For the attention of the IHP

Dear Mr Kirkpatrick and IHP Members

I was present at the HNZC hearing on Thursday last week and I was there in particular during the presentation of their rezoning maps for Ponsomby/Grey Lynn/Westmere area. I would like to comment on these maps.

In the Ponsomby/Freemans Bay area the original proposal by HNZC was for THAB zoning to cover practically the full extent of the area with total disregard of any historical or character value. There was no rationale in that proposal, the only logic was to intensify to the extreme regardless of the consequences. What credibility has HNZC in all the other zoning map proposals? A planning study has to be serious in all of its parts to make some sense, the HNZC proposal for Ponsomby/Freemans Bay was not serious at all and the whole of its proposal has to be flawed.

With the latest amendments HNZC is now very much in line with the Council position for the Ponsomby/Freemans Bay area and now it is asking for a rezoning of only one property within that big area, but where the Council is seeking more intensification then it is a different story. In the Westmere/West Grey Lynn area HNZC has maintained its extreme intensification proposal. Is there any agreement between the Council and HNZC to support each other in this Unitary Plan process?

I know West Grey Lynn very well as I have been a Grey Lynn resident for twenty years and the proposal of extended MHU zoning along those street makes no sense and especially won't achieve anything in the future. It is just proof of a total lack of knowledge of the area and a useless planning exercise with the only result of creating controversy and anger.

Unfortunately the "Council Planning Department" has used the HNZC submission with these over inflated intensification proposals to claim support for its latest "in-scope" zoning maps released on 17 December 2015. After these maps had been published there was an indication that maybe 20,000 to 30,000 properties were included in the rezoning, but certainly the affected parties can be a lot more considering also the properties in the vicinity of the rezoned areas.

Is it reasonable to deny many thousands Auckland residents the possibility to object based only on the HNZC "non-serious" proposals? There is no difference between "in-scope" and "out-of-scope" if that distinction is based only on the HNZC submission or even on other "non-specific" submissions, therefore all those new zoning maps should be withdrawn if not properly notified.

The HNZC representatives have been directly involved with the "groups of experts" during the mediation for the business and residential topics together with few other representatives of various developers and they have largely influenced the outcomes of the mediation process. Private submitters and representatives of large groups of residents have been excluded to have any say on those outcomes. I understand that the IHP has not initiated the "groups of experts" but I have raised several times the issue of these groups during my interventions at the various pre-hearing and hearings for other topics. This is also an issue of democracy, unfortunately decisions on the changes to the business and residential rules have been made by the Council in agreement with "interested parties" and these changes are indeed very substantial.

The Panel should have dealt with that immediately, instead postponing any decision to the end of the process gives the impression of a "done deal" and in fact all the evidence presented by the Council in late January takes for granted the approval of all those changes, including the additional height overlays.

I have noticed that Mr Nick Roberts, who was contracted by the Council for the mediation process for the residential topics, is now representing several clients during the hearing for the rezoning. Is this compatible with his role during mediation?

Franco Belgiorno-Nettis

Igiono Nettig rance

e-mail: franco.nettis@xtra.co.nz

Takapuna, 14/3/2016