HAS BEEN PASSED, WHICH PLACES A MUCH BROADER ROLE FOR KAINGA ORA IN FACILITATING URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES."

# NEWSROOM ARTICLE

(1)

MATT LINDENBERG

BRUCE JULYAN

ROBERT HODSON

- ALL 3 ARE BECA PLANNERS

MATT - "THE CHALLENGE IN THE NEAR TERM, IS HOW DO YOU HAVE A CONVERSATION WITH EVERYONE ELSE ABOUT THE NEED TO EXPECT CHANGE, AFTER ALL IT'S NOT JUST DEATH AND TAXES THAT ARE CERTAIN."

- WE ALL EXPECT AND EXPECT CHANGE. THE ISSUE HERE IS THE NATURE AND DEGREE OF CHANGE. CHANGE IS NOT NECESSARILY FOR THE BETTER. IT IS NOT SYNONYMOUS WITH IMPROVEMENT.

- INTENSIFICATION AS ENVISAGED AND DRIVEN BY HNZ CERTAINLY IS NOT. HNZ HAS AN ABYSMAL TRACK RECORD - IN TERMS OF SANCTIONS FOR UNACCEPTABLE ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR OF ITS TENANTS AND ALSO FOR ITS DISMAL PERFORMANCE IN MAINTAINING ITS HOUSING TO AN ACCEPTABLE STANDARDS.

- THERE MUST BE, HAS TO BE, MEANINGFUL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TO DISCUSS THE NEGATIVE IMPACT OF URBAN INTENSIFICATION - ESPECIALLY AS PROMOTED BY HNZ.

BRUCE - "IT IS ABOUT MORE THAN THE IDEA OF THEIR SECTION AND THEIR HOUSE BEING THEIR CASTLE AND THAT THEY SHOULDN'T HAVE TO PUT UP WITH ANYTHING THAT CHANGES THEIR ENVIRONMENT."

- IS IT? PEOPLE HAVE EVERY RIGHT TO SEEK TO PROTECT THEIR HOME FROM CHANGE THAT WILL NEGATIVELY IMPACT THEIR ENVIRONMENT. TO CALL THIS NIMBYISM IS VERY SIMPLISTIC.

- IT IS ESSENTIAL TO DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN URBAN INTENSIFICATION AS A GENERAL TERM AND CONCEPT, AND THAT PROMULGATED BY HNZ - WITH ITS ASSOCIATED NEGATIVE IMPACT.

- WE CURRENTLY HAVE A SIGNIFICANT PERCENTAGE OF HOTEL ACCOMMODATION OCCUPIED BY HNZ CLIENTS. THIS MAY WELL BE A POSITIVE FOR THOSE INDIVIDUALS AND THE HOTEL OWNERS CONCERNED. HOWEVER IT IS A NEGATIVE FOR ALL OTHER HOTEL GUESTS AND NEIGHBOURS (AND THE

TOURISM INDUSTRY.) THIS IS DUE TO THE LACK OF CONSIDERATION AND ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR EXHIBITED BY MANY OF THESE HNZ CLIENTS. NOTHING IS DONE BY HNZ TO SANCTION SUCH BEHAVIOUR. IT IS A REALITY THAT WILL INEVITABLY BE MIRRORRED BY THE OUTCOME OF URBAN INTENSIFICATION DRIVEN BY HNZ.

- PHIL TWYFORD HAS STATED HNZ WILL BE A WORLD CLASS PUBLIC HOUSING LANDLORD. REALLY! DOES HIS PRONOUNCEMENT CARRY ANY WEIGHT IN LIGHT OF HIS PAST RECORDS? NO!

DOES IT CARRY ANY WEIGHT IN LIGHT OF HNZ'S PAST RECORDS OF DISRUPTIVE ANTI-SOCIAL TENANTS AND POORLY MAINTAINED HOUSING STOCK? NO!

HNZ HAS NO RIGHT TO BE LABELLED A RESPONSIBLE LANDLORD.