

APPENDIX 2 – CLAUSE 23 REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

163-179 Pilkington Road Point England – Proposed Private Change Application -

Applicant: Wyborn Capital Investments Ltd

Proposed changes: PPC –Rezoning, Height Variation Control and introduction of new precinct provisions

#	Category of information missing	Specific Request	Reasons for request	Applicant Response (please reference any attachments)
URBAN DESIGN (Specialist: Georgia Pieri (ph 027 245 1465 email georgia.pieri@aucklandcouncil.govt)				
UD1	Comprehensive development	<p>Section 2.2 of the Urban Design Assessment confirms that 'any future development would be subject to a comprehensive design process'.</p> <p>Please clarify what is meant specifically by 'subject to a comprehensive design process' and how a comprehensive design for this site would be processed.</p>	<p>This is a significant, highly accessible brownfield site under single ownership. Future redevelopment of this site needs to be carried out in a co-ordinated manner to avoid piecemeal / ad-hoc redevelopment without consideration of the bigger picture.</p> <p>Successful large-scale brownfield urban redevelopments are often guided by comprehensive approaches such as master planning or establishing strategic outcomes for the site. Local examples of this are TRC, Stonefields and Te Tauoma.</p> <p>Yet it is understood that this proposal relies on the provisions of the draft precinct and the underlying BMU zoning to deliver outcomes.</p>	
U2	Streetscape Outcomes -	Please provide information on how future development will ensure positive streetscape outcomes from a CPTED	The streetscape environment along Apirana Avenue / Pilkington Road towards the town centre is compromised in terms of pedestrian safety (CPTED) and amenity. The open space zoned land (comprising 84% of the site's frontage	

#	Category of information missing	Specific Request	Reasons for request	Applicant Response (please reference any attachments)
	Walkability and CPTED	point of view, to encourage walkability to and from the site.	<p>along the eastern boundary contains well-established specimen trees / vegetation) making visibility into the site from the street very difficult and, creating a large setback the street edge.</p> <p>The site is highly accessible. It is located within the proposed walkable catchment of the Glen Innes town centre and train station. An increase in pedestrian traffic associated with future development in a BMU zone is likely, and this raises the need for information on how CPTED matters, will be addressed to encourage walkability to and from the site.</p>	
UD3	Residential amenity outcomes	Further analysis is requested to determine whether the provisions of the plan change proposal are sufficient to address residential amenity outcomes for this site or whether additional standards i.e. shading due to greater building height, building separation, overlooking, privacy, outdoor living spaces would be required to manage onsite residential amenity.	<p>It is understood that greater building height and residential density is an outcome the applicant wishes to achieve for this site. The plan change proposal does not include additional residential amenity standards other than minimum dwelling size, outlook, and specific acoustic provisions along the western boundary.</p> <p>Therefore, the BMU zone and proposed precinct provisions are not likely to provide enough certainty to ensure broader residential amenity outcomes will be achieved.</p>	
<p>Non CI23(1) request matter/other comments</p> <p>The plan change area site is a large-scale (7ha) brownfield parcel of land in single ownership. The site is within walking distance of Glen Innes Town Centre and Train Station and, is well-located in terms of proximity to open spaces, employment areas, public transport and other amenities.</p> <p>The plan change proposal presents an opportunity to intensify the site with a mix of commercial and residential activities. However, this needs to be considered holistically, to ensure that future development of such a strategic site can be undertaken in a coordinated and integrated manner.</p>				

#	Category of information missing	Specific Request	Reasons for request	Applicant Response (please reference any attachments)
			<p>The BMU zone allows for generous flexibility of residential and commercial land uses and the proposed precinct provisions seek to manage amenity for activities sensitive to noise associated with the railway located along the western boundary and to remove the HIRB provision along the eastern boundary. The BMU zone and proposed precinct provisions do not provide enough direction to ensure both strategic planning and good design outcomes are achieved. This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordinated movement and land use development across the plan change area. - Ensuring desirable built form / streetscape outcomes along the Apirana Avenue and Pilkington Road frontage, where the site adjoins the Council-owned open space / road reserve to promote and encourage safe pedestrian connections to and from the site. - Ensuring broader residential amenity outcomes beyond what the BMU zone requires. <p>In addition, further consideration is needed to ensure that a greater level of certainty can be given to achieving a comprehensive development for a site of this scale and significance through the consenting process. For example, considering the inclusion of special information requirements such as a masterplan to be prepared at the time of the first application for subdivision or land use within the precinct to address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall layout • Movement network and site access • Location of open space and landscaping at a high level (in particular, along the rail corridor where there is an opportunity for a landscaped buffer) • Building footprints to help illustrate the relationship between buildings and spaces and how these support the intended outcomes for the site • Land use and densities • Housing typologies • Site opportunities e.g., a 'marker' building at the northern-most corner of the site fronting the Apirana Avenue roundabout; retention of existing significant vegetation; etc <p>For such a large site area, reliance on the AUP and the basic consenting processes is unlikely to result in good urban design outcomes.</p>	

#	Category of information missing	Specific Request	Reasons for request	Applicant Response (please reference any attachments)
Open Space / Parks / Community Facilities (Specialists: EZRA BARWELL ph 021897004 email: ezra.barwell@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz and James Hendra ph 021 347 348 email james@wla.net.nz)				
OS1	Open Space Needs	Please provide an estimate of the occupancy of the site if developed to the maximum permitted by the proposed zone and standards and provide an assessment of open space needs, for example the size and proximity of local purpose reserves based on council's open space provision policy and expected development within the area permitted by the plan and PC85.	The s32 report states: "In summary, the surrounding open space, amenities, and social facilities are accessibly by active modes of transport and are of a sufficient size to cater for the social and cultural needs and well-being of future residents of the Plan Change area." Aside from listing nearby open spaces, the basis for this conclusion is not explained. The number of residents who may potentially occupy the site has not been provided, nor the demand for open spaces in the future estimated. It is not clear if existing open spaces in the area will cater for existing users and people from the development over time.	
OS4	Building height and Height in relation to boundary	Please provide bulk and location drawings which demonstrate the difference in built outcomes from applying the BMU's HIRB standard compared to the proposal to have no HIRB control alongside open space, while also considering the proposed 21m and 27m maximum building heights. Please explain how the difference in built form made possible by excluding the HIRB control results in any material beneficial outcomes with respect to the listed bullet point objectives in the s32 report.	No analysis has been provided to demonstrate that removing the HIRB standard and increasing the maximum building height would be the most effective and efficient means to achieve objectives (B2.31 and IX.2.2) discussed in the s32 report.	

#	Category of information missing	Specific Request	Reasons for request	Applicant Response (please reference any attachments)
OS	Road crossings	Please provide an assessment of how any new or altered road crossings to future development on site could affect the council reserve and how these effects would be managed.	This information is required to determine future potential effects on council's land asset.	
Non CI23(1) request matter/other comments				
1. See Urban Design non CI23 matters.				
LANDSCAPE (Specialist: Gabrielle Howdle ph 021 194 6470 email: gabrielle.howdle@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz)				
L1	Surveyor's report	Please provide a surveyor's report / calculation to confirm the plane heights (rolling height method) across the site in relation to the co-ordinates within Schedule 9 to confirm the suitability of the 21m and 27m Height Variation Control (HVC).	The plane heights as indicated on Auckland Council GIS Maps are accurate to a degree, however where development is within close proximity to a viewshaft (such as the proposed increased heights of future built form would be), a survey report undertaken by a registered survey is typically provided to demonstrate compliance. In this instance, the HVC was informed by the existing viewshaft overlays and aims to not impede these but does not confirm if this has been surveyed accurately.	
L2	Photosimulations	Please provide a set of images which visually demonstrates from the seven viewpoints used in the Landscape & Visual Effects Assessment (LVA), the comparison between the existing Business Light Industry (BLI) (20m), PC78, buildings within a walkable catchment (21m) and the proposed 21m and 27m HVC.	Viewpoint photos from seven representative catchments identified by the assessor within the LVA have been provided, however, to understand the potential landscape effects (including landscape character, visual amenity and connections/views to the maunga) of the proposed HVC more information should be provided visually to represent the appropriateness of the HVC.	

#	Category of information missing	Specific Request	Reasons for request	Applicant Response (please reference any attachments)
L3	Maunga	<p>Please provide an assessment of views between maunga; including from Maungarei (Mount Wellington) to Rangitoto and Maungarei to Te Taurere (Mount Taylor).</p> <p>This assessment is to be supported by photo simulations of the potential effects of future development under the various maximum building heights of the AUP BLI zone, Proposed PC78 BMU zone and the proposed HVCs.</p>	<p>The LVA recognises the presence of the scheduled volcanic viewshafts, and briefly notes that the HVC will not impede these elements. As part of the AUP (OP) Regional Policy Statement B4 – Natural Heritage aims to protect both significant public views (viewshafts) and views between Auckland's maunga, are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development (B4.3.1 (1)).</p>	
L4	Landscape character	<p>Please provide a clear assessment and level of effects, the PPC may have on landscape character values from a local and wider landscape perspective, including the impact the HVC will have on the biophysical, associative and experiential values (this includes urban values / characteristics).</p>	<p>The LVA has undertaken an assessment of the potential visual amenity effects resulting from the change in zoning proposed by the PPC. The assessor in 'Part 6.1 Neighbourhood Perspective' concludes that "potential visual effects from a neighbourhood perspective to be very low" but it is unclear if this is the effects relating to the visual amenity effects only or also the impact on landscape character values. The assessor is asked to provide clarity on the impact of the PPC on the landscape character effects, and visual amenity values (as a subset of landscape values).</p>	
<p>Non CI23(1) request matter/other comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See Urban Design non CI23 matters. 2. Note: There are inconsistencies in the height variations shown on the planning maps and the Executive Summary of the s32 report. 3. Note: The Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment methodology notes that "the assessment has been prepared in accordance with Te Tangi a te Manu Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Assessment Guidelines (May 2022)". It is noted 				

#	Category of information missing	Specific Request	Reasons for request	Applicant Response (please reference any attachments)
that the most recent version of TTatM is dated July 2022 ('Te Tangi a te Manu: Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Assessment Guidelines', Tuia Pito Ora New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects, July 2022').				
ECONOMIC EFFECTS (Specialist: MARKET ECONOMICS - SUSAN FAIRGRAY Fairgray ph 027 633 2970 susan@me.co.nz & Danny CONTRACTOR email danny@me.co.nz)				
E1	Site activity	Please provide information on the site's current and recent past activity. For the existing activity, it would be helpful to advise on the geographic catchment areas served and approximate employment levels.	This information will help understand the site within the industrial space market context of the Auckland region and the eastern/southern catchment area (as defined in economic assessment).	
E2	Employment potential	Please provide an assessment of the employment potential on the site within the current BLI zone provisions applied and any changes in the level of employment with a change to a B- MU zone.	While this potential activity can be partly inferred from the industrial land assessment, it would be useful to estimate the likely potential development (taking into account likely facility if the site remained zoned BLI. This will be helpful to understand any economic effect of a change in local employment opportunity.	
E3	Commercial activity	Please provide an estimate of the level and type of commercial activity able to be established on the site if a B-MU zone is applied. In particular, it is important to understand the potential level of retail and other centres-based activity that could be reasonably accommodated	It is important to understand the effects of commercial activity that could be enabled to establish on the site, on the role and function of the Glen Innes town centre. This includes understanding whether the commercial activity may dilute any retail/commercial activity within the existing core centre area	

#	Category of information missing	Specific Request	Reasons for request	Applicant Response (please reference any attachments)
		on the site if it were developed with a commercial focus.		
E4	Residential activity	<p>Please provide an economic assessment of the likely residential household yield on the proposed site or any assessment of the appropriateness of residential development in this location.</p> <p>Please identify any additional demand generated for retail, hospitality and household services commercial activity from the additional household growth.</p>	This information will be useful in understanding part of the economic costs and benefits of the proposal relating to the additional demand from household growth in this location.	
Non CI23(1) request matter/other comments - None				
Stormwater (Specialists: Healthy Waters - SUSAN ANDREWS susan.andrews@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz AMBER TSANG amber.tsang@jacobs.com Consultant catchment manager for Healthy Waters – DANNY CURTIS danny.curtis@harrisingrierson.com				
HW1	Stormwater discharge	<p>Please confirm if the Applicant wishes to apply for a private stormwater discharge consent or seek to be considered under the Auckland Council Healthy Waters Regionwide Stormwater Network Discharge Consent (NDC).</p> <p>If the Applicant seek to come under the NDC, please submit a Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) as part of the plan change proposal.</p>	<p>This information is required to enable understanding of the plan change proposal.</p> <p>Auckland Council Healthy Waters holds a NDC for stormwater which commenced on 30 October 2019. Diversions and discharges of stormwater through the public network are permitted by the NDC provided that the discharges and network are authorised by a SMP, and the impervious area is lawfully established. This includes a privately built network that wants to connect to the public stormwater network.</p> <p>For large brownfields re-developments (i.e. 20 lots and over or more than 5,000m² of impervious area), it is a requirement</p>	

#	Category of information missing	Specific Request	Reasons for request	Applicant Response (please reference any attachments)
			<p>of the NDC that a SMP is notified with the plan change documents and meets the NDC's requirements, including Schedule 2 (which sets out the NDC's strategic objectives, outcomes, and targets) and Schedule 4 (the performance requirements).</p> <p>HW2-5 below will be relevant should the Applicant seek to come under the NDC.</p>	
HW2	Stormwater attenuation	<p>Please provide an assessment of downstream network capacity, network upgrade requirements, post development drainage catchments and assessment of effects.</p> <p>If the Applicant does not want to undertake the above assessments, then flood modelling will be required to support the plan change proposal to demonstrate that there will be no increase in flood risks downstream.</p>	<p>There is flooding identified downstream of the plan change area and the Applicant needs to explain how they intend to ensure that any flooding impacts downstream are avoided, remedied, or mitigated.</p> <p>Section 3.1.2 of the Civil Engineering Report stated that stormwater treatment and hydrology mitigation is required but did not address whether attenuation of the 10% and 1% AEP events will be required.</p> <p>It is recommended that attenuation of the 10% AEP event is considered. Considering that greater than 50% of the site area is to be redeveloped, this means that the pre-development scenario should be considered as greenfield to establish attenuation requirements.</p>	
HW3	Stormwater treatment	Please confirm if stormwater treatment of all impervious surfaces with a GD01 device is proposed.	<p>Section 3.1.3 of the Civil Engineering Report is confusing. It referenced the treatment of all impervious surfaces with a GD01 device, but then also mentioned Chapter J of the AUP(OP) and treatment of High Contaminant Generating Areas.</p> <p>The request is to clarify our understanding of the proposed stormwater treatment.</p>	

#	Category of information missing	Specific Request	Reasons for request	Applicant Response (please reference any attachments)
HW4	Stormwater retention and detention	<p>Please provide information to demonstrate how the retention and detention requirements will be met to service any future development enabled by the plan change proposal.</p> <p>Please note, it is requested under the NDC requirements that the consideration of communal devices, together with approximate locations are provided.</p>	<p>Section 3.1.4 and Appendix B of the Civil Engineering Report provided generic retention and detention volume calculations, assuming that the entire development will be 100% impervious.</p> <p>No geotechnical information has been provided to suggest that retention through infiltration would be possible. Therefore, it should be assumed that full detention will be required, with guidance provided that infiltration testing will be required at the next stage of the development design.</p> <p>Section 3.1.4 suggested that the retention and detention volume could be provided through rain tanks, tree pits and raingardens. This would appear to be promoting small scale devices which would not be cost effective for Auckland Council and/or Auckland Transport to maintain.</p>	
HW5	Flooding and overland flow path	Please demonstrate how the existing overland flow path on the site will be incorporated into the development design to avoid any potential impacts on flooding downstream.	<p>Section 3.1.6 of the Civil Engineering Report stated that there are no significant flow paths on the site. It considered that there will not be any impact on flooding downstream as the existing flow path will be incorporated into the development design.</p> <p>However, Auckland Council's GeoMaps indicates that there is a flowpath on the site that has a contributing catchment of over 44,000m². We are wanting to avoid any downstream flooding impacts from future development of the site.</p>	
Non CI23(1) request matter/other comments – None				

#	Category of information missing	Specific Request	Reasons for request	Applicant Response (please reference any attachments)
TRANSPORT (Specialist: ABLEY LTD - DAVE SMITH ph 021 864 461 email: dave@abley.com and LIAM BURKHARDT email liam@abley.com)				
T1	Existing roads Section 3.2 of ITA	Please provide an assessment to determine whether the static traffic volumes on adjoining roads are a result of the local network operating at capacity as opposed to being a result of flattened traffic demand?	Traffic volumes from future development on the site has implications for the capacity of the local network to accommodate more activity and corresponding traffic demand.	
T2	AT Cycleways programme Section 3.5 & 3.6 of ITA	Please include construction timeframes for Auckland Transport's Links to Glen Innes Cycleways project in the ITA.	It is unclear when the 'Links to Glen Innes Cycleways' project will be implemented. This project will be critical in improving accessibility for future residents from an active modes perspective.	
T3	Walking and cycling speed assumptions Section 3.5 & 3.6 of ITA	Please provide the underlying walking and cycling speed assumptions	This is helpful to understand the level of reach demonstrated Figures 11 and 13.	
T4	Crash records Section 3.7 of ITA	Please advise whether any of the crashes involved pedestrians or cyclists.	It is unclear whether there are any underlying safety issues along the corridor corresponding to active modes.	
T5	Neighbouring developments Section 3.10 of ITA	Please describe the potential development that will occur in the vicinity, including the wider Tāmaki Regeneration Programme.	The Tāmaki Regeneration Programme will result in additional development occurring in the coming decades, which will likely occur at the same time as development within the plan change area. This needs to be considered. Any other future development that may occur within the surrounding area should also be discussed in this section.	

#	Category of information missing	Specific Request	Reasons for request	Applicant Response (please reference any attachments)
T6	Trip rates [minor error] Section 6.2 of ITA	Please add the correct trip rate for terraced houses in table 3, and confirm rates are peak hourly trip rates.	The trip rate for terraced houses stated in table 3 is incorrect and should be updated to a midpoint of 0.575.	
T7	Trip rates Section 6.2 of ITA	Please confirm the source of the trip rates used for non-residential activities in table 4 and confirm rates are peak hourly trip rates	It is unclear what source has been used for the trip rates in table 4.	
T8	Traffic forecasts Section 6.2 of ITA	Please outline how figures 29 and 30 relating to future peak hour traffic flows have been developed. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. When were the underlying intersection surveys collected? b. What is the peak hour for the evening period? c. Has an allowance for the removal of existing activity on site been made? d. Has an allowance for growth and/or the addition of other consented/anticipated development (other than the under construction Tāmaki Regeneration Programme build)? 	It is important to understand the traffic flow assumptions underpinning this assessment, and to be confident that the calculations have been made accurately for both roundabouts. [Note that the Auckland Forecasting Centre may be able to assist in providing future traffic volumes.]	

#	Category of information missing	Specific Request	Reasons for request	Applicant Response (please reference any attachments)
		<p>e. Is all traffic generation anticipated to be (new) primary trips on the network?</p> <p>f. What is the basis of the trip distribution assumptions used?</p>		
T9	Sidra modelling Section 6.4 & 6.5 of ITA	Please provide the Sidra intersection models and confirm whether the existing Sidra models' performance has been calibrated against observed roundabout performance (e.g. current observed delays or queue lengths in peak hours)?	This is considered best practice to ensure the Sidra model appropriately reflects the current operating environment.	
T10	Sidra modelling _ Merton Road roundabout Section 6.4 & 6.5 of ITA	Please undertake a sensitivity test for the Merton Road roundabout to reflect the reduced capacity shown in figure 10 of the ITA?	These intersection works are in AT's forward work programme and should be tested in the modelling.	
T11	Level of service for pedestrians	Please provide an assessment of the level of service to be provided for pedestrians. This should focus on the connections across Apirana Avenue to other likely destinations and take into account AT's proposed zebra crossings at the Merton Road/Apirana Avenue roundabout.	To establish whether the existing 1.8m wide footpath along the site frontage, existing nearby footpaths that provide access between the site and pedestrian destinations, and AT's proposed zebra crossings at the Merton Road / Apirana Avenue roundabout provide a satisfactory level of service for pedestrians.	
Non CI23(1) request matter/other comments – None				

#	Category of information missing	Specific Request	Reasons for request	Applicant Response (please reference any attachments)
NOISE AND VIBRATION Specialist Andrew Gordon ph 027 482 3527 andrew.gordon@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz				
NV1	Existing noise environment	Please provide comments on the existing noise environment in regard to existing ambient and background levels and the contribution from business activities, rail and road traffic sources.	The assessment describes the existing 'legal' environment with no reporting of the existing noise environment at the site. This information is required to assess compatibility with any future residential activity.	
NV2	Railway noise	Please confirm the KiwiRail guideline for railway noise of 70 dB LAeq(1hour) at 12m from the track is representative for design purposes.	As no rail noise measurements were completed, it is important to confirm the KiwiRail noise guideline is appropriate for this Site.	
NV3	Railway noise effects area	Please provide additional comments/evidence why the recommended 60m effects area is appropriate for this site.	The KiwiRail document titled 'Model district plan provisions' clearly refers to 'All zones – at any point within 100 metres from the legal boundary of any railway network'.	
NV4	No-complaints covenant	Please advise if a no-complaint covenant is appropriate for ensuring reverse sensitivity effects on KiwiRail are avoided.	Although acoustic treatment will mitigate indoor noise levels to a reasonable level, a minority of future occupants may still be annoyed to the extent that complaints may be made to KiwiRail.	
NV5	Minimum setback distance	Please advise the recommended minimum setback distance that Activities Sensitive To Noise should be located from the rail corridor to ensure compliance with the recommended rail vibration criterion of 0.3mm/s vw95.	Setback distance is a critical mitigating factor and an indicative setback distance should be quantified. Such distances are also necessary for the safe operation of the Eastern Railway Line.	

#	Category of information missing	Specific Request	Reasons for request	Applicant Response (please reference any attachments)
NV6	Road traffic noise	Please advise if road traffic noise (existing & future) from the two arterial roads next to the eastern site boundary will give rise to adverse effects in buildings containing Activities Sensitive To Noise.	Road traffic noise, like rail noise, is not controlled by any AUP standards, but traffic noise effects have not been discussed.	
Non CI23(1) request matter/other comments				
1. Paragraph 8.1 design considerations do not specifically include designing facades (that are most exposed to rail noise) to comprise a more solid construction (i.e. minimal glazed areas) and without balconies or, designing internal layouts so that non-habitable space share the most exposed façade. These design considerations should be discussed.				
PLANNING, STATUTORY AND OTHER MATTERS (Specialist – MICHELE PERWICK ph 021 684 208 michele.perwick@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz)				
P1	Planning maps	Please provide a plan showing the extent of the KiwiRail landholdings to be included within the proposed plan change area to be rezoned.	To enable a full understanding of the location the two landholdings making up the subject site and how this could potentially affect future development capacity and site viability.	
P2	KiwiRail railway corridor	Please provide evidence of KiwiRail's agreement to include part of their railway corridor within the plan change.	No evidence of an agreement by the landowner has been provided.	
P3	Consultation	Please provide further information on the views of the people and organisations the Applicant has consulted with and how the Applicant has specifically responded to those views.	This is a requirement of clause 21 (2) - Form of the request under Schedule 1 of the RMA. It will enable a full understanding of the views of those people and organisations the Applicant consulted with.	
P4	Tamaki Regeneration Masterplan	Please provide an assessment of the proposal against the strategic priorities and key moves of the Tamaki Regeneration Masterplan.	The Tamaki Regeneration Company (TRC) was established by Central Government and Auckland Council to facilitate the regeneration of Tamaki. TRC estimates that 2500 public houses will transform into 10,500 new private and market	

#	Category of information missing	Specific Request	Reasons for request	Applicant Response (please reference any attachments)
			<p>affordable and public homes. There will be additional growth on non-TRC owned land.</p> <p>The proposed site lies within the Tamaki Employment Precinct of this Masterplan. It is important to understand how the proposed plan change aligns with the strategic priorities and key moves set out in that masterplan.</p>	
P5	Cultural values assessment	Please provide a cultural values assessment.	Policy B.6.5.2(7) requires a Māori cultural assessment in structure planning and plan change processes.	
P6	Regional Policy statement (RPS)	Please provide an analysis of the proposed plan change in relation to the AUP RPS chapters B3 – Infrastructure, Transport, Energy, B6 Mana Whenua and B10 Environmental Risk.	This is required for a full understanding of the proposed plan change under the RPS.	
P7	Local Board	Please provide an analysis of the proposed plan change in relation to the Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board Plan 2020.	This is required to fully understand the proposed plan change in relation to the Local Board plan.	
P8	Funding	Please provide an analysis of the proposed plan change in relation to the Auckland Council Ten Year Budget / Long Term Plan 2018-2028	The Auckland Plan shows Glen Innes as a development area and one where substantial investment will be made. This information is required for a full understanding of the proposed plan change in relation to the demands of development enabled by the plan change and what is / what is not provided for in Council's LTP.	
Non CI23(1) request matter/other comments – See Non CI23 Urban Design.				