

From: Pilkington, Robyn on behalf of ACEsubmissions
Sent: Friday, 29 May 2009 14:38
To: Tapsell, Susanne
Subject: FW: Resource consent submission - St Lukes Mall, St Lukes Road

Submission No. **347**

Cheers

-----Original Message-----

From: onlinesubmissions@aucklandcity.govt.nz [mailto:onlinesubmissions@aucklandcity.govt.nz]
Sent: Friday, 29 May 2009 13:29
To: ACEsubmissions
Cc: christopherdempsey@paradise.net.nz
Subject: Resource consent submission - St Lukes Mall, St Lukes Road

Full name: Christopher Dempsey
Organisation: Eden Albert Community Board
Agent:
Address for correspondence: c/- Auckland City Council, Private Bag, Auckland Application number:
Business phone: 021 29 74 078
Home phone:
Email: christopherdempsey@paradise.net.nz

I wish to make a submission on the application of (name of applicant) : Westfield NZ Ltd

At (site address): St Lukes Mall, St Lukes Road

I/we oppose these particular parts of the above application: Traffic, Environment, Development controls, Zoning

The reasons for my/our submission are:
Submission to Private Plan Change application by Westfield NZ Ltd for St Lukes Mall.

General

1. The Board notes that Westfield owns land to the south of the subject site, which is zoned business use.
2. We hold concerns about the appropriateness of rezoning existing residential land to the north of the subject site for business use, when existing business land is available for redevelopment by the applicant.

Traffic

3. The Board sees merit in the general principle of connectivity. This principle notably forms one of the seven 'C' principles in the Urban Design Protocol, to which Council is a signatory, as are large organisations such as Westfield.
4. Connectivity recognises that connections between places, things, and activities underpin a successful flourishing urban life. It provides choice to people who live and work in an area as to how they would like to move around an area. It provides permeability to urban areas, making areas safer as people can easily find their way around an area.
5. However, connectivity is just that, a principle. Principles are not meant to be applied lavishly, and to all cases. They are designed to be applied if the attributes embodied in the principle bring benefit after it is applied to a particular case.
6. In this instance, there are few benefits after application of the principle by creating a through road from Morningside Drive to Aroha Ave. The through road sought in the proposed private plan change would only benefit the applicant (as most of the traffic in the area is generated by the activities of the applicant, rather than from residents).
5. We oppose the application on the grounds that the through road is not an appropriate application of the urban design principle of connectivity.
6. The Board also notes that Westfield St Lukes is viewed by the applicant as a regional facility; that is, it serves a regional catchment, from Waitakere through to North Shore, and down south to Manukau.

7. Regional facilities attract regional traffic. The Board holds concerns about the adverse impact of this upon the local neighbourhood, and on already congested district arterial roads such as Balmoral Road, and St Lukes Road.

Form

8. The applicant seeks a 40m height envelope. The applicant also claims to want to create a town centre.

9. The Board notes from observation that all town centres on the isthmus have two things in common; a height restriction of 12.5m to 15m, and general low rise buildings of up to three stories. Town centres in the isthmus are low in height. The applicant proposes a height limit nearly double the 12.5m height. This is not a town centre. It is something else different.

10. Accordingly the effects of this proposal need to be considered on the basis of not a town centre, but a mega-mall. We consider that the effects of a mega-mall on the surrounding neighbourhood in terms of height will be severe and cumulatively negative.

11. Associated with height is bulk. The Board holds concerns regarding the bulk of the built form; adverse effects arise from a discrepancy between general bulk and location forms of a residential neighbourhood and a monolithic bulk and location form of a mega-mall.

12. Additional effects could be shading of properties, visual privacy impacts, and light spill (where high buildings spill light onto surrounding areas).

13. The Board hold concerns that a blanket 40m height limit over the entire site restricts the ability of concerned neighbours to have any say in development within that envelope.

Environment

14. The Board has for some time supported local community groups in their efforts to clean up Meola Creek, a regionally significant creek, located to the south of the subject site.

15. We hold concerns at the possible adverse effects on Meoloa Creek arising from any development permitted under the plan change.

16. Waste water capacity in the vicinity of the subject site is limited, and has reached capacity.

17. Development under the private plan change will cause adverse effects on Meola Creek as it becomes the recipient of any wet & dry weather wastewater overflows from the Watercare interceptors at Haverstock Road and Locarno Ave.

18. The Board also holds concerns at the adverse effects from increased traffic in the area, arising from increased traffic flow to the mall from across the region. Increased traffic will mean increased air pollution, as congested traffic will sit, idling, while waiting to move into the mall carpark.

Economic

19. The Board is very concerned about the potential economic impact on other town centres within the surrounding area. These town centres are crucial to the ward, and the economic, heritage and cultural lives of the residents in the ward. We believe that the impacts on these town centres needs to be analysed in depth, and any adverse impact taken into account under the environment effects, which include economic - both positive and negative

The Board wishes to be heard.

Christopher Dempsey
Chair, Eden Albert Community Board
C/- Auckland City Council
Private Bag
Auckland

The decision I wish the Council to make is: Decline the application.

I/we wish to be heard at the council planning hearing: Yes

If others make a similar submission I/we will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing: No

I Would like to be emailed a copy of my submission: Yes

This page was generated from <http://www.aucklandcity.govt.nz/council/services/resourceconsents/submissions.asp>
on Friday, 29 May 2009 at 13:29

