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Abstract

This is a report on change and development issues facing Glen Eden. The Waitakere Ranges Local Board commissioned staff of the Social Practice Department of Unitec to carry out a two-stage report. The first stage was a literature search looking at material specific to Glen Eden as well as more theoretical information about development and growth. This second and final stage includes interviews carried out with key stakeholders in Glen Eden.

This report makes a number of suggestions to the Waitakere Ranges Local Board relating to redevelopment of the Glen Eden town centre, design and urban policies concerning future intensification of Glen Eden, and greater emphasis on strategies to deal with such matters as safety, cycleways and pedestrian amenity.

In making recommendations about growth and change there is an ever-present challenge: to ensure that all citizens, young old, new or long-term, Māori, Pākehā and people of many cultural backgrounds, feel they are not ignored but are included in the cultural and political life of Glen Eden and its surrounding areas.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parrs Park East</th>
<th>Parrs Park West</th>
<th>Tangatū</th>
<th>Woodglen</th>
<th>Glen Eden East</th>
<th>Kaurilands – Massey</th>
<th>Whau</th>
<th>Waitakere Ranges</th>
<th>Auckland Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation Index</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household median Income</td>
<td>$58,800</td>
<td>$66,900</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$67,400</td>
<td>$58,500</td>
<td>$88,500</td>
<td>$66,900</td>
<td>$63,900</td>
<td>$79,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>2139</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>3138</td>
<td>4569</td>
<td>7008</td>
<td>3162</td>
<td>107,685</td>
<td>72,594</td>
<td>48,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated numbers born in New Zealand</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2919</td>
<td>3981</td>
<td>2241</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>31,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated numbers born overseas</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>2355</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>13,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated Ethnicity %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori %</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European %</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasifika %</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian %</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern/ Latin American/ African %</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other %</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of households</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>2511</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>16,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household &amp; Employment %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of private rentals</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>4,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of HNZ rentals</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership %</td>
<td>43.9 %</td>
<td>41.5 %</td>
<td>58.4 %</td>
<td>55.00 %</td>
<td>49.9 %</td>
<td>60.3 %</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>59.9 %</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median weekly rent 2013</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$310</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>73.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate %</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Stats NZ, 2017
Glen Eden – brief snapshots of where we are now

Glen Eden has demographics that differ significantly from the rest of the Waitakere Ranges Local Board areas. It is not as European and incomes are lower. Like the rest of Auckland, it is an expensive place to live. The average sale price for a house (three bedroom) in Glen Eden December 2017 was $714,180. The average weekly rental was $479. These figures have changed since the same date the previous year, with average Glen Eden sale prices in December 2016 being $710,901 and rentals $454 per week. In 2015 The average sale price for a house (three bedroom) in Glen Eden December was $648,401. The average weekly rental was $430 (Barfoot & Thompson, 2015, 2016, 2017). It goes without saying that average incomes have not risen to the same extent as house prices over the past few years.

Moving west to east across the five Census Area Units (CAUs) included in this study, the trend is for the most western CAUs to have the highest deprivation indexes and the largest numbers of Māori, Pasifika, Asian and MELAA peoples. These are also areas where more people are reliant on renting and fewer people own their own homes.

Between 32% and 37% of people in Glen Eden identify as born outside New Zealand compared to an Auckland average of 39.1%.

Kaurilands CAU is an anomaly in having such a large percentage of Europeans, a deprivation rate of only 3 and household incomes higher than average for the overall local board area. While much of the Kaurilands CAU does not fall within Glen Eden’s footprint as a suburb it is intimately connected with Glen Eden, thought of as part of Glen Eden by some long-term locals and provides a useful contrast to the other CAUs.

The decile ratings for Glen Eden schools in Table 2 show a wide range, from decile 8 down to decile 2 for the most deprived.

The following map shows Housing New Zealand units. The largest clusters are in the Parrs Park CAU.
Broader background – Auckland growth

Glen Eden is strategically located between two larger metropolitan centres, New Lynn and Henderson, in West Auckland. It has good access to public transport by bus and rail. It is an area planned for urban development including population growth, urban growth and intensification. A key issue relates to the provision of urban amenity to keep up with population growth. The Auckland Region is undergoing a population rise of considerable proportions as noted by Stats NZ:

The Auckland region is projected to account for three-fifths of New Zealand’s population growth between 2013 and 2043, with an increase of 740,000 from just under 1.5 million to 2.2 million (medium projection). Auckland’s population is estimated to have surpassed 1.5 million in the year ended June 2014, and is projected to reach 2 million by 2033. In 2028, Auckland would be home to 37 percent of New Zealand’s population, compared with 34 percent in 2013. By 2043, the population of Auckland could make up 40 percent of New Zealand’s population. (2015, p. 5)

Crothers (2015) notes that a major proportion of growth is due to migration, and the government has a high migration policy. Crothers says:

Net migration does make a significant contribution to Auckland’s population growth. New immigrants and New Zealanders returning from overseas add directly to Auckland’s population. The medium projection assumes average net migration of 16,000 a year during 2014–18, and
8,000 a year thereafter. As most of these migrants are aged 15–39 years, they may also contribute births to Auckland’s population growth. (p. 22)

At the same time, it is noted in the Auckland Council report, *Auckland Profile* (2013), that the population of Auckland is ageing. Hence, we can forecast for the foreseeable future increased population growth, continued ethnic diversity and a steady ageing of the population.

Auckland’s urban areas are experiencing pressures such as rapid urban growth and intensification. These issues are all interconnected with gentrification, the provision of adequate urban amenity and affordable housing. What follows will attempt to unravel these issues and try to show a way forward.

### Existing plans for Glen Eden

Some existing documents will have important consequences for Glen Eden:

1. *The Auckland Unitary Plan.* This formally approved plan for the region includes opportunities for greater intensification of an area surrounding and within the Glen Eden town centre. This plan includes provision for medium-density townhouses and apartments. When completed, this increased level of intensification will result in more people living and working in the central area of Glen Eden.

2. Glen Eden town centre plans. Two documents have been prepared:

The plans have key suggestions for revitalising the town centre:

1. Upgrade the intersection of Oates and Glendale Roads.
2. Improved general and interpretive signs.
3. Glenmall Place streetscape upgrade including Market Square (lighting, footpaths, street trees and area for market and events).
4. West Coast Road streetscape upgrade.
5. Arts and sculpture strategy.
7. Glenmall Plaza: seating, shade and play area.
8. Promotion and marketing strategy/budget.
These concepts should become part of a strategy for the town centre along with budgets and timelines. Additional ideas from key stakeholders for the town centre upgrade are included on page 37 and pages 41 to 45 of this report.

**Urban development**

The policy shift towards greater urban intensification has been influenced by research carried out by Newman and Kenworthy (1989). They demonstrated the link between low urban density and high fuel use. They showed a positive link between reduced car dependence as a result of greater urban intensification and sustainability, including health benefits.

Allen (2015) points out that, “Auckland…has enacted an urban growth management strategy premised on the concepts: ‘liveability’ and a ‘quality compact city’” (p. 86). She goes on to argue that, “…a key element in the transition to more urbanised environments is related to the extent to which urban amenities have a role in resident perceptions of quality of urban life” (p. 87). Urban amenities include public transport, schools, professional services (doctors, dentists), council amenities like parks, recreational facilities and libraries, and private sector amenities such as retailing, cafés and other services. This has become especially important for the increasing numbers of ‘work-at-homers’ who may deal with feelings of isolation by accessing local amenities such as cafés, print centre and local gyms.

These points are well made. It is important to reflect on the serious mistakes that were made during the rapid regional growth in the 1960s and 1970s, when isolated suburbs were created in South and West Auckland. These suburbs were established without important infrastructure and services, and resulted in major social problems such as social isolation, mental-health issues and the lack of any social, transport, professional, retail or recreational opportunities and services. (See reports: Social Services in West Auckland [1976] and Social Planning for New Communities [1975]).

Allen carried out a study that involved 57 interviewees from the Auckland communities of Takapuna, Te Atatu Peninsula, Kingsland and Botany Downs. Around 80% of respondents mentioned that proximity to urban amenity was a factor in making their housing choice. Most were happy with low-to-medium-density housing. She concludes that, “…the majority of those interviewed would trade-off standalone living for low-rise apartments or terraced house living…if urban amenities were integrated into their neighbourhoods in line with the increasing number of residents” (p. 97).

This position is supported by a 2015 study carried out by the Auckland Council (The Housing We’d Choose). “A key finding from this research is that Aucklanders desire a greater volume and choice of accommodation options. A significant proportion of respondents chose more intensive forms of housing, and they were prepared to trade-off location and dwelling type ahead of dwelling size, as the price increased” (p. 49). Faced with financial constraints, 48% said they would choose something other than detached housing (Auckland Council, 2015a).
Based on available research on the issue of intensification, Syme, McGregor and Mead came to some useful conclusions:

While acknowledging that social issues are a result of a complex mix of social, economic, cultural and political factors, available research would suggest that social problems are likely to be minimised if intensive housing is:

– Well designed in terms of internal and external living spaces.
– Well located in terms of being accessible to a range of services and activities.
– Meets the needs of a diverse range of households in terms of income and demographics, that is, it is not associated with one particular group in society. (2005, p. 2)

They also point to two important benefits coming from local surveys about intensification. They conclude that intensified housing provides opportunities for affordable housing and reduced travel costs (2005). Turner (2010) would also add a further benefit: a reduction in energy use of around 20% through improved solar orientation and insulation. Terraced housing is eminently suitable for such gains through compact site planning.

Mead and McGregor, in a 2007 report to the Auckland Regional Council, pointed out that “…the intensive housing segment of the market has grown rapidly over the 10 years to 2006…” (p. 1) and represents 35% of the urban housing market within the region. They argued that, “The benefits of living in and owning intensive housing versus other housing forms needs to be defined.” They went on to point out, in much the same way that Allen argued, that, “real gains will only come from substantially upgrading the environment within selected areas” (p. 3).

However, the Auckland Council’s 2015 study showed that West Auckland, in comparison with the total regional urban areas, is lacking in housing variety. The report shows the following comparisons (p. 44):

### PRESENT HOUSING STOCK AS A PERCENTAGE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stand-alone</th>
<th>Units, including terraced housing</th>
<th>Apartments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Auckland</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional urban areas</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Auckland Unitary Plan has zoned major parts of Glen Eden for medium-density housing including terraced housing and apartments. This is likely, over time, to correct the imbalance and provide greater choice for people. A key danger is that this private housing will be unaffordable for working people. Policies requiring or encouraging developers to provide a percentage of affordable houses may mitigate this potential problem, an issue that will be discussed further in this report.
Urban design

In Mboup’s report on *Streets as Public Spaces and Drivers of Urban Prosperity* (2013) he suggests that streets should be more than just places for vehicles to move. He calls for:

…more sustainable urban development, such as promoting mixed land use, supporting more compact development and transport options beyond the automobile. Among the avenues proposed are promoting environmentally friendly public transport and designing streets in a way that pedestrians and cyclists have equal share of streets. (p. vii)

In the classic study of urban life by Jane Jacobs (1961), she supports the need for an upgraded environment and suggests that this can often be achieved by widening footpaths, which can then be used by people for a variety of uses (trees, music, art, seating, cafés), and especially by children and young people for play and meeting friends. More people on the streets means there is a greater level of informal surveillance and this leads to improved safety. She goes on to point out that we must be careful not to suppose that good housing and services are all that is needed to solve social problems. She says, “…there is no direct, simple relationship between good housing and good behavior” (p. 122).

Jane Jacobs argued that density cannot be based on abstractions but rather it should be based on specific circumstances, situations and locations. She did, however, include four conditions to generate exuberant diversity (p. 164):

1. A district should service more than one primary function. This will ensure the presence of people on the streets who have different purposes and schedules.
2. Most blocks must be short with opportunities for people to turn corners.
3. Buildings should be a mixture of age and conditions so that they vary in their economic yield.
4. There should be a sufficient density of people, especially those who live there.

In a later section to this report there is debate on child-friendly cities and age-friendly cities. Both these concepts could inform policy on urban development and design.

Affordable housing

The Auckland Unitary Plan Independent Hearings Panel reporting to Auckland Council on the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (PAUP) recommended removing any specific policy on affordable housing from the plan. It did not
consider the Resource Management Act gives council the authority to act in a redistributive manner. It states, “The Panel also notes the Plan on its own is not able to deliver affordable housing” (2016, p. 58). The role of the plan, in relation to affordable housing, is to enable housing supply and housing choice. In effect this means that the plan will focus on the zoning of land for a variety of housing types to meet the demands of the market. Unless council plans to become an active player in the supply of affordable housing, it and the local boards can only encourage the market to supply affordable housing through offering suitable incentives. With the change of government in 2017, opportunities may occur in the future for local authorities to be more involved in the provision of affordable housing such as pensioner housing, social housing in conjunction with community organisations, and private or rental affordable housing. It will be important to monitor government policy changes and act accordingly.

Glen Eden is one of the many suburbs of Auckland where, post the late 1950s, the building of new houses for young families was stimulated by demand-side approaches. Typically, these involved incentives such as cheap government loans for new houses and the option of capitalising the family benefit. Parrs Park CAU (and the astrologically named streets in particular) was a place where many young families in the mid-1970s attained the kiwi dream of home ownership by using incentives such as cheap loan options and capitalised family benefits to invest in group housing schemes undertaken by companies such as Neil Housing.

Many of the houses were relatively small compared to average house size today. They were built quickly, simply and cheaply and were seen as ideal for young, new home owners (C. Moore, personal communication, December 12, 2016). Perhaps ironically, it is just these very streets that now have high levels of private rentals. It seems those enabled by demand-side approaches to get a start on the property ladder have now moved on to better things, leaving the area a magnet for small-scale investors in rental housing.

Social housing can be broadly defined as the provision of housing by non-profit organisations, agencies or branches of local or central government, for those in social and/or economic need. Social housing (or community housing, as it is sometimes called) is also sometimes seen as a way to address the inequalities in housing that occur when housing is left solely in the hands of the market.

In New Zealand, organisations can register as Community Housing Providers and become eligible to receive the accommodation supplement when they provide rental housing for tenants that meet certain criteria. In general, organisations that become Community Housing Providers source their own funding to acquire properties rather than receive direct grants from central or local government. A welcome change is the recent announcement of $24.4 million to be allocated to Community Housing Providers in the Auckland region.

With the change of government in 2017, and with it a greater commitment towards the goal of affordable housing, there may be opportunities for local authorities and local boards to become involved in the supply of affordable housing, including housing for the elderly.
The ten largest Auckland Community Housing Providers are as follows:

- Accessible Properties Ltd
- Airedale Property Trust/Lifewise
- Auckland Community Housing Trust
- Bays Community Housing Trust
- CORT Community Housing
- Habitat for Humanity (Auckland)
- Keys Social Housing
- Monte Cecilia Housing Trust
- New Zealand Housing Foundation
- The Salvation Army
- Vision West Community Trust

(Auckland Community Housing Providers Network, 2016)

To mention just two examples:

Vision West Community Trust is involved in the proposed high-rise residential development on the site close to Glen Eden Railway station.

Bays Community Housing Trust is a good example of an Auckland initiative that seeks to both secure housing for the vulnerable in our communities and also weave the kinds of strong neighbourhood relationships that create belonging and community.

It is important to note that both of these agencies take an active role in undertaking community engagement. It is not enough to simply provide support solely for the clients of their service. To make social housing successful it is essential to bring local communities on board. There is a strong role for local boards in assisting this process.

As the 2014 research of Lisa Woolley (CEO of Vision West) makes clear providing social housing without social support is ineffective. Tenants struggling with multiple social issues need assistance to manage these and it is also critical that local communities are engaged in ways that enable support of social housing initiatives rather than feeling threatened by them. Supportive facilities and a community-development approach are critical factors in ensuring the success of social-housing ventures.

One of the key informants informally approached in developing this piece made the comment that social housing is always politically unpopular until the social issues that accompany it emerge, then it becomes popular to deal with it. If social housing is to be part of the mix that allows Glen Eden to retain its current diversity, then it will require the kind of commitment from the local board and other agencies that acknowledges successes will always be accompanied by challenges.
Employment opportunities

There are few employment opportunities in Glen Eden and its surrounding area. Out of an employed population in the WRLB area of around 32,000, only 5000 of these people work in the district. Most of these jobs are in the service sector. In addition, the number of businesses is also low, with only 5500. This deficit in the employment ratio for West Auckland has been known for many years. The consequence of this deficit is high levels of commuting by public transport or private vehicle to other parts of Auckland for work.

This is an issue for West Auckland as a whole, and coordinated action is needed to advocate to Auckland Council and Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development to promote employment in the West. In addition, it is also important to protect existing businesses such as those small-scale, light-industrial businesses along West Coast Road. They are important in providing local employment.

The WRLB could also investigate opportunities for increasing the availability of small commercial spaces for enterprises including the creative arts. The provision of such spaces is a reasonably common activity for local authorities in a number of overseas countries. Wellington City Council has a strategy of encouraging access for artists to underused commercial spaces.

Gentrification

Gentrification is deeply rooted in social dynamics and economic trends. Its signs, effects and trajectories are to a large degree determined by its local context; the physical and the social characteristics of the neighbourhoods in question, the positions and the goals of the actors, the dominant functions of the city, the nature of economic restructuring and local government policy. The study of the city should pay heed to this complexity.... In the end, the ‘why’ of gentrification is less important than the ‘how’ and the repercussions of the process. (van Weesep, 1994, p. 80)

Gentrification can be defined as the replacement or displacement of working people on low incomes from a geographic area by more-affluent people moving into the area. A typical scenario is where property values rise and those on lower incomes are unable to afford the increasing rents or to purchase a house, which is likely to be beyond their means.

Auckland saw this happen in the 1970s and 80s in areas like Ponsonby, Freemans Bay, Parnell and Grafton, when it became attractive for people to move from the suburbs into the city fringe to reduce transport costs and utilise the major facilities such as two universities, CBD services and Auckland Hospital. The purchase and refurbishment of low-cost housing (previously often rental properties) became part of this process. The 1990s saw this process linked to the neoliberal emphasis on markets and the contemporary role that property plays in wealth creation. It was during this period that
Auckland’s inner city saw “…unprecedented residential development centred on apartments and terraced/town house developments” (Murphy, 2008, p. 2522).

Clark (2005) argues that “Gentrification cannot be eradicated in capitalist societies, but it can be curtailed and the playing field can be changed such that when gentrification does take place it involves replacement rather than displacement…” (p. 28). The secret, he argues, is compromise between various stakeholders.

Levy, Comey and Padilla (2006) suggest that there are three types of strategies to reduce gentrification-related displacement:

- Affordable housing production. This requires land available at an affordable price and suitably zoned.
- Affordable housing retention. This requires current residents to remain in their houses at affordable rents. It might also give preference to existing tenants if policies are introduced to privatise state housing.
- Asset building. This involves increasing individuals’ assets so that they have increased means to enter the housing market.

They also note four lessons from studies of city gentrification that are important “…regardless of city size, housing market strength or stage of gentrification” (p. 593). These are:

1. The availability of land. This might involve land banking early for future housing developments.
2. Local government involvement to include policies to proactively support affordable housing, neighbourhood revitalisation and the provision of facilities and services.
3. Community involvement in providing advice on local plans, housing needs and housing pressure points.
4. Economic development. The promotion of the local economy, support for local businesses and buying local are some of the strategies they suggest.

Two other issues relating to Glen Eden that need to be considered are:

- Infill housing.
- The prospect of the sale and privatisation of existing state houses that are pepper-potted within the existing single-dwelling zone.

The first issue may lead to public disquiet as new forms of more intensified housing develop and the nature of the community changes. The second could lead to the displacement of state-house tenants. The large redevelopment of Glen Innes, for example, has been called a state-led gentrification process (Cole, 2015) and has resulted in strong opposition from a local community group – the Tāmaki Housing Group. Such a redevelopment is unlikely to occur in Glen Eden due to a different scale of state housing. However, any move to
privatise Glen Eden state houses will have an impact on existing state tenants. This is a particular risk for the high deprivation areas of Glen Eden such as the Parrs Park area, where Housing New Zealand currently provides 26.7% of the rental accommodation. This is the highest rate of any area in West Auckland and leaves the Parrs Park population uniquely vulnerable to swings in housing policy.

Given the pressures on the housing market due to a high immigration policy and the inadequate supply of affordable housing in Auckland, a consequence would seem to be continued gentrification. In relation to Glen Eden, this might take the form of middle-income families and individuals purchasing existing single dwellings, similar people purchasing new terraced housing units and apartments (for rent or occupation), and the displacement of state tenants if state houses in Glen Eden are sold through the open market rather than to social-housing providers.

**Perceptions of safety**

A 2017 West Auckland report on safety (Moore, Bridgman, Moore, & Grey) shows that this is a public concern. This is in contrast to the recent fall in levels of crime committed in West Auckland. Particular groups see themselves as being vulnerable, e.g. young people, women, Māori, Pasifika people and Asians. For example, the report confirms “…women feeling less confident about answering their front door, walking alone in the street after nightfall, letting their children walk without an adult to the local park, and traffic safety” (p. 30).

The report makes reference to the Stoks Limited 2014 study (commissioned by Auckland Council) on safety issues in the wider Henderson area, and notes some important observations that would make a positive contribution to perceptions of safety. These observations are applicable to other areas:

1. Community engagement processes that increase social connections at the local level.
2. Particular initiatives to link people across different cultures.
3. A wider debate within communities about providing more positive messages on the strengths of communities rather than those arising from the media and social media.
4. Initiatives that encourage public participation in the prioritisation of spending at the local level.
5. Investment in environmental initiatives that provide “…attractive, well-lit, well-resourced and accessible public/community centres, streets, parks, footpaths and cycleways, and other spaces that local people and visitors feel comfortable using” (p. 36).
The report goes on to stress the importance of community development:

It is the neighbourhood measures (saying hello to your neighbours, breaking down the cultural barriers, having community events and community BBQs, having a say in neighbourhood developments, keeping an eye out for each other and the children of the community) which do increase people’s sense of control and engagement. (p. 34)

**Urban development charter: Child-friendly and age-friendly policies**

A basic premise and a recurring theme within the literature is that child-friendly communities are sustainable communities and that one cannot be separated from the other. (Woolcock & Steele, 2008, p. 5)

Auckland Council has a strategy that promotes Auckland as a child-friendly city. The 2014 strategy (*I Am Auckland – Children and Young People’s Strategic Action Plan*) sets out seven principles:

1. I have a voice. I am valued and take part.
2. I am important. I belong. I am cared for and feel safe.
3. I am happy, healthy and thriving.
4. I have the same chances to do well and to try.
5. I can get around to be connected to people.
6. Auckland is my playground.
7. Rangatahi tu rangatira. All rangatahi will thrive.

There is an expectation within the plan that local boards, through their annual plans, will implement actions to put children and young people first (p. 14).

The Woolcock and Steele report (p. 6) suggests the following policies for ensuring a local authority is friendly towards children:

1. Increase the ability of children to make choices and independently access a diverse range of community services and activities.
2. Enhance the capacity for children to engage in play and develop competence in their local community environment.
3. Ensure the rights of children to be safe and healthy within community public places.
4. Increase the ability of children to feel secure and connected within their
physical and social environments.

5. Create spaces that offer children a sense of welcome, belonging and support.

6. Increase opportunities for children to access green, natural areas for play and relaxation.

In addition, the report noted some key concepts:

**Key Concept 1 – Agency**
“Children spoke of wanting to make choices and have some control over their own lives within age-appropriate boundaries” (p. 8).

**Key Concept 2 – Safety and feeling secure**
They “…craved safe spaces that allowed them to participate in activities” (p. 8).

**Key Concept 3 – Positive sense of self**
This involves a positive sense of being valued and respected.

- Other concepts:
- Activities for fun and competence
- Spaces for children
- Access to activities
- Child-friendly environments
- Natural places in which to explore
- A desire to exercise, keep fit and healthy

Much of the literature on child-friendly and age-friendly communities makes the perhaps unsurprising point that if the built environment works well for children and the elderly it generally works well for everybody. Communities where design encourages people to engage with each other have the sense of safety that ‘informal surveillance’ informed design creates; communities where people are able to access services and recreation space without a car; and where people have easy and safe access to nature are both good places for everybody to live and more environmentally sustainable.

The population of Auckland is steadily ageing. Auckland Council reports (2015b) that in the Waitakere Ranges Local Board area there are 4500 people aged 65 years and over, which is 9.4% of the population. The report also notes, “The proportion that had lived in their current dwelling for 30 years or longer was particularly high in the Waitakere Ranges Local Board area (38.1%)…” (p. 6).

The World Health Organisation (WHO) (2007) has published a guide for developing age-friendly cities. It includes advice on:

- Outdoor spaces and buildings
It is also worth noting that many older people do not have access to the internet. In a study by Koopman-Boyden, Cameron, Davey and Richardson (2014), they found that 39% of people aged between 65 and 74 years had no access to the internet. For people aged 75 and over, 68% did not have access to the internet. This compares to an average of 90% access to the internet for all younger age groups. There are a number of important benefits to internet access, such as social connectedness, loneliness reduction and greater independence in accessing information and contacting friends and family. Koopman-Boyden et al. state, “Non-internet use did...contribute to feelings of being stigmatised and being side-lined because of others’ assumptions about universal use of the medium” (p. vi).

The literature on child- and age-friendly cities, along with the aspirations of Auckland Council, may be very useful for the future development of Glen Eden simply because they provide sets of easily accessible and practical benchmarks against which proposed development may be measured.

The Council of Europe adopted the *European Urban Charter* (1992), which establishes principles for:

- Transport and mobility
- Environment and nature in towns
- The physical form of cities
- The urban architectural heritage
- Housing
- Urban security and crime prevention
- Disadvantaged and disabled persons in towns
- Sport and leisure in urban areas
- Culture in towns
- Multicultural integration in towns
- Health in towns
- Citizen participation, urban management and urban planning
- Economic development in cities

Based on the above and the conclusions to this report, a draft charter for Glen Eden has been produced (see Appendix).
Key stakeholder analysis

In 2017, 15 stakeholders were interviewed based on suggestions from staff of the WRLB. Those interviewed were asked a set of open-ended questions and the interviews were recorded. The recordings were transcribed, allowing the identification of key themes. These themes have been considered according to common views of the interviewees. The eight key themes are as follows:

- Intensification
- Urban design
- Transport and traffic
- Upgrade of the town centre
- Facilities and services
- Safety
- Social issues and community development

INTENSIFICATION

In general, participants were not opposed to greater intensification in and around the town centre. One person said: “I think intensification is just starting. …I deliver flyers to households and what you notice now is far more infill housing down the backs of properties than when we first came here. Absolutely doubled, but now we are starting to see the changes of like apartments arriving, which is going to change us again.”

Most participants (12) did express concerns about the implications of intensification. One commented, “I want to see some plans that people have well thought out the social impact of those on the people that are going to be living there….”

The issues around intensification are summed up below:

1. That social and physical infrastructure should keep up with any population growth. This would include such facilities as local green space, community facilities, schools, as well as well-designed public spaces.

2. Almost all suggested that good urban design should be a key requirement of any intensification of the area. Some wanted more public input into such matters. Mention was made about using the Auckland Council design guidelines and the Auckland Urban Design Panel to ensure that the proposed buildings met modern standards.

3. There was concern expressed by many (14) about the proposed ten-storey apartment blocks alongside the rail station. In particular, there was concern expressed about the number of one-bedroomed apartments in the design. In reality this means there will be few children within the blocks. Some suggested that the WRLB should negotiate with the developer to seek changes to a mixed form of development with one and two bedrooms.
URBAN DESIGN
There was support for improved urban design and mention again was made to utilise the design guidelines mentioned above. Two areas were of concern: the town centre and the proposed ten-storey apartment blocks alongside the rail station. The issue of the town centre is covered in the next sub-heading. One comment about the ten-storey buildings is noted below:

“The location of the ten-storey building is already congested. We are already having huge amounts of floods because our infrastructure can’t cope and now we are going to have ten-storey apartments using the same infrastructure.”

The increase in density due to infill housing in the suburban areas of Glen Eden was also seen as a positive. One commented that, “The suburban areas are not as run-down as they were and I think that is something to do with gentrification and it seems to have a bit of a ripple effect.”

GLEN EDEN TOWN CENTRE
The need for an upgrade of the town centre was a subject raised by all participants. They were concerned about access, design, safety and facilities with the town centre and the need for a complete upgrade. A number of comments highlight concerns:

“I think the WINZ office, the liquor store and the TAB should move away from the town centre because from the WINZ office you get a lot of people that come out of the meetings quite annoyed and the liquor store is bang across from it. And the TAB is adjacent to the liquor store. So you have a triangle of negativity that tends to carry through the day and night.”

“You know how some communities have a very obvious central focus point like, for example, New Lynn.”

“I would love us to have like LynnMall or West City with our own movie theatre, that would be a dream.”

“I say most women like me would not be shopping here for clothing. We don’t have furniture shops. We used to have shoe shops.”

“I think the shopping centre is an abomination.”

“I think you can tell a bit about a community by the number of two-dollar shops and bakeries, and they are all down there.”

Participants (5) noted the difficulty for pedestrians, e.g. parents with pushchairs, and older people. Also noted was the lack of children’s play area and equipment. A number (9) have noted safety concerns, especially at night-time. Safety issues are dealt with in more detail in the next sub-section. A number of female participants (8) said they would not go to the town centre at night. Some commented on aggressive beggars and rough sleepers affecting
the image of the area. In summary, they wanted to see the town centre upgraded in the following ways:

1. Greater levels of pedestrianisation
2. Restrictions on angle parking
3. Provision of children’s play area and equipment
4. Provision of quiet seating facilities with green spaces
5. Separate parking area
6. Improved lighting

A number of participants said they wanted the WRLB to plan for some sort of social centre in or near the town centre that might cater for young people as a drop-in centre, and a place where older people might meet. Also mentioned by some was the concept of space for a regular farmers’ market.

Some (5) recognised that there is an issue of trying to cater for car parking as well as the provision of public space. One said, “Parking is very tight. There is angle parking both sides and with the big SUVs you’ve got today, if you get through Glen Eden safely you are doing well, you are doing very well.”

Another commented that the town-centre plan provides guidance on this. Mention was made of previous plans to revitalise the town centre. One commented, “When we were still under Waitakere City Council, there was a project to revitalise Glen Eden town centre and they had some good ideas.”

SAFETY
Safety was mentioned by many of the participants (12). The following concerns were raised:

1. Safety issues in the town centre at night, which has been dealt with above.
2. Traffic safety. It was suggested there needs to be a careful evaluation of traffic safety along key points and corridors in the Glen Eden roading system. Of particular concern for those who cycle is the lack of cycleway facilities. One commented, “It is absolutely not safe for cyclists. There is no biking path around Glen Eden. It starts to get safer from Sunnyvale then it goes into Henderson and it is a lot safer.”
3. Safety of patrons using the train service. Two argued that there are too many bad incidents on the Western Line. One said, “But it is not unusual and you do hear about situations all the time where the trains are not safe.”
4. There is a perception of safety concerns by people using the rail Park and Ride area, especially at night-time. They have suggested better lighting. The following is from a regular user: “The Park and Ride area is safe in the daytime. The moment darkness starts to prevail, it gets a
little bit scary walking alone to your car.”

5. Many expressed concern at the rail, road and pedestrian crossing by the rail station. It was suggested this would worsen due to increased population, increased car use and the site of the proposed ten-storey apartment blocks. They suggested a complete safety audit of this crossing. One comment sums up the feeling: “The two ten-storey buildings that are going here, apparently the effects on this intersection are going to be less than minor but the intersection is a nightmare now without this building.”

6. Practically all stakeholders (11) mentioned the need for a greater police presence in Glen Eden. Comment was made that the community constable only spends six hours per week in Glen Eden. However, one participant observed a good feeling of safety in Glen Eden’s suburban areas. He noted that children can walk around the suburb safely. He said, “The good thing about where I live is that I have seen children as young as five and seven, walking alone to the dairy.”

FACILITIES AND SERVICES
Participants were generally appreciative of the many facilities and services in Glen Eden. Many mentioned the excellent library service and Parrs Park. Some comments were as follows:

“Parrs Park does have a pool. It has the walk, perimeter almost 2k, which is beautiful. Many people love it. It’s got a kiddies’ playground, it’s got the playground where you can play cricket, football or rugby.”

“Parrs Park is beautiful. They have done a really nice children’s area. I take my grandchildren there and there’s always people playing sports on those fields.”

“I love what they have done with Parrs Park, love the slide and our kids talk about it.”

“The library created a focal point and uplifted the feeling of the area.”

“I would say that they are predominantly Māori and Pacific Island people using the library computers.”

There were also useful suggestions from participants for improved facilities:

– Greater use and publicity for the public use of Waikumete Cemetery. One said, “I would like to see the public using Waikumete Cemetery as a park because you have got flora and fauna there. Beautiful wildflowers, wild orchids and little bats.”


– The provision of public facilities and open space within the town centre. This has been dealt with in the subsection on the Glen Eden town centre.
SOCIAL ISSUES
Participants raised a number of social concerns including:

- Homelessness. Participants tended to take a non-judgemental position and noted that these people are in need of assistance. One said that facilities are needed for the homeless with “hot showers, that can have lockers, access to healthcare, then homelessness doesn’t need to be something that sits in one area and just gets moved on....”

- Aggressive begging. A number (five) noted the increase in people begging. In particular, they disliked any aggressive begging. One said, “Beggars are often aggressive.”

- Multicultural Glen Eden. Participants welcomed the new multi-culturalism of the area. A number (six) suggested that multi-culturalism could be celebrated by holding cultural events, including food festivals.

- Inequality. A number (eight) recognised the problem of inequality. One said, “There is a bigger gap between the haves and have-nots, so there is more poverty within families. There are more families in crisis.”

- Community development. A number (six) mentioned the need for the WRLB to support the community, through general support and funding. Examples of how the WRLB could foster community development are included in the conclusions and recommendations. When asked if people of Glen Eden mixed socially, the answer was often in the negative. One summed up the views: “The people tend to be very wary of each other.”

- Public participation and engagement. Comments relating to this were as follows: “Engagement is what you need. You need a community...It worries me seeing older people sitting in their homes lonely.”

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT
Issues tended to focus on parking, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists (also mentioned in subsection [d] on the topic of safety). One said, “I don’t think traffic is a problem in Glen Eden in the way that it is in New Lynn, which is a nightmare.” In relation to cycling and the needs of pedestrians, another said, “I would like to see our cycleways and the pedestrian routes strengthened and connected to the town centre better.” A further comment was: “It is difficult to get around Glen Eden if you are a pedestrian.”
Conclusions

These conclusions are based on research (literature search, and interviews with key stakeholders) and have the aims of mitigating negative consequences of change and development with a backdrop of social justice, community engagement and sustainability of our natural and physical environment.

URBAN DESIGN
The local board should champion good urban design in all new significant development. In particular, urban intensification in and around the Glen Eden town centre should be subject to careful urban-design scrutiny. This report advocates use of the Auckland Council design guidelines as well as principles within the child- and age-friendly city concepts.

GLEN EDEN TOWN CENTRE
Redesign of the town centre should be on the local board’s agenda as a matter of priority.

STRENGTHENING ALLIANCES
Social-housing providers need the support of local authorities. Support can involve direct funding, but just as usefully it could involve working collaboratively from a shared vision for Glen Eden. There are opportunities for powerful synergies if the capacity of the local board to engage with local communities is added to the targeted work of social-housing providers.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
This could be conceived of as operating in two distinct stages.

First: a broad consultation with the community with the aim of developing a charter (see Appendix) for how change should proceed in Glen Eden. Possibly this could be expanded across all three local boards in the west to lend a regional flavour to the charter. Specific groups that should not be excluded are children, older people and mana whenua.

Second: local board support and guidance of longer-term community development approaches to supporting Glen Eden as a place of diverse neighbourhoods. This would be done best in partnership with community groups, some of which exist now, and possibly with new groups whose development could be supported by the board.

LOBBYING FOR CHANGE
There are a number of areas of policy where a local board might advocate. These include:

- Improvements in terms of social housing provision and affordable housing.
- Provision of levies from unearned property values due to policy changes such as new zoning of land.
– Safety concerns, whether these are due to traffic, transport, social or crime concerns.
– Government (and its agencies) policy or legislation that has a negative impact on its area. For example, any decision to privatise Housing New Zealand properties should not be carried out until all the consequences are understood. Such a process should involve the local board.
– Policies arising from Auckland Council and its council-controlled organisations (CCOs) that are likely to negatively affect the area.

CREATING A CHARTER OR SET OF PRINCIPLES FOR GUIDING CHANGE IN GLEN EDEN
As briefly discussed, the principles of child-friendly and age-friendly cities give some hint of what sorts of principles such a charter might include. Done well, a charter would be multi-dimensional in being both socially aspirational in terms of how Glen Eden peoples would relate to each other and eminently practical in drawing on what is known about how design can work to create safer, sustainable, diverse and inclusive communities. Such a charter could provide both a moral reference point in examining proposed developments and a practical set of criteria against which proposals could be checked.

In our opinion, developing a charter should be carried out in partnership with the community. Using community-development principles of allowing process to dictate outcome rather than using process to validate a predetermined goal would (in our opinion) lead to a robust conclusion with stronger buy-in from multiple local stakeholders.

While charters (or sets of principles) have no legal weight, they can, if utilised sensibly, create considerable leverage for change. The sorts of leverage envisaged include the simple ones of creating a rallying point around which diverse existing groups can organise and an invitational device for inducting new groups. See the Appendix below for a draft Glen Eden charter.
References


Other sources


David Haigh has a long career in community development. He is the former head of CD for the Auckland Regional Authority and has recently retired from Unitec, where he taught in social practice and not-for-profit management. David is active in Auckland Action Against Poverty.

David Kenkel is a Senior Lecturer in Social Work at Unitec and Chair of Community Waitakere.

Kate Doswell is a registered social worker who has practised in New Zealand, Australia and the UK, and is a former lecturer in the Bachelor of Social Practice at Unitec.
APPENDIX

Draft charter for Glen Eden: Waitakere Ranges Local Board (WRLB)

Mission: A sustainable Glen Eden that moves confidently to the future.

Challenges: Glen Eden will face a number of challenges including managing greater levels of urban intensification and upgrading of the town centre.

Infrastructure:

1. The WRLB will encourage public transport, walking and cycling.
2. Improvements to traffic safety will be ensured.
3. A review will be carried out of Glen Eden’s infrastructure requirements as a result of planned intensification (e.g., water, sewage and storm water).

Urban design

1. The impacts of greater intensification can be mitigated through good design that includes the use of noise-reduction materials, energy saving through having a northerly aspect, passive surveillance of common and public areas, and privacy.
2. Promote a variety of affordable housing, including single dwellings, apartments and townhouses, that meets a required standard of construction.
3. Intensification will also require consideration of access to services, both public and private.
4. In the upgrade of the Glen Eden town centre, consideration will be given to greater levels of pedestrianisation, improved access for older people and people with disabilities, new parking arrangements, public spaces that can be used for community events, facilities for children and indoor facilities for public gatherings.
5. Protect the physical form of Glen Eden that has heritage or historic values.
6. Promote good design of all modern buildings.
7. Glen Eden town centre will be designed to ensure that it meets the needs of people with disabilities.
Social

1. The WRLB will encourage good relationships with government agencies, Auckland Council organisations, civil society organisations and the private sector.

2. The WRLB will promote public consultation in Glen Eden on policies, plans and programmes.

3. The social sector will be promoted through a community development process of community engagement, social capital and through the provision of financial and other support.

4. Social facilities will be established to meet the needs of a growing and changing population due to intensification and in-migration.

5. The WRLB will support efforts by social agencies to deal with social issues such as homelessness and begging.


8. The WRLB will discourage forms of gentrification that displace existing residents. This might include advocacy to retain existing social housing in public and community ownership, and encouraging developers to incorporate social housing within their housing developments.

Cultural

1. The WRLB will liaise with tangata whenua concerning issues of relevance to them. This will include supporting capacity-building of Māori organisations that provide housing, educational and social services; rangatahi development; supporting employment and enterprise development; and integrating Māori space and cultural expressions into place-making.

2. The WRLB recognises the important work of the Hoani Waititi Marae and Te Whānau o Waipareira Trust.

3. The WRLB will protect the important cultural heritage within the district.

4. Recognising the multicultural population of Glen Eden, cultural events will be promoted and supported.

5. The WRLB will encourage greater public use of the Glen Eden Playhouse Theatre.
Economic

1. The WRLB recognises the important economic and employment contribution of small businesses in the district.
2. The WRLB will liaise with retailers in the upgrade of the town centre and support initiatives that reduce risks from petty crime and promote public safety.

Environmental

1. Green spaces will be provided within the upgrade of the town centre.
2. The WRLB recognises the contribution that green space/trees make towards mental health and wellbeing.
3. The WRLB will ensure there are adequate green spaces to cater for any population increases.
4. Existing natural areas will be enhanced and protected.