

**BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL**

**IN THE MATTER OF: The Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan**

**SUBMITTERS:**           **The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Trust Board (LDS)**

**The Federation of Islamic Associations of New Zealand (FIANZ)**

**Aitutaki Enea Society Incorporated (Aitutaki Enea)**

**SUBMISSION NO:**   **Topic 005 - 4409 – 04 & 05; 4415 – 04 & 05; 7734 – 1 & 2**  
**Topic 013 – 4409 – 6-15; 4415 – 6-15; 7734 – 3 & 65-70**

**TOPICS**               **005 - RPS Issues**  
**013 - RPS Urban Growth**

**EVIDENCE:**           **Primary**

---

**STATEMENT OF PLANNING EVIDENCE BY**  
**DAVID NEILSON HAY ON BEHALF OF THE ABOVE SUBMITTERS**  
**7 OCTOBER 2014**

---

## SUMMARY

1. The submitters are providers of community facilities which form part of the social infrastructure in Auckland.
2. It is considered that the Enabling Quality Urban Growth Issue (1.1) does not specifically recognise that a growing Auckland population will require both additional community facilities plus the optimisation of the use of existing community facilities.
3. The RPS on Social Infrastructure (2.7) which addresses in part this issue is supported. However, amendments to this were sought in the submissions in terms of:
  1. Specifically recognising places of worship and places for cultural activities.
  2. Recognising that sites for community facilities (and associated resource consents) are often secured while the site is zoned rural or future urban and prior to urbanisation occurring and/or or the completion of the transportation network.
  3. Recognise that community facilities have to be affordable for the community providing them, and economically and socially sustainable.
4. The Auckland Council Reporting Officer has recommended a number of changes to Issue 1.1 which reflect the submissions by the three submitters and these recommended changes are supported. They are:
  - (a) Inclusion of “community facilities”

**Our growing population increases demand for housing, employment, business, infrastructure, community facilities and services. This means we must manage our growth in a way that:**
  - (b) The recognition to encourage the efficient use of community facilities.
    - **encourages the efficient use of existing community facilities and provides for new community facilities**
  - (c) Under social well-being, recognise that social infrastructure includes places where the community can come together to participate cultural or religious activities.
    - places where the community can come together to discuss issues, to participate in recreational, cultural or religious activities, or to socialise.

## **INTRODUCTION**

4. My name is David Neilson Hay and I am a Director of Osborne Hay (North) Limited (Osbornehay), a Resource Management Practice based in Warkworth. I hold the qualifications of a Master of Science Degree (with Honours) (1992) in Resource and Environmental Planning from the University of Waikato. I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.
5. I have practised in the field of environmental planning for 23 years, initially with Works Consultancy Services Ltd then from January 1996 with Manukau Consultants Limited which was purchased in January 2000 by GHD Limited, and since February 2007 in my own practice.
6. Since 1991 I have provided statutory and environmental planning advice to a range of clients for infrastructure and development projects. In particular, I have acted as the Planning Consultant for quarry developments, educational facilities, marae, religious facilities, roading projects, telecommunication projects, wastewater and stormwater projects, electrical infrastructure projects and marina related activities.
7. I have been the Planning Consultant for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Trust Board since 1997 and in more recent years have provided planning services for site specific projects in Auckland for the Aitutaki Enea Society Incorporated and the Federation of Islamic Associations of New Zealand.
8. I have read and agree to comply with the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note 2011. The evidence is within my scope of expertise except where I state otherwise. I have prepared this statement to meet my obligations under section 5 of the Practice Note and have considered and referred to all material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed here.
9. I have read the evidence of Mr Michael Tucker for Auckland Council on Topic 005 RPS Issues.

## **SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

10. This evidence covers the provision of community facilities in the RPS Issues (1.1 Enabling Quality Urban Growth) and then in the supporting RPS Topic (2.7 Social Infrastructure).
11. With the permission of the Panel, it is requested that this evidence be taken as the evidence in support of the submissions by the three submitters to these two topics (topics 005 and 013) as in my opinion they are inter-related.
12. This evidence covers:
  - (a) Reasons for Submissions
  - (b) Additional Issues to Include
  - (c) Basis of Changes Sought to 2.7 Social Infrastructure
  - (d) Relief Sought

## **REASONS FOR SUBMISSION**

13. The three submitters provide cultural or religious facilities and services. These are defined in the PAUP as “community facilities” and fall within the broad term of “social infrastructure”. All three submitters either have existing facilities in Auckland or are in the process of designing and constructing new facilities.
14. The LDS is in the process of currently constructing a new 3-Ward Meetinghouse in Porchester Road Alfriston and acquiring two new sites for Stake Centres (to accommodate up to 1200 people) in Mangere and Hingaia. They have recently obtained resource consents for another Meetinghouse in East Tamaki. In addition, at the current time they have five meetinghouse or car park extensions currently being consented, which generally reflects a typical portfolio of works being undertaken by the LDS in Auckland.
15. Aitutaki Enea is in the final stages of lodging resource consents for a new Marae in Porchester Road, Alfriston.
16. FIANZ is currently awaiting resource consents for a new Vocational Centre (comprising of both religious and educational facilities) in Porchester Road.

17. The requirement for these facilities is driven purely by their congregations or membership, which form part of the Auckland community. This demand reflects:
  - (a) Population growth within Auckland;
  - (b) Changing ethnicities and demographics within Auckland; and
  - (c) That existing facilities are nearing capacity. For example, a driver for the Aitutaki Enea Marae is that marae in Papakura previously used by Aitutaki Enea are now increasingly booked up with other events. The LDS requirement for new buildings are driven by increasing congregations.
18. Churches and marae have long-formed part of both the rural and urban fabric of New Zealand. They form part of the social infrastructure of a community, which is critical for the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community. It is important that the PAUP recognises that a large percentage of the Auckland population does attend some form of place to worship. Such facilities are considered by part of the community as important in terms of providing for their social and/or cultural well-being.
19. In addition, it is also important within a large multi-cultural city such as Auckland that different ethnic groups have the opportunity to provide for their own facilities as a meeting place, place of worship and/or for cultural activities.
20. Historically churches and marae have provided a range of social services but with the continuing devolution of government provided social, educational and medical services, such facilities are now being provided for on occasions at local Marae and churches. For example, the new FIANZ Vocational Centre is likely to include a school while the Aitutaki Enea Marae over time is likely to provide both an educational centre and a well-being facility of some form.
21. An LDS Meetinghouse is used for a range of activities in any one week in addition to Sunday services, including youth groups, sporting activities, seminary classes, dances and fellowship meetings.
22. In very simple terms, many churches and marae within Auckland are no longer used "once a week" but rather are used daily, often from prior to school starting time to late evening. Such facilities are often used by a cross-section of the community.

23. It is also important to recognise the cost of such facilities within Auckland. In addition to land, a modern large church or marae may cost in the order of half to one million dollars to design and get consented with construction costs over ten million dollars.
24. A significant cost is land. Historically and at the current time, future urban land is often purchased for these facilities owing to both suitable lot sizes being available and the lower cost of the land before it is re-zoned residential. In addition, it is not uncommon for these facilities to be consented and sometimes built on this Future Urban Zoned land prior to re-zoning or urbanisation. This is currently occurring on the Future Urban zoned land along Porchester and Ranfurly Roads where currently there are two Buddhist Temples and an LDS Meetinghouse under construction, the FIANZ proposal is being consented with construction likely next year and the Aitutaki Marae resource consents are about to be lodged.
25. In Hingaia, the LDS again is in the processing of preparing resource consents for a new facility on Future Urban Zoned land.
26. Although not a matter for this hearing, it is critical that the Future Urban Zone provides for such facilities, which it does not and evidence will be presented on this at a later hearing.
27. In my opinion the PAUP fails to recognise strongly enough the importance of community facilities such as places of worship and marae. This recognition is important for the following reasons:
  - (a) Such facilities often establish on land zoned Future Urban and require supporting RPS objectives and policies to recognise the importance of establishing these facilities in a timely and cost efficient manner; and
  - (b) Existing facilities within Auckland need to be able to change over time to reflect the changing needs of the community. This change may result in re-development or expansion of existing buildings and/or car parks or changes in the type and hours of use.
28. In my opinion, the Enabling Quality Urban Growth Issue does not currently specifically recognise community facilities. As a community grows then so does the demand for and on community facilities. As outlined earlier, Alfriston/Papakura is an excellent example of this at the current time.

29. In terms of providing for future community facilities, there are two main methods that are used which I have observed in East Tamaki in the early to mid-2000's, which has occurred in Alfriston over the last ten years and which I am now observing in Hingaia:
- (a) Purchase land well in advance in rural/future urban areas and then wait until urbanisation occurs which may be many years away. This has holding costs plus significant risk in terms of timing. A good example of this is those community facilities being established along Porchester Road where a number of these groups have held their land for a number of years. Nevertheless, although the community requires these facilities now, they are having to provide for on-site wastewater treatment and disposal due to Watercare refusing connections to the nearby wastewater network due to Watercare's philosophical opposition to connecting community facilities outside the Metropolitan Urban Limits until the RuB has been confirmed in the PAUP.
  - (b) Seek a six month conditional purchase agreement for land within rural/future urban areas within the purchase being conditional on resource consents being obtained.
30. With the continued rapid expansion of Auckland continuing I do not see this method of site establishment for many community facilities changing, particularly for community funded community facilities which are generally cost sensitive.
31. With community facilities often being consented and sometime established prior to urbanisation occurring around it, it is not always possible to assess it in terms of the future transportation network and in particular the public transportation network. In addition, it has to be recognised that the use of public transportation by users is not always practical, feasible or affordable. For example, a family catching a bus to church on a Sunday may:
- (a) Result in increased travel time;
  - (b) Be more expensive than using a private car or van;
  - (c) Does not reflect that the family may wish to visit other families or friends after Church.
32. The PAUP also needs to recognise that, and provide for, the use of certain existing community facilities will need to be optimised to meet growing population

requirements. As an example, the LDS uses its facilities for 1, 2 or 3 Wards (with a ward being similar to a parish). As an example, instead of having two separate Churches around the Orewa/Whangaparaoa area, the LDS has a single Meetinghouse which hosts two Wards of the Church. On a Sunday, one Ward meets in the morning and the other in the afternoon. However, as the LDS is seeking across Auckland a number of their current facilities need to be upgraded to meeting increased demand and to accommodate additional Wards of the Church to minimise the additional new sites they require to address increasing congregations.

33. An example of this is the LDS Sandringham Meetinghouse in Kiwitea Street. This was designed and built as a 3-Ward Meetinghouse in the 1980's but in recent years has only hosted two Wards. Due to increased congregation numbers in this area and because the nearest facilities such as Onehunga are now at full capacity, a third-ward is now required to use the Sandringham Meetinghouse. This requires additional car parking which requires resource consent. However, to date there has been resistance both from certain Council Officers and from some neighbours to this application and in my opinion a lack of reflection by Council Officers that increased urban density will likely result in greater demand on existing facilities and the need for these facilities to be modified to provide for this greater demand.
34. Having been involved in number of these extensions of community facilities within Auckland in recent years, a number of which have met some resistance from Council Officers and residents, I consider that it is an important issue which needs to be reflected in the Enabling Quality Urban Growth Issue.
35. An issue that has become more apparent in recent years is the conflict between what the community can afford for its facilities and the aspirations of Council Officers in terms of urban design, sustainability and stormwater treatment. There is a significant disconnect occurring largely driven by the lack of financial consideration required to be given by Council Officers. This is resulting in the delay in construction of community facilities due to funding or possibly the diversion of funding from social good programmes into the building process.
36. In my opinion the provision of a safe, efficient and economically sustainable community facility overrides the need to provide a "state of the art" or "high quality" community facilities. There has to be a realisation, through the PAUP,



that community facilities need to be affordable to the community that is both funding them and which they are to serve. They also need to be economically sustainable in the long term for the community through keeping down initial construction costs to an affordable level while at the same time ensuring that there are minimal on-going resource management related costs.

#### **ADDITIONAL ISSUES TO INCLUDE**

37. In summary, from my experience I consider that the following issues needs to be specifically addressed:

- (a) Recognising that a growing population in Auckland requires new community facilities.
- (b) Recognise that the growing population in Auckland and changing demographics will result in the need to optimise the use of existing community facilities.
- (c) Recognise that social well-being requires the provision of a whole range of facilities including places to worship and places for cultural activities.

#### **BASIS OF CHANGES SOUGHT TO 2.7 SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE**

38. In respect to Part 1 Chapter B 2.7 (Social Infrastructure) in my opinion this Chapter needs to:

- (a) Better reflect that social infrastructure includes places of worship and places for cultural activities.
- (b) Reflect that social infrastructure has to be economically and socially sustainable for the community that is funding it and that it is to service.
- (c) Reflect that social infrastructure has to accessible to be both located in an affordable area and accessible to the community its serves and should not be wholly reliant on accessibility by public transport.
- (d) Recognise that some community facilities are established in future urban areas by land acquisition and resource consents and on occasions prior to the area being urbanised and prior to the final transportation network being established.

- (e) Recognise that in some cases best practice urban design and sustainable building design may not be economically efficient, practical or culturally appropriate for some community facilities.

## **RELIEF SOUGHT**

### Topic 8

39. The Council Officers recommendations generally reflect the relief sought by the submitters and I am in agreement with the recommended changes.

### Topic 13

40. In respect to Topic 13, for which this evidence is being submitted prior to the release of the Officers Report, I am in agreement with the relief being sought by the submitters. In particular:
- (a) In Objective 1, the term “high quality” should be replaced by “economically and socially sustainable” to reflect that the most important aspect of community facilities is they have to be affordable for the community and designed and operated in such a manner that they continue to serve the requirements of the community.
  - (b) In various objectives and policies, the key requirement of affordability and economic viability needs to be reflected.
  - (c) In respect to Policy 2(d), it needs to be recognised that land acquisition and resource consents is a common tool for securing sites for private community facilities.

Relief Sought:

#### 2.7 Social Infrastructure

*Social infrastructure is an important asset to society as it provides:*

- *opportunities to learn*
- *facilities for the prevention and treatment of illness and injury*
- *facilities to support the justice system*
- *places where the community can come together to discuss issues, to participate in recreation*

- activities or to socialise
- Places to worship
- Places for cultural activities.

#### Objectives

- 1 *An ~~high quality~~ economically and socially sustainable network of social infrastructure that meets Aucklanders' needs both locally and regionally.*
- 2 *Social infrastructure is located where it is accessible by a range of transport modes where practicable.*

#### Policies

- 1 *Make social infrastructure accessible to users by providing for:*
  - a *local small-scale social infrastructure so they are accessible and affordable to local communities e.g. medical centres, places of worship, care centres, primary schools, community halls and cultural facilities*
  - b *medium-scale social infrastructure e.g. civic buildings, libraries and art galleries in the city centre and in metropolitan and town centres*
  - c *larger-scale land extensive social infrastructure e.g. hospitals, universities, large community churches, marae and large cultural facilities and secondary schools in locations where the existing and/or proposed roading network has sufficient capacity, and, where practicable, in close proximity to the public transport network and the walking and cycling networks.*
- 2 *Provide Auckland with sufficient social infrastructure to meet the needs of its growing population by:*
  - a *enabling intensive use and development of existing and new social infrastructure sites*
  - b *working with providers to plan and fund social infrastructure to meet future growth needs in brownfield and greenfield areas*
  - c *requiring adaptable multi-functional buildings to meet changing needs and provide for co-sharing and co-location (where this is supported by the provider)*

- d identifying new growth areas well in advance of their development so that forward planning of the provision of social infrastructure can occur via tools such as land acquisition, resource consents, structure planning and designations to secure sites for future social infrastructure.*
- 3 Enable the efficient use of land and facilities by providing for complementary activities to occur on social infrastructure sites.*
- 4 Improve connections between social infrastructure and public transport, cycling and walking networks.*
- 5 Manage the transport effects of large scale social infrastructure to an appropriate level and in an integrated manner.*
- 6 Require social infrastructure to:*
  - a be safe and functional for its users*
  - ~~*B be sympathetic to the character, both existing and future, of the area and community in which it is located*~~
  - c Where appropriate and economically viable incorporates the principles of sustainable building design*
  - d maintain or improve the amenity of any adjoining streets and sites.*

**DAVID HAY**

7 October 2014