Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

'INTENSIFICATION VS URBAN SPRAWL':

THE CULTURAL PULL TOWARDS LOW DENSITY SUBURBAN LIVING

A dissertation
submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Resource and Environmental Planning
at
Massey University, Albany, New Zealand.

Kylie Rochelle Hitchcock

November 2001

ABSTRACT

With the population of the Auckland region expected to reach 2 million people within the next 50 years, the physical form of the city is topical. The Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) and various other planning documents for the region apply New Urbanist principles of urban design, including compact development, and alternative transports. The focus of the current research looks generally at peoples preferred growth patterns.

From the research conducted the following major themes emerged:

- Renters and/or younger respondents favoured peripheral growth over compact;
- Home Owners and/or older respondents favoured compact growth over continued peripheral growth; although compact development was only slightly preferred over peripheral and both options combined;
- Planners strongly preferred compact development, yet none of those questioned chose this
 option for themselves; and,
- Space, privacy, social issues, rural and natural values and proper provision of infrastructure were strong themes of discussion from all the respondent groups.

The findings also illustrated a lack of appreciation from the general public of the benefits of medium density housing. Education and experience could enhance this understanding and reduce opposition to intensive developments in existing neighbourhoods. Finding a common link between 'consolidationists' and 'expansionists' is vital to the success of the RGS.

Many of the concepts raised in support of compact development, including adequate provision of infrastructure, protection of rural and natural values and improved transport are likely to be positive outcomes of successful implementation of the RGS. The physical size of the city is important with regard to these three issues, as well as socially. Social issues were used to justify continued peripheral development by the respondents choosing this option, however a compact

city can equally produce positive social benefits. For example 'walkability' positively impacts on public health and good urban design can encourage social interaction. Physical size relates directly to these notions which are promoted through more intensive urban form. The interrelationship between reasons for and against compact development should be more closely examined in the public realm.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are a number of people I would like to thank for helping me complete this dissertation.

I would like to thank my supervisor Mark Bellingham for support and advice, and to Peter Vari and Rob Bates for the same. Thank you to Justine, Jenny, Kath and Mum & Dad for your valuable editing. And of course thank you to all the participants!

Thank you to my family, who never failed to support me, even in times when they themselves needed the support. And, thank you to Bridget, Sarah, Jordana and Sonia for continued support and friendship.

And a special thanks to Andrew for putting up with me!

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	II
LIST OF FIGURES	V
LIST OF TABLES	VII
LIST OF BOXES	VIII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	IX
GLOSSARY	X
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	
1.1.1 Justifying the Research	3
1.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIVES	4
1.2.1 Research Questions	
1.2.2 Research Objectives	
1.2.3 Addressing the Research Questions	
1.3 PLACING THE RESEARCH	
1.4 DISSERTATION OUTLINE	
CHAPTER TWO: THE PRIVATE MARKET, PUBLIC POLICY AND URBAN FORM.	
2.0 Introduction	7
2.1 THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION AND THE SEARCH FOR UTOPIA	
2.2 THE PROBLEM OF UNCONTROLLED SUBURBAN GROWTH	
2.3 TRADITIONS OF HOME OWNERSHIP	
2.4 POLITICAL & ECONOMIC STRUCTURES CONTRIBUTING TO LOW DENSITY GROWTH	
2.5 THE INFLUENCE OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR ON ACCOMMODATION CHOICES	
2.7 ARGUMENTS FOR PERIPHERAL GROWTH	
2.8 THE INFLUENCE OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991	18
CHAPTER THREE: CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES TO URBAN DESIGN	
3.0 Introduction	
3.1 SOCIAL IMPACTS & URBAN DESIGN	21
3.2 What Do Suburban Residents Want?	25
3.3 TRADEOFFS AND AFFORDABILITY	29
3.4 PUBLIC VS PRIVATE GOOD	

CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY
4.0 Introduction 33 4.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT AND HYPOTHESIS 33 4.2 PHASE ONE 34 4.3 PHASE TWO 35 4.4 LIMITATIONS 36 4.4.1 Phase One Limitations 36 4.4.2 Phase Two Limitations 37 4.4.3 Alternative Methods of Data Collection 37
CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS
5.0 INTRODUCTION 39 5.1 PHASE ONE 39 5.1.1 Part One 40 5.1.2 Part Two 43 5.2 PHASE TWO 45 5.2.1 Intensive Housing Development 46 5.2.2 General Accommodation Choices 48 5.2.3 Initial Reasons for Purchasing 49 5.2.4 Current Situation 49 5.2.5 Neighbourhood Qualities 52 5.3 SUMMARY 57
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION
6.0 Introduction
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUDING STATEMENT
BIBLIOGRAPHYI
APPENDIX A: PHASE ONE QUESTIONNAIREVIIVIII
APPENDIX B: PHASE TWO QUESTIONNAIRE IX
APPENDIX C: QUALITATIVE ANSWERS TO PHASE ONE; RODNEY RESPONDENTS XXII
APPENDIX D. QUALITATIVE ANSWERS TO PHASE ONE. NORTH SHORE RESPONDENTS XXIII

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER THREE: CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES TO URBAN DESIGN

FIGURES 3.1 & 3.2	PLANTING AND FENCING SEPARATE THE HOUSE FROM THE STREET.
FIGURE 3.3	SMALLER SITES COMBINED WITH FRONT YARD SETBACKS ENCOURAGE FENCING.
FIGURE 3.4	MARKETING CAMPAIGNS EXPLOIT RECENT BACKLASH AGAINST MEDIUM DENSITY
	HOUSING.
FIGURES 3.4 & 3.5	FENCING IS SO COMMONPLACE IT IS OFTEN THE FIRST THING BUILT.
FIGURES 3.7 & 3.8	CONTEMPORARY HOUSE DESIGN EMPHASISES PRIVACY.
FIGURES 3.9 & 3.10	GARAGES OFTEN DOMINATE, PARTICULARLY IN NEWER AREAS.
FIGURES 3.11 & 3.12	REPETITIOUS TERRACE HOUSING DOES LITTLE TO PROMOTE HIGHER DENSITIES.

CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS

FIGURE 5.1	TOTAL 'RODNEY' PHASE ONE: PERIPHERAL VS COMPACT GROWTH
FIGURE 5.2	TOTAL 'NORTH SHORE' PHASE ONE: PERIPHERAL VS COMPACT GROWTH
FIGURE 5.3	TOTAL 'COLLEGE OF EDUCATION' PHASE ONE: PERIPHERAL VS COMPACT
	Growth
FIGURE 5.4	TOTAL 'PLANNERS' PHASE ONE: PERIPHERAL VS COMPACT GROWTH
FIGURE 5.5	HOME OWNERS COMBINED 'NORTH SHORE' & 'RODNEY' SAMPLES PHASE ONE:
	PERIPHERAL VS COMPACT GROWTH
FIGURE 5.6	RENTERS COMBINED 'NORTH SHORE' & 'RODNEY' SAMPLES PHASE ONE:
	PERIPHERAL VS COMPACT GROWTH
FIGURE 5.7	HOME OWNERS 'COLLEGE OF EDUCATION' PHASE ONE: PERIPHERAL VS
	COMPACT GROWTH
FIGURE 5.8	RENTERS 'COLLEGE OF EDUCATION' PHASE ONE: PERIPHERAL VS COMPACT
	Growth
FIGURE 5.9	HOME OWNERS 'RODNEY' PHASE ONE: PERIPHERAL VS COMPACT GROWTH
FIGURE 5.10	HOME OWNERS 'NORTH SHORE' PHASE ONE: PERIPHERAL VS COMPACT
	Growth
FIGURE 5.11	PHASE ONE: GENERAL CONCEPTS GIVEN IN SUPPORT OF PERIPHERAL
	DEVELOPMENT

FIGURE 5.12	PHASE ONE: GENERAL CONCEPTS GIVEN IN SUPPORT OF COMPACT
	DEVELOPMENT
FIGURE 5.13	PHASE Two: 'IMPORTANT QUALITIES IN A SUBURB' (QUESTION 34)
FIGURE 5.14	PHASE Two: 'AMENITIES PROVIDED IN NEIGHBOURHOODS' (QUESTION 35)

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY

TABLE 4.1 SAMPLING METHOD/S & NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS FOR EACH AREA.

CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS

TABLE 5.1 RESPONDENTS SELECTED FOR FURTHER QUESTIONING

TABLE 5.2 PHASE TWO: QUALITIES VS AMENITIES PROVIDED

LIST OF BOXES

CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS

Box 5.1:	SAMPLE OF RESPONSES FROM PHASE ONE
Box 5.2:	Answers to Question 8 "What are your views on intensive housing"
Box 5.3:	Answers to Question 10 "Would you choose intensive housing for
	YOURSELF? WHY/WHY NOT?"
Box 5.4:	Answers to Question 9 "What effect do you think intensive housing
	WILL HAVE ON YOUR PROPERTY, SHOULD IT GO AHEAD IN YOUR
	NEIGHBOURHOOD?"
Box 5.5:	Answers to Question 11 "What would attract you to live in high
	DENSITY ACCOMMODATION?"
Box 5.6:	Answers to Question 13 "What do you look for in the area you choose
	TO LIVE?"
Box 5.7:	Answers to Question 14 "Why did you move to your current area?"
Box 5.8:	Answers to Questions 22 "What do you like about your current
	HOME?" AND 19 "WHAT INITIALLY ATTRACTED YOU TO YOUR HOME?".
Box 5.9:	Answers to Question 23 "What don't you like?"
Box 5.10:	Answers to Question 21: "What other aspects were considered at that
	TIME?"
Box 5.11:	Answers to Question 26 "If you could change/add/remove anything
	ABOUT YOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD TO IMPROVE IT - WHAT WOULD IT BE?"
Box 5.12:	Answers to Question 37(II) "Why/Why Not? (Would you live in a high
	DENSITY AREA IF IT OFFERED THE QUALITIES YOU HAVE IDENTIFIED AS BEING
	IMPORTANT)".

CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION

BOX 6.1 PHASE ONE REASONS RELATING TO 'SPACE'.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ACC AUCKLAND CITY COUNCIL

ARC AUCKLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL

MFE MINISTRY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

NSCC NORTH SHORE CITY COUNCIL

NIMBY 'NOT IN MY BACKYARD'

PCE PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

RDC RODNEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

RGF REGIONAL GROWTH FORUM

RGS REGIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY

RMA RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

TLA TERRITORIAL LOCAL AUTHORITY

WCC WAITAKERE CITY COUNCIL

GLOSSARY

Climate Change

Refers to a suspected phenomenon of increasing global

temperatures brought by human activity.

High Density

A compact form of urban development such as apartment

blocks and high rise buildings.

Low Density

A pattern of suburban development where dwellings are

'standalone' on a site of more than approximately 300sqm, such as the standard pattern of development for suburban

Auckland.

Medium Density

A form of development more intensive than the standard

for suburban New Zealand, characterised by site sizes of

approximately 150-300m²; including terrace and integrated

housing.

Please Note: Often the terms high and medium density are

used synonymously. While the term 'high density' is used in

the questionnaire is refers to what would be known

academically as medium density.

Sustainable Management

See Part II of the Resource Management Act 1991.