Look - WE DON'T NEED THIS PLAN CHANGE.

The legislation that has *FORCED* this plan change on Auckland Council (which should itself be subject to judicial

review - given that's it's origins remain a complete mystery) - was, as I understand it - cobbled together by - surprise, surprise -

Nicola Willis, and Megan Woods ONLY - and rammed through by bi-partisan agreement in the dead of night.

Auckland Council didn't want it - Auckland Council planners certainly didn't want it - and the people of Auckland don't want it.

... So why is it happening?

Nicola Willis no doubt wants it to deflect attention away from from the real elephant in the room when it comes

to housing in New Zealand: the effects on the market of the now huge number of speculators, investors and landlords etc.

(of which she is one) who have converted the very notion of houses as homes for people to live in - into assets to be bought, sold and traded.

A small country like New Zealand simply can't sustain the level of speculative investment that's become so much a

part of the real estate market here.

... Result: Because investors are constantly trying to push prices up to the maximum the economy can withstand - housing

has for all intents and purposes become unaffordable - particularly in the better areas of Auckland.

That's a disgrace - you know?

... What can be done about these greedy investors?

... Nobody knows.

... So why would Megan Woods support such a draconian move? Because no Labour Government wants to be sitting (helplessly) on top of such an outrageously inflated property market.

New Zealand's real estate market is known to be a basket case - as has been repeatedly noted by the OECD.

The Reserve Bank has time and again warned that the levels of speculative investment here are bad for the economy -

and what's worse - bad for the social fabric of New Zealand.

What difference has that made to property investors?

... Absolutely none at all.

Auckland Council should have done what Christchurch did - and simply refused to accept, or act upon the Housing Intensification Legislation.

Auckland had already factored in huge growth in residential housing in Auckland in it's Unitary Plan ... an amazingly democratic

document, in that it was based on feedback and suggestions from the people of Auckland - and - had been thoroughly considered

and assessed by Auckland Council planners.

Neither of these crucial steps were part of this (dangerously undemocratic) Housing Intensification Legislation.

What's good about current conditions - is that they allow for a pause and reconsideration of this (ridiculous) Plan Change 78.

... The market has softened because of the effects of Covid, and because of the war in Ukraine - which has of course softened the world economy.

 \dots In addition - the floods / global warming have shown up weaknesses in planning and infrastructure (which should have been obvious all along -

given the amount of cheap-jack housing that's been consented in New Zealand).

Again - we should simply say 'No' to this plan change - and the legislation underwriting itand return to the drawing board once again to try to devise some way forward.

... That way should involve a thorough examination of the rationale behind the Housing Intensification legislation (e.g. via judicial review, if necessary) - a thorough examination of the effects and consequences of property speculation on the New Zealand real estate market - and of course - commitments to more state / public housing.

Any future housing initiatives must meet the same (*MINIMAL*) standards that have always been applied - and perhaps involve modest IMPROVEMENTS to Auckland's Unitary Plan.

All future housing initiatives must be climate resilient. (That should change the very foundations - the very premises - of all future planning, of course) ...

(If there are any guidelines in the Housing Intensification Act that can be of use in such an exercise - fine).

Best regards,

Andrew Joughin.