

BEFORE THE AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource
Management Act
1991 and the Local
Government
(Auckland Transitional
Provisions) Act 2010

AND IN THE MATTER

Of Topics:
059 Residential
objectives and
policies;
060 Residential
activities;
062 Residential
development controls;
and
063 Residential
controls and
assessment

AND IN THE MATTER

Of the submissions
and further
submissions set out in
the Parties and Issues
report

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF GRAEME CLEMENT SCOTT
ON BEHALF OF THE
AUCKLAND BRANCH OF THE NEW ZEALAND INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS (NZIA), submitter 5280
AND THE
URBAN DESIGN FORUM NEW ZEALAND (UDF) submitter 5277**

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
The Unitary Plan process	1
Capacity to intensify existing urban areas	2
Revision of some rules	3
Other considerations	4

Schedule 1 : Graeme Scott's CV.

Introduction

1. My full name is Graeme Clement Scott. My experience as an architect is attached in Schedule 1. In summary I have 40 years professional experience. I am a registered architect with an annual practicing certificate. I have an Honours degree in Architecture from the University of Auckland.
2. I have been a director of ASC Architects Ltd in Auckland since 1981.
3. I am a Fellow of the New Zealand Institute of Architects Inc, and have been a member of the Auckland Branch Urban Issues Group since 1996, including 4 years as chairman.
4. I am the chairman of the Urban Design Forum. The Urban Design Forum has a cross-disciplinary membership of professionals involved in the design of the built environment, and its purpose is to promote good urban design outcomes.
5. I chair one of the Design Review Panels at Hobsonville Point for the Hobsonville land Company.
6. I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014 and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person.

The Unitary Plan process

7. I have been involved in submissions on the Auckland Plan, the draft Unitary Plan, and I substantially wrote the submission from the NZIA and UDF regarding the proposed Unitary Plan. This year I have attended the workshop on the residential section held in June, and I attended two of the expert conferences on the residential rules convened by Richard Burton. I led the team of our members who attended most of the recent mediation sessions.
8. I consider that the process has produced a good outcome, as represented in the evidence for Council from Nick Roberts, supported by that from Graeme McIndoe.
9. The definition of the zones, their policies and objectives and the rules to implement them have been coherently set out in Mr Roberts' evidence, and most, if not all of the points raised in the NZIA / UDF submission have been satisfied. I therefore support Mr Roberts' evidence.
10. A key outcome of the process has been the deletion of what is commonly called the density rule, requiring a minimum site size. This rule was probably seen as a method to ensure space around dwellings, but it has an unintended consequence of increasing dwelling size and thereby reducing

the supply of lower-cost dwellings.

I strongly support the deletion of this rule, in order to increase the supply of smaller and more affordable dwellings.

Capacity to intensify existing urban areas

11. The ability to intensify existing urban areas to cater for 60 to 70% of Auckland's growth over the life of the plan has been a central theme of discussions around the Unitary Plan. This has proved problematic when analysed from a commercial viability perspective, and development capacity has been found to be well short of the target. There appears to be a current view that removal of the density control has solved this problem. Evidence on behalf of NZIA and UDF from David Gibbs will question this view.
12. The debate regarding commercially developable capacity is likely to persist over time and will no doubt change as completed developments are sold and the market conditions adjust. Meanwhile substantial development will occur throughout Auckland in response to existing commercial pressures, and it is important that sufficient theoretical capacity is built into the rules, consistent with the objectives and policies, to avoid widespread 'under-development' which will be then set in place for the life of those new developments.
13. The other major determinant of capacity is the spatial distribution of the zones across Auckland. Although not the subject of this hearing, I note that Mr Roberts makes reference to this issue by, for instance, taking the view regarding the SHZ (his point 23.6) that the 'loss of development potential as a result of requiring a 600m² minimum lot size is an *issue with the spatial extent* of the SHZ rather than the control itself'. (my italics). NZIA and UDF will take up this and related issues at future hearings.

Given that the debate around the application of the zones to the maps has yet to occur, it seems inappropriate to have the statement in the Zone Objectives and Policies that the MHS zone 'is the most widespread residential zone in Auckland'.

Revision of some rules

14. Taking into account the above issues around intensification capacity, I consider some specific rules should be further revised to lift development capacity in some zones. These are summarised as:

12.1 Building coverage to be:

SHZ	35%	(As proposed in Mr Roberts' evidence.)
MHS	40%	
MHU	45%	
THAB	50%	(As proposed in Mr Roberts' evidence.)

All zones to be able to increase coverage by 5% as a restricted discretionary activity.

12.2 The alternative height in relation to boundary control to apply in the MHS zone as well as in the MHU and THAB zones.

12.3 The required side yard to be reduced to zero in the MHU and THAB zones on the side boundary where the alternative height in relation to boundary control is allowed to be used (ie, the first 20m back from the street frontage.)

15. In making those suggestions, I consider that the MHS zone is able to absorb slightly more potential intensification while still meeting the zone objectives and policies. Street-facing terrace housing, which the alternative height in relation to boundary control is designed to encourage, is compatible with suburban character, and can lend a welcome variety to the streetscape. By not incentivising this housing type, the standalone house with the reduced upper floor size will continue as the suburban norm in this zone, thereby either reducing open space dimensions or increasing lot size, or both.

This will reduce housing choice and affordability in this zone.

16. I also consider the 1m side yard requirement proposed in the MHU and THAB zones to be an unnecessary impediment to development capacity in these zones. In Graeme McIndoe's evidence, much use is made of examples at Hobsonville Point, where, as NZIA / UDF noted in their submission, much of the development would not be permitted under the proposed Unitary Plan rules. Many houses there have zero lot-lines, or no side yard.

I accept that the design process at Hobsonville Point, where a whole block of houses are designed together and poor amenity outcomes can be avoided, is different to new development in an existing suburban context. However, on many sites of around 15 to 18 metres width, the proposed

side yard requirement (which deducts 2 metres from the available frontage) will make street-facing terrace houses difficult to fit across the remaining frontage, and a more ordinary front-and-back site plan will be adopted. This has the same effects on choice and affordability as noted in the above point.

I consider the negative effects of building on the boundary can be addressed through design assessment, and I note that zero side yards have been an important component of the Victorian code for many years.

Other considerations

17. I have given consideration to the question of whether there should be rules to cover potential negative effects on adjacent properties, particularly in conjunction with the alternative height in relation to boundary rule and the ability to build to the site boundary under limited circumstances. In particular I note the Victorian code has rules on sunlight access to adjacent properties and on privacy/overlooking. I agree with Mr Roberts that these issues are best dealt with through the assessment criteria, which 'require regard to be given to the site context and neighbourhood character as part of considering the site layout and building design', as outlined in his evidence section 19.13.
18. I have participated in discussions on the requirement for Design Statements, and attended the mediation session on this topic. I support the proposed requirement as outlined in Tracey Ogden-Cook's evidence. While Design Statements may be viewed by some as overly bureaucratic, there is nothing else in the overall RMA process to require a well-considered design outcome. It may well be that effectively forcing designers to acknowledge the reality of their designs in a statement will have some positive outcomes, and it is worth testing this over the next few years.
19. I support the incentives for affordable housing as set out in David Mead's evidence.

Graeme Scott

22 September 2015

PROFILE

Graeme Scott



NEW ZEALAND INSTITUTE OF
ARCHITECTS
INCORPORATED

Date of Birth:	01.11.49	
Nationality:	New Zealander	
Profession:	Architect	
Specialisation:	Commercial, Residential and Interior architecture Urban design	
Education:	1968-1972	University of Auckland, School of Architecture
	1963-1967	Selwyn College, Auckland
Qualifications:	BArch (Hons)	Bachelor of Architecture with honours Fellow of the New Zealand Institute of Architects Green-star practitioner
Work History	1981-now	ASC Architects, Director
	1976 -1980	ASC Architects, Architectural graduate
	1973-1976	Various architecture practices in London

Graeme graduated from the University of Auckland's School of Architecture in 1973, and has been a Director of ASC Architects since 1981, playing a leading role in establishing the company's design reputation. He has designed numerous public and corporate buildings over that time, and has won awards for many of them, including four from the New Zealand Institute of Architects.

Graeme has a strong interest in design in a New Zealand context and was Convener of the National Awards for Architecture for the New Zealand Institute of Architects in 1994 and 1995. He was a member of the NZIA Council and the Honorary Secretary for four years 1996 to 1999.

He has a strong background in commercial architecture, having completed office buildings in Auckland for clients including The National Bank and the McDonald's headquarters. He is currently the principal architect for New Zealand for ANZ Bank retail operations.

His interest in urban design formed around the debate over the 1995 Britomart scheme, which eventually was abandoned in favour of the now-completed scheme. Comment on the scheme was led by the NZIA Urban Issues Group, which Graeme re-joined in 2000, becoming Group Chair in 2004. He currently chairs the Urban Design Forum NZ.

In a design capacity, Graeme has participated in urban design competitions, including Britomart and Matiatia for Auckland City Council, where ASC Architects were shortlisted, and in urban design / masterplanning for MOE Schools at Botany Downs and Flatbush, Housing NZ projects and the McLennan housing project at Papakura. He currently leads teams working on Market Cove - a large apartment development of 14 hectares in Mangere, Auckland, and on Unitec, Auckland - both master-planning and new buildings.

Graeme has received the NZIA President's award four times, is chairman of one of the two Hobsonville Point Design Review Panels, and is a member of the Auckland Council's Urban Design Panel.