

PROJECT UNITARY PLAN PARKING PROVISION RULES
SUBJECT EXISTING PLAN CHANGES
TO KATHERINE DOROFUEFF, AUCKLAND COUNCIL
FROM MAIRI JOYCE
REVIEWED BY BRONWYN COOMER-SMIT
DATE 24 OCTOBER 2012

1 INTRODUCTION

In 2011 Auckland Council commissioned Flow Transportation Specialists Ltd (Flow) to investigate options for the number of parking and loading spaces which should be required in the Auckland Unitary Plan (outside of the Auckland City Centre). The aim was to implement the strategic approach to parking contained in the Auckland Regional Land Transport Strategy 2010-2040 (RLTS) and the Auckland Regional Parking Strategy 2009. Flow's findings and recommendations are outlined in a report dated 17 January 2012. At the same time, Transport Planning Solutions Ltd (TPS) was commissioned to complete a similar piece of work for the Auckland City Centre, and outlined their findings and recommendations in a report dated 25 January 2012.

The recommended parking approach contained in section 9 of Flow's January report identified that it would be desirable to undertake further work on the parking provision rules for the city fringe centres (which were listed as Ponsonby, Three Lamps, Parnell, Grafton and Newton). Further to this, Flow has been commissioned to recommend parking provision rules for the City Centre Fringe Area, with the findings outlined in a further report dated 29 June 2012. It is also acknowledged that the TPS report and the Flow reports of 17 January 2012 and 29 June 2012 are subject to ongoing review by Auckland Council during the development of parking and loading provisions for the Unitary Plan.

Our report recommends the implementation of maximum, and the removal of minimum, parking provision rules, in urban centres which are identified as having potential for change, and are located on the Frequent Services Network (FSN) (or are planned to be so within the next ten years). These parking provision rules would apply within 1 km of a rail or busway station and 800 m of a FSN bus stop. This is a move away from the parking provision philosophy of existing District Plans in Auckland which generally include parking rules that specify a minimum number of parking spaces to be provided in conjunction with activities established on a site with no restriction on the maximum number of parks provided. The principal exception is within the City Centre, where there has traditionally been no requirement to provide ancillary parking for activities, and where there are also limits on the maximum number of spaces permitted. However, our report also identifies that the recent Plan Changes to the existing District Plans have resulted in the introduction of maximum parking provision rules in some urban centres including Newmarket, Sylvia Park, Orakei Point, Massey North and Hobsonville. Other Plan Changes have also resulted in reduced minimum parking standards for particular activities, again predominantly around mixed use town centres.

This technical note reviews these Plan Changes and identifies any conflicts between the plan change provisions and the proposed parking provision rules as recommended in our report. Where a conflict occurs, we have recommended a course of action. The results of the analysis are outlined in attached Table 1.

2 ANALYSIS

2.1 Plan Changes Selected

The Plan Changes included in Table 1 have been selected because they include different parking provision rules than the general parking provision rules included in the existing District Plans. The majority apply to urban centres which have been identified for growth and so are relevant to the parking provision rules as proposed above. The only Plan Changes which have been included which do not apply to an urban centres are Plan Change 35 (Smales Farm) and Plan Change 260 (Orakei Point) which have been included due to their use of maximum parking rates. It is noted that both of these areas are located on the proposed FSN but have not been identified as an urban centre in the Auckland Plan.

Some of the Plan Changes are already operative and are therefore fully part of the existing District Plans but have still been included to ensure the identification of any potential conflicts between the proposed parking provision rules in the Unitary Plan and any established plan changes.

2.2 Analysis Methodology

Table 1 identifies where there are conflicts between the parking provision rules proposed in the plan changes already in place (either proposed, under appeal or operative) and the parking rules proposed under the Unitary plan. Where a conflict has been identified we have recommended whether the plan change rule or the proposed Unitary Plan rule should apply. This recommendation is a draft recommendation only and will need be subject to further analysis from the Unitary Plan team. However, our recommendations are based on consideration of the following criteria:

- ◆ There is a need for consistency throughout the region with regard to an approach to parking provision rules. This will reduce the potential for some urban centres to be more attractive to development over others as a result of differences in parking provision rules
- ◆ Recognition that some of the Plan Changes have been in place for over four years and are likely to be based on evidence prepared a number of years before that. In addition, the Plan Changes have been approved within the context of the parking provision rules included in the existing District Plans. Many of these Plan Changes may have applied more restrictive parking provision rules if they were decided within a context of the regional parking provision rules currently proposed for the Unitary Plan
- ◆ Recognition of the fact that the parking provision rules included in some plan changes are based on a significant amount of site specific analysis, which is much greater than has been undertaken for the proposed rules for the Unitary Plan. This may include an assessment of traffic effects based on the proposed parking provision. This, combined with the fact that some of the plan changes are very recent (2011) and have been subject to Environment Court decisions, means

that in some cases there is a valid argument in retaining the parking provision rules included in the existing plan changes, even if this results in inconsistencies between centres in the Unitary Plan.

Overall our approach has been to recommend that the proposed Unitary Plan parking provision rules should apply (for the reasons outlined above), unless there appears to be evidence that a detailed site specific analysis of parking provision rules has been included in the plan change process. It is acknowledged that this is based on an initial review of the plan changes only and therefore some further analysis of the evidence prepared for the plan changes will need to be undertaken before a final decision can be reached.

It is also acknowledged that the Unitary Plan team will need to consider other factors when deciding on whether the Plan Change parking provision rules should be carried forward into the Unitary Plan and that our recommendations are based on the above transport related considerations only.

Table 1: Plan Change Analysis

Plan Change	Status/ Date	Location	Activity	Parking Provision Rules in Plan Change		Unitary Plan Proposed Parking Provision Rules		Conflict?	Recommendation (Draft)
				Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Yes/No and Explanation	
Plan Change 71 to the Auckland City Isthmus District Plan	Fully operative, 2008	Mixed Use Zone	Residential activities	Yes, A minimum of 1 space per studio/1 bed unit with a GFA <75 m ² and 2 spaces per unit larger than 75 m ² A minimum of 1 visitor space per 5 units	Yes, a maximum of 2 spaces per unit with two bedrooms or more and / or GFA <75 m ² plus	Depends on location	Depends on location	It is unlikely there will be significant conflict as mixed use zones in the Isthmus are likely to be in urban centres or corridors.	Review when more information about the content and spatial application of the zoning proposed in the Unitary Plan is available. The floor areas or number of bedrooms used should be consistent with the proposed rules in other locations
Plan Change 196 (Newmarket) to the Auckland City Isthmus District Plan Note: Newmarket is identified as a Metropolitan Centre in the Auckland Plan, is on the FSN and is located within the City Centre Fringe Area	Approved 2007 but under appeal (the one remaining appeal does not relate to parking rates)	Core Parking Area	For activities where access to on-site car parking requires direct access from Broadway, Khyber Pass Road, Nuffield Street or Remuera Road and where vehicle access is not available from an alternative road or service lane	No	Yes, no parking is permitted	No	Yes as per all urban centres	Yes, the existing rules are more restrictive for the identified frontages	Retain existing restrictions for urban design reasons
			All activities	Cycle parking at 1:800m ² GFA	No	1 per 10-15 employees + 1:100m ² GFA	No	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules for cycle parking are higher	The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency reasons and to reflect the updated approach
			Activities located on the ground floor of a building and the site size is less than 1000m ²	No	1:25m ² GFA	No	1:25m ² GFA for retail, 1:60m ² GFA for office	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules for office activity are more restrictive than the existing as they apply to a wider area and to all floors	The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency reasons and to reflect the updated approach
			Activities located on the ground floor of a building and the site size is greater than 1000m ²	1:30m ² GFA	1:25m ² GFA.	No	1:25 m ² GFA for retail, 1:60m ² GFA for office	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules remove the minimum parking requirement for ground floor activities and the maximum rates for office activities is more restrictive	The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency reasons and to reflect the updated approach
			Activities not located on the ground floor of a building and the site size is less than 1000m ²	No	1:40m ² GFA	No	1:35 m ² GFA for retail 1:60m ² GFA for office	Yes the proposed Unitary Plan rules for non office activities are slightly less restrictive than the existing rules	The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency purposes and to reflect the updated approach
			Activities not located on the ground floor of a building and the site size is greater than 1000m ²	1:60m ² GFA	1:40m ² GFA	No	1:35 m ² GFA for retail, 1:60m ² GFA for office	Yes the proposed Unitary Plan rules remove the minimum parking requirement and the maximum rate for office activities is more restrictive.	The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency purposes and to reflect the updated approach

Table 1: Plan Change Analysis

Plan Change	Status/ Date	Location	Activity	Parking Provision Rules in Plan Change		Unitary Plan Proposed Parking Provision Rules		Conflict?	Recommendation (Draft)
				Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Yes/No and Explanation	
								The maximum rate for all other activities is slightly less restrictive with the proposed Unitary Plan rules	
		Outer Parking Area	All activities	Cycle parking at 1:800m ² GFA	No	1 per 10-15 employees + 1:100m ² GFA	No	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules for cyclists are higher	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency reasons and to reflect the updated approach</i>
			Offices, industry, laboratories, warehousing and storage, workrooms, health care	1:60 m ² GFA	1:40m ² GFA	No	1:60m ² GFA for office, 1:25 m ² for ground floor activities and 1:35 m ² for above ground activities	Yes, proposed Unitary Plan rules are more restrictive	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency reasons and to reflect the updated approach (subject to further consideration of medical facilities)</i>
			Other activities	Yes - rate equal to 75% of the car parking required by Part 12 of the existing District Plan for the particular activity in question	Yes - rates that does not exceed the parking rates specified by Part 12 of the existing District Plan	No	Yes – 1:25 m ² for ground floor activities and 1:35 m ² for above ground activities	Yes, proposed Unitary Plan rules are more restrictive and no minimum parking provision rule applies	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency reasons and to reflect the updated approach</i>
			Residential Activities	Studio / one bed less than 75m ² GFA - 1 space per unit 2 bedrooms or more, or any unit greater than 75 m ² GFA – 1 space per unit Visitor space – 1 space per 5 units	2 bedrooms or more, or any unit greater than 75 m ² GFA – 2 spaces per unit	No	Yes, 0-80 m ² - 1 per unit 81-110 m ² -2 per unit >110 m ² – 2 per unit Visitor spaces for multiunit developments – 0.2 per unit	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules do not include minimum parking for residential units	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency reasons and to reflect the updated approach</i>
Plan Change 235 (Sylvia Park) to the Auckland City Isthmus District Plan Note: Sylvia Park is identified as a Metropolitan Centre and is located on the FSN	Operative , 2010	Sylvia Park Town centre	Office	Yes - rate equal to 75% of the car parking rates set out in the existing District Plan	Yes: • 0m ² to10,000m ² =1:25 m ² • 10,001m ² to 20,000m ² =400 spaces plus 1:30 m ² for any office GFA above 10,000 m ² • 20,001m ² to 30,000m ² =733 spaces plus 1:35 m ² for any office GFA	No	Yes - 1:30 m ²	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules remove minimum standards for parking. The maximum rates are generally similar. It is noted that the progressive rates for office activities work out to be similar once you get to above 30,000 m ² .	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply. However the graded office activity maximum rates could remain if desired to reflect the fact that PT is still developing and this is based on site specific evidence using comparisons of surrounding office facilities.</i>

Table 1: Plan Change Analysis

Plan Change	Status/ Date	Location	Activity	Parking Provision Rules in Plan Change		Unitary Plan Proposed Parking Provision Rules		Conflict?	Recommendation (Draft)
				Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Yes/No and Explanation	
					above 20,000 m ² • Over 30,001m ² =1019 spaces plus 1:40m ² for any office GFA above 30,000m ²				
			All other activities	Yes - rate equal to 75% of the car parking rates set out in the existing District Plan for the particular activity in question	No	No	Yes as per all urban centres and corridors	Yes proposed Unitary Plan rules require no minimum but the minimum rates are similar to the proposed maximum rates	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency with other centres</i>
Plan Change 260 (Orakei Point) to the Auckland City Isthmus District Plan Note: Orakei is not identified as a centre in the Auckland Plan but is located on the FSN	Approved in 2011 but under appeal	Mixed Use Zone, Orakei Point	Residential	75 % of the maximum	One space per 1 bed residential unit Two spaces per residential unit with two beds or more	Yes, 0-80 m ² - 1 per unit 81-110 m ² -2 per unit >110 m ² – 2 per unit plus 0.2 visitor spaces per multi unit development	No	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules do not include maximum parking provision rules	<i>Retain existing rules which reflect the area's close proximity to public transport and mixed use activities even though it is not identified as an urban centre in the Auckland Plan</i>
			Offices	75 % of the maximum	1:60m ² GFA	No	Yes – 1 per 30 m ²	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules are less restrictive	<i>Retain existing rules which reflect the area's close proximity to public transport and mixed use activities and traffic effects to the surrounding area even though it is not identified as an urban centre in the Auckland Plan</i>
			Retail	75 % of the maximum	1:40m ² GFA	Yes 1 per 25 m ² areas open to the public	No	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules are less restrictive	<i>Retain existing rules which reflect the area's close proximity to public transport and mixed use activities and traffic effects to the surrounding area even though it is not identified as an urban centre in the Auckland Plan</i>
			Garden Centre, including an ancillary café that incorporates up to 20% GFA and/or up to 5% of the outdoor area	75 % of the maximum	Garden Centre: 1:40m ² for 100m ² of outdoor area Café: one space for every 4 café seats	Yes 1 per 15 m ² for food based retail plus 1:25 m ² for retail open to the public	No	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules are less restrictive	<i>Retain existing rules which reflect the area's close proximity to public transport and mixed use activities and traffic effects to the surrounding area even though it is not identified as an urban centre in the Auckland Plan</i>

Table 1: Plan Change Analysis

Plan Change	Status/ Date	Location	Activity	Parking Provision Rules in Plan Change		Unitary Plan Proposed Parking Provision Rules		Conflict?	Recommendation (Draft)
				Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Yes/No and Explanation	
			All other activities	75 % of the maximum	One space per 60m ² of GFA	Yes as per the proposals for outside of urban centres	No	Dependent on activity	<i>Retain existing rules which reflect the area's close proximity to public transport and mixed use activities and traffic effects to the surrounding area even though it is not identified as an urban centre in the Auckland Plan</i>
Plan Change 8 (St Lukes) to the Auckland City Isthmus District Plan Note St Lukes is identified as a Town Centre and will be located on the FSN by 2022	Operative	St Lukes Town Centre	All activities up to 45,473m ² GFA	Yes - 2,018 spaces	No	No	Yes as per all urban centres	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules include no minimum and have a maximum	<i>Proposed Unitary Plan rates should apply for consistency purposes and to reflect the updated approach</i>
			Retail premises, Restaurants, Cafes and other eating places, Community Welfare Facilities and Healthcare Services	Minimum 1:22 m ² of GFA (after the first 45,473m ²)	No	No	Yes 1 per 25 m ² on the ground floor and 1:35 m ² on the above ground floors	Yes the proposed Unitary Plan rules are more restrictive and are a maximum not a minimum	<i>Proposed Unitary Plan rates should apply for consistency purposes and to reflect the updated approach</i>
			Cinemas	1 per 11 seats	No	No	Yes 1 per 25 m ² GFA ground and mezzanine floors 1 per 35 m ² GFA above ground floors	Yes, the proposed unitary plan rules include a maximum rate	<i>Proposed Unitary Plan rates should apply for consistency purposes and to reflect the updated approach</i>
Plan Change 37 and Variation 9 (Residential 8 Zone Anzac Street) to the North Shore District Plan Note: The Anzac Street precinct is located within the catchment area for Takapuna, which is classified as a Metropolitan centre in the Auckland Plan and is located on the FSN	Hearings held May 2012, awaiting decision		Commercial parking requirements for ground floor	Yes, 1:40m ²	Yes, 1:20m ²	No	Yes, 1:40 m ²	Yes, Anzac Street is located in the catchment area for Takapuna and the proposed Unitary Plan rules are more restrictive than the existing	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency purposes and to reflect the updated approach to Takapuna</i>
			Commercial parking requirements above ground floor	Yes 1:50m ²	Yes, 1:35m ²	No	Yes, 1:40 m ²	Yes, Anzac Street is located in the catchment area for Takapuna and the proposed Unitary Plan rules are more restrictive than the existing	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency purposes and to reflect the updated approach to Takapuna</i>
			Residential	Yes, Studio/1 bedroom: 0.8 space per unit 2 bedrooms: 1 spaces per unit 3+ bedrooms: 1.5 spaces per unit Visitor parking; 1 space per 5 units Bicycle parking for	Yes, Studio/1 bedroom: 1 space per unit 2 bedrooms: 1.5 spaces per unit 3+ bedrooms: 2 spaces per unit Visitor parking; 1 space per 5 units Bicycle parking for	No	Yes, 0-80 m ² - 1 per unit 81-110 m ² -2 per unit >110 m ² - 2 per unit Visitor spaces for multiunit developments - 0.2	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules include no minimum requirement for car parking	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency purposes and to reflect the updated approach to Takapuna</i>

Table 1: Plan Change Analysis

Plan Change	Status/ Date	Location	Activity	Parking Provision Rules in Plan Change		Unitary Plan Proposed Parking Provision Rules		Conflict?	Recommendation (Draft)
				Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Yes/No and Explanation	
				residents; 1 stand per unit The above parking spaces are not required to be allocated to specific units	residents; 1 stand per unit The above parking spaces are not required to be allocated to specific units		per unit		
Plan Change 35 (Smales Farm) to the North Shore District Plan (Note: Smales farm is not identified as an urban centre in the Auckland Plan but is located on the FSN and includes the use of maximum parking rates)	Operative 2011	Business Park 7A Zone at Smales Farm	All	No	Yes, 1,936 car parks for the first 44,770m ² GFA An additional 1 space per 31.8m ² GFA for development between 44,770m ² and 105,000m ² GFA An additional 1 space per 45.1m ² GFA for development in excess of 105,000m ² GFA up to a maximum of 5094 spaces	Yes, minimum parking provision rules would apply as for areas outside of urban centres	No	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules are less restrictive	Retain existing rules to reflect the mixed use activities and the close proximity to PT, even though Smales Farm is not identified as an urban centre in the Auckland Plan
Plan Change 9 and Variation 67 (Albany) Note Albany Village is identified as a Local centre in the Auckland Plan but is not planned to be on the FSN by 2022	Operative 2008	Business 12 - Mixed Use zone Area A (Albany Village)	Residential Units, Apartment Buildings, Intensive Housing and Minor Residential Units	Yes, Studio/1 bed unit - 1 space 2 or more bed unit - 2 spaces In the Business 12 - Mixed Use zone Area B (Bute Road) and C (Clyde Road/ Beach Front Lane), the following parking is required: Studio/1 bed unit - 1 space 2 bed unit - 1.5 spaces 3 or more bed unit - 2 spaces	No	Yes, 0-80 m ² - 0.7 per unit 81-110 m ² -1.4 per unit >110 m ² - 1.7 per unit Visitor spaces for multiunit developments - 0.2 per unit	Yes, 0-80 m ² - 1 per unit 81-110 m ² -2 per unit >110 m ² - 2 per unit Visitor spaces for multiunit developments - 0.2 per unit	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules require more parking	Retain existing rules which have been calculated specifically for this land use and area. This is despite the fact that Albany Village is not identified as being on the FSN by 2022
Plan Change 19 Business 12 Mixed use Browns Bay and	Operative 2008	Albany Village	Residential	Yes, 1 space per studio/ one bed unit 2 spaces per 2 or more	No	Yes, 0-80 m ² - 0.7 per unit	Yes, 0-80 m ² - 1 per unit	Yes, the rates are very similar but the proposed Unitary Plan rates require visitor parking	Retain existing rules which have been calculated specifically for this land use and area. This is

Table 1: Plan Change Analysis

Plan Change	Status/ Date	Location	Activity	Parking Provision Rules in Plan Change		Unitary Plan Proposed Parking Provision Rules		Conflict?	Recommendation (Draft)	
				Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Yes/No and Explanation		
Albany Village Note Albany Village is classified as a Local centre in the Auckland Plan but is not planned to be on the FSN by 2022. Browns Bay is classified as a Town centre and will be on the FSN by 2016				bed residential unit		81-110 m ² -1.4 per unit >110 m ² – 1.7 per unit Visitor spaces for multiunit developments – 0.2 per unit	81-110 m ² -2 per unit >110 m ² – 2 per unit Visitor spaces for multiunit developments – 0.2 per unit	where as the existing plan change rates do not.	<i>despite the fact that Albany Village is not identified as being on the FSN by 2022</i>	
		Browns Bay	Residential	Yes, 1 space per unit, 1.5 spaces per 2 bed unit, 2 spaces for each 3 or more bedroom unit	No	No	Yes 0-80 m ² - 1 per unit 81-110 m ² -2 per unit >110 m ² – 2 per unit Visitor spaces for multiunit developments – 0.2 per unit	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules do not include a minimum parking provision rule. However overall a developer could provide a similar number of parking spaces	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency purposes as there is little difference between the two rates</i>	
Plan Change 17 (New Lynn) to the Waitakere City District Plan Note, New Lynn is identified as a Metropolitan Centre in the Auckland Plan and is located on the FSN	Approved 2007 but under appeal	New Lynn Town centre	Retail (For sites less than 1000m ² in area)	No	No	No	Yes, 1:25 m ² on the ground floor and 1:35 m ² on the above ground floors	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules include the implementation of a maximum rate but this will have minimum impact for these sites	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency purposes as there is little difference between the two rates</i>	
			non-residential activities such as offices, retail (over 1000 m ² GFA)	Yes, For ground floor activities (like a shop) fronting a main shopping street, the rate will be 1 space per 35m ² of floor area For ground floor activities fronting a street on the edges of the centre, the rate is 1 space per 25m ² of floor area.	No	No	No	Yes, 1:25 m ² on the ground floor and 1:35 m ² on the above ground floors	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rates include a maximum rate rather than a minimum rate, although the rates are similar	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency purposes as there is little difference between the two rates</i>
			Residential	No	No	No	Yes, 0-80 m ² - 1 per unit 81-110 m ² -2 per unit	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules include the implementation of a maximum rate	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency purposes</i>	

Table 1: Plan Change Analysis

Plan Change	Status/ Date	Location	Activity	Parking Provision Rules in Plan Change		Unitary Plan Proposed Parking Provision Rules		Conflict?	Recommendation (Draft)
				Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Yes/No and Explanation	
							>110 m ² – 2 per unit Visitor spaces for multiunit developments – 0.2 per unit		
Plan Change 15 (Massey North) to the Waitakere City District Plan Note, Westgate/Massey North is identified as a Metropolitan Centre in the Auckland Plan and is located on the FSN by 2016	Part operative, 2011		Non-residential Activities	No	Yes, 1:25m ² GFA at ground or mezzanine level 1:35m ² GFA above ground floor	No	Yes, 1:25m ² GFA at ground or mezzanine level 1:35m ² GFA above ground floor except Offices which is 1:30 m ²	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules are slightly less restrictive for offices on the ground floor and slightly more restrictive above ground floors	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency purposes as the rates are very similar</i>
			Residential Activities	No	Yes, one car park for dwellings with one bedroom, or two car parks for dwellings with two or more bedrooms	No	Yes, 0-80 m ² - 1 per unit 81-110 m ² -2 per unit >110 m ² – 2 per unit Visitor spaces for multiunit developments – 0.2 per unit	Yes, the existing rules are based on number of bedrooms where as the proposed Unitary Plan rules are based on GFA	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency purposes</i>
Plan Change 14 (Hobsonville) to the Waitakere City District Plan Note, Hobsonville is identified as a Local centre in the Auckland Plan and will be located on the FSN by 2022	Approved 2011, but under appeal	Hobsonville Base Special Area	Non-residential Activities	No	Yes, 1:25m ² GFA at ground or mezzanine level 1:35m ² GFA above ground floor	No	Yes, 1:25m ² GFA at ground or mezzanine level 1:35m ² GFA above ground floor except Offices which is 1:30 m ²	Yes, the proposed Unitary Plan rules are slightly less restrictive for offices on the ground floor and slightly more restrictive above ground floors	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency purposes as the rates are very similar</i>
			Residential Activities	No	Yes, one car park for dwellings with one bedroom, or two car parks for dwellings with two or more bedrooms	No	Yes, 0-80 m ² - 1 per unit 81-110 m ² -2 per unit >110 m ² – 2 per unit Visitor spaces for multiunit developments – 0.2 per unit	Yes, the existing rules are based on number of bedrooms where as the proposed Unitary Plan rules are based on GFA	<i>The proposed Unitary Plan rules should apply for consistency purposes</i>

Reference:S:\ACUP\007 Unitary Plan Parking Additional Work\TN2D121025-plan changes.docx - MAIRI