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1 Introduction

1.1 The wider research programme

This report contributes to social research being undertaken by Taylor Baines & Associates on the siting and social impacts of various facility types. Taylor Baines & Associates has been contracted by the Foundation for Research Science and Technology to undertake this research, and is being funded by the Public Good Science Fund\(^1\).

The need for research into the siting and social impacts of various facility types is highlighted by the varied but often negative response from host communities to the siting of certain facilities. Examining siting issues and identifying the social impacts experienced by host communities will provide empirical information that is presently lacking in New Zealand. This information can be used to encourage thorough assessments of effects, greater community participation in the siting process, the development of effective relationships between facility providers and host communities, more equitable and better-informed planning decisions, and improved ongoing management of facilities. This in turn will further develop the effects based approach to resource management and planning embodied in the Resource Management Act 1991.

Large retail facilities (for example, supermarkets and malls) have been included in Taylor Baines’ facilities research since the siting of new retail facilities in greenfields locations or the re-development and expansion of existing malls and supermarkets has become increasingly contentious in recent years. In many instances, the potential for environmental and social effects associated with the design and operation of the large retail facilities have been the cause of concern to neighbours. At another level, the challenge exists to demonstrate whether or not retailing activity, particularly the level of activity associated with large facilities, plays any significant role within the structure and function of urban communities beyond simply meeting consumer demand for retail goods and services. This is a challenge to provide empirical evidence that is relevant to contemporary New Zealand.

1.2 Three stages of the retail facility research

There are three stages involved in this research on large retail facilities:

1) a *Sector Review*\(^2\) which presents a discussion of the forms, roles and functions of retail development based on international literature and New Zealand experience; describes the institutional setting of local authority policies and plans, and recent trends up till 2001; and presents a summary framework of the potential social impacts associated with large retail developments.

2) a *Comparative Analysis*\(^3\) which examines the nature of large retail facilities and retail sector development trends by describing a sample of retail facilities\(^4\) selected to contrast different scales of retail centre and different stages in the cyclical pattern of retail centre development.

---

\(^1\) Contract TBAX0203.
\(^4\) In the cities of Auckland, North Shore and Christchurch.
3) several case studies which explore the social impacts associated with large retail developments as experienced by selected host communities in New Zealand. This case study, set in North Shore, is the third case study in the series.

1.3 Concepts utilised in this research programme

The concept of ‘effects’ or ‘social impacts’ which is used and explored in Taylor Baines’ facility siting research is not intended to refer only to negative effects or social impacts. Rather, the authors use the concept in an unbiased way, acknowledging that both positive and negative effects on host communities may result from the operations of a large retail facility. This approach is consistent with the definition of ‘effect’ in the Resource Management Act 1991.

The term host community, employed throughout this retail facility research, refers to the area around the retail facility within which residents/businesses/organisations/institutions/facilities are most likely to experience the direct effects and impacts of retailing activity and the flows of people and vehicles associated with this retailing activity. In practical terms for large shopping centres, and particularly for those which include major retail facilities, this is likely to incorporate a maximum of two to three blocks around the shopping centre. Major topographical or street boundaries may also play a part in defining this concept in a practical sense.

Previous research in this programme focussed on waste management facilities (such as landfills, transfer stations and waste water treatment plants) and prisons. The waste management facilities typically involved relatively few people permanently on site. Indeed, some waste water treatment plants are automated to the point where no personnel are present on site for significant periods of time. The focus on prisons introduced a new dimension to this social research, by virtue of the fact that prisons are occupied by relatively large numbers of people (inmates and staff) on a permanent basis. People are an integral part of the facility; their presence and activities are closely linked to most of the effects that may be experienced off site by members of the host community. Thus, the research on the off-site effects of prisons and the social impacts which prisons have on their host communities was, in practical terms, an assessment of the relationship between prisons and their host communities. Far more so than in the case of waste management facilities, this is a two-way relationship.

This evolution is continued with the research into the experience of large retail facilities. Malls and supermarkets deliberately set out to provide retail services, not only for members of their host communities but also for much wider catchments. Unlike the situation with prisons, most of the immediate neighbours of a mall or a supermarket are likely to be regular users, and thereby benefit from its proximity and operations.

Resource Management Act 1991:

3. Meaning of “effect”- In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, the term “effect”...

includes-
(a) Any positive or adverse effect; and
(b) Any temporary or permanent effect; and
(c) Any past, present, or future effect; and
(d) Any cumulative effect which arises over time or in combination with other effects—regardless of the scale, intensity, duration, or frequency of the effect, and also includes—
(e) Any effect of high probability; and
(f) Any potential effect of low probability which has a high potential impact.
1.4 The retail case studies

Case study selection

In the Comparative Analysis carried out in Stage Two of this research programme (Baines et al., 2003, pp.4-6), a hierarchy of shopping centres was described as part of a framework for examining the functional and social roles associated with shopping centres in an era when consumption and leisure activities increasingly overlap.

The selection of case studies was influenced by several considerations. The three case studies selected each exemplify a different level in this shopping centre hierarchy. In this case study, the re-developed Westfield Glenfield (an enclosed mall) is located within a district shopping centre in Glenfield, North Shore. The other two case studies involve a stand-alone supermarket in a neighbourhood shopping centre (St Martins, Christchurch) and a stand-alone supermarket in an out-of-centre location, but exhibiting the potential to evolve into a suburban shopping centre (Ferrymead, Christchurch). Another important consideration in selecting the case study retail facilities was that they should not be subject to any active planning or decision-making processes during the period of the research.

Structure of the case study reports

In order to assess the social impacts of upgrading Westfield Glenfield on its host community, this case study outlines the nature of the Mall re-development and the shopping centre setting, and then explores the experience of residents, businesses and organisations since the re-development occurred.

There are six sections in this report. Section 2 describes the methodology and approach adopted in this research. Section 3 profiles Westfield Glenfield, with particular attention to the changes which occurred during re-development, and section 4 provides a description of the host community. The assessment of effects incorporates changes in the patterns of residents’ use of the re-developed Mall, effects experienced by neighbouring businesses and community organisations, as well as any off-site effects experienced by neighbours due to the new building or its functioning as a mall. The last section, section 6, provides some conclusions.

1.5 Research programme outputs

In addition to the Sector Review, Comparative Analysis, and Case Study reports, the results of this research will be disseminated in the form of host community feedback presentations, discussion sessions and conference papers.

---

6 A ‘district centre’ generally serves the needs of residents in a group of suburbs within a single urban area, and where near the urban fringe may also serve an adjacent rural hinterland. A ‘suburban centre’ normally serves up to two or three suburbs in localities not conveniently served by a district centre. A ‘neighbourhood centre’ generally has a catchment area that is limited to or within a suburb. Retail facilities in a neighbourhood centre mainly provide for convenience goods that serve the day-to-day needs of the surrounding neighbourhood, but may include a limited range of more frequently required comparison goods.
The case study reports are available for the cost of reproduction and postage:

Taylor Baines & Associates
PO Box 8620
Riccarton
Christchurch

Summary case study reports are available free of charge on the Taylor Baines & Associates’ website shown above.

1.6 The research provider - Taylor Baines & Associates

Taylor Baines & Associates has been a private provider of research, consulting and training services since 1989. The firm specialises in social research and the application of social assessment methods to a wide variety of issues in community development (for more information on the services and work carried out by Taylor Baines & Associates refer to www.tba.co.nz).
2 Methodology

2.1 Research methods

Several research methods were used in this case study based on the theoretical and practical approach to social assessment as described by Taylor, Bryan, and Goodrich in *Social Assessment: theory, process & techniques* (1995). These methods include:

- key informant interviews
- structured questionnaires
- secondary data analysis
- feedback meetings

This combination of methods was used to enable community and stakeholder participation, cross checking, and to ensure a thorough and accurate collection of profile information and reported effects.

Although these methods were appropriate methods for this research, the authors acknowledge their associated limitations. The use of structured questionnaires, for example, can run the risk of constraining the opportunity for the interviewer to access all relevant information and experiences from the interviewee. As with most research methods, there is also the risk that interviewees will refrain from sharing information and experiences or give dishonest answers. In order to address these limitations, the questionnaire was designed to be as comprehensive as possible, and also contained sections for ‘comments’, giving interviewees the opportunity to add anything that was not addressed in the questionnaire’s detailed questions. Interviewees were also asked for evidence to back up their assertions and interviewers used the multiple research methods listed above to cross check (corroborate) the results wherever possible.

*Key informant interviews:*

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with key informants in the Mall and in the community. The purpose of these interviews was to gather profile information on the Mall and the community, and to scope potential effects and issues. As often as possible these interviews were conducted face to face, the remainder were carried out over the telephone. Interviews lasted anywhere between fifteen minutes and two hours.

Mall staff interviewed included:

- Mall manager
- Mall Operations manager
- Mall Security manager
- Mall Customer Services manager

---

7 This may be because an interviewee attempts to predict what is a ‘socially acceptable’ answer to the interviewer or because of a desire to protect their own interests, for example in this case, local property values.

8 Including the North Shore City Council based in Takapuna.
Key informants in the community included:

- North Shore City Council Environmental Services Major Projects Team Leader
- North Shore City Council Environmental Health Officer
- Community constable
- Business Association Chairperson
- Glenfield Ratepayers Association Chairperson
- Glenfield Intermediate principal
- Glenfield College deputy principal
- Wipeout volunteer
- Glenfield Public Librarian
- Glenfield Community Project Operations Manager
- Glenfield Community Centre co-ordinator
- Citizens Advice Bureau volunteer
- North Shore taxis
- Senior sergeant for North Shore Traffic police

Structured questionnaires:

In total, 159 ‘neighbours’ (126 residents, 21 businesses, and 12 community organisations) were interviewed for this case study.

Questionnaires were completed by the interviewers and took between fifteen minutes and 45 minutes to complete. These explored neighbours’ use of the Mall, the wider shopping centre, and other shopping centres, and their experience of day to day operational effects of the Mall.

The questionnaire was divided into five main sections. The first four sections contained mainly prompted questions relating to participants’ use of the Mall, use and experience of the wider shopping centre, use of other shopping centres. The fifth section explored off-site effects of the Mall, by giving participants an opportunity in the first instance to report unprompted, any positive, negative or other effects that they had experienced as a result of the Mall’s presence and operation. A ‘prompted’ section that followed contained detailed questions relating to a number of potential effects identified in literature reviews, past Taylor Baines work in the retail sector, and resource consent documentation for the Glenfield Mall re-development in 2000. These potential effects included noise, litter, traffic (noise, safety, volume), parking overflow, lighting, visual, and landscaping effects. Some personal information (demographics) was also collected.

Secondary data analysis:

Analysis of secondary data was also carried out. Census data for example, was used to establish a demographic profile of the Glenfield community (see Section 4.3). The records of the Land Transport Safety Authority were used to compare the incidence and locations of traffic accidents in the Glenfield neighbourhood before and after the Westfield Glenfield re-development. North Shore City Council traffic counts on Glenfield Road were used to establish changes to traffic volume around the time of the Mall re-development.
Feedback meetings:

Three individual feedback meetings were held with businesses and community organisations, residents and Mall management. While four local business people and community organisation representatives attended the afternoon feedback meeting, another community organisation requested a summary of the findings and comments were posted to the research team. Six residents, all of whom lived in close proximity to the Mall (the ‘near’ study area), attended an evening feedback meeting. Feedback discussion was also held with a North Shore City Council planner.

2.2 Selection and access to participants

Those residents, businesses, and community organisations who participated in the survey were selected primarily on the basis of their location, all being within the geographical area identified as the host community of Glenfield (refer to Figure 1). Three interviewers in the research team went door to door to access participants.

Residents were targeted for interviewing in three distinct groups, the overall intention being to get a good sampling of residents who are frequent users of the Mall and shopping centre as their local convenience stores as well as those who are most likely to experience any off-site effects should these be occurring. The most intensive efforts were made closest to the Mall in the ‘near’ area of interviewing (see Figure 1 and Table 1). More distant residents were sampled in two specified areas - ‘east’ and ‘west’, as described in Table 2 below.

An attempt was made to interview as many businesses and organisations in the local shopping centre as possible.

Figure 1: Survey areas

---

9 Businesses outside the Mall complex. Businesses within the Mall complex were not interviewed.
Table 1: Summary information for interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Area Description</th>
<th>Distance to retail facility (residents only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near</td>
<td>43 total</td>
<td>Streets surrounding and in close proximity to the Mall, including Bentley Ave down to the Bentley/Downing corner, Downing Street down to the Bentley/Downing corner, the East side of Glenfield Road between Downing Street and Camelot Place, and Mulberry Place</td>
<td>20-300 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>45 total</td>
<td>Streets on the east side of the Mall between Glenfield Road to the west, Chartwell Road to the East, Chivalry Road to the north and Marlborough Avenue to the south, including Camelot Place, Battle Place, and Bentley Avenue from the Bentley/Downing corner down to Chartwell Road</td>
<td>175-570 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>71 total</td>
<td>Streets on the west side of the Mall between Glenfield Road to the east, Glenfield College to the West, Mayfield Road to the north, and Sunward Rise to the south, including Taynith Place, Powie Street, Peach Road, Waverley Avenue, Kaipatiki Road, Sunnyfield Crescent, Emirau Place, and Lancelot Place</td>
<td>60-460 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54 residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Time frame

All interviews were conducted between 5th May and 10th May 2003.

Feedback meetings were held on the 15th and 16th September 2003.

2.4 Analysis

The research aims to identify the range of social effects experienced within the host community of Glenfield as a result of the upgrading of Westfield Glenfield which was completed in October 2000 - what difference did the upgrade make to those who live in the host community or run businesses there.

During the previous stages of the research (McClintock et al., 2002; Baines et al., 2003), potential effects were identified from New Zealand and international literature and also from consulting work carried out for the purposes of preparing statements of evidence for planning hearings in New Zealand.

The analysis reported here focuses on determining whether or not these potential effects have been experienced as actual effects in this particular case, and if so, who has been affected and what are the consequential impacts. The analysis also draws attention to any other effects not anticipated but nevertheless evident through observation, key informant interviews, structured surveys, or secondary data analysis.

In determining whether or not potential effects are actual effects, it is important to differentiate between actual effects and perceived effects. For example, it is likely that residents’ comments about an effect on property values are referring to perceived effects. Further investigation and corroboration from other sources of data (beyond the scope and resources of this research) would be needed to determine whether this is an actual effect. However, having noted the difference
between perceived and actual effects, this is not to say that perceived effects are without relevance or consequential impacts. The existence of a perceived effect, especially if the perception is held by a number of people in the community, may result in observable impacts. For example, if a resident believes there has been an increased risk to safety on the nearby streets because of higher traffic volumes at certain times of day, then this belief may in turn cause the resident to alter their behaviours in some way - choose a different time of day to go out; accompany children to school rather than let them walk on their own; and so on.

The case studies specifically ignore consideration of construction-phase effects. They focus on the community’s experience of the operations of large retail facilities. As will be discussed in more detail in Section 5.1, the scope of the analysis covers a broad range of effects including changes in people’s use of the supermarket and the neighbouring shops, changes in relationships between the supermarket and other shops, and changes in the nature and extent of off-site environmental effects and their social consequences.

An important feature of this analysis is that it is presented from the perspective of the host community - people who live or run businesses within relatively close proximity of the supermarket - and therefore people who might experience the whole range of potential effects and impacts.

2.5 Ethics

This research has been developed and carried out in accordance with the ethical requirements of the New Zealand Association for Impact Assessment and the Sociological Association of Aotearoa New Zealand.

In keeping with these ethical requirements, participation in the research was voluntary, and informed consent was sought (verbal). An information sheet was provided to residents and businesses who participated in the survey. This information sheet explained the research, assured anonymity, and noted the right of participants to withdraw their participation or any information provided at any time prior to the publication of this report. No one has chosen to exercise this right.
3 Profile of the retail facility

3.1 Westfield Glenfield within the hierarchy of retail facilities

As noted in Section 1.4, this case study in Glenfield is an example of a major retail facility set in the context of a district shopping centre. Within the hierarchy of shopping centres, a district centre generally has a catchment area that covers a group of suburbs within a single urban area (Tansley, in Baines et al., 2003, p.4).

Note that Westfield Glenfield is also referred to as ‘Glenfield Mall’ in this report, emphasising the fact that the major retail facility in this case is an enclosed mall.

3.2 Glenfield Mall - the current situation

Ownership and location

Glenfield Mall is owned by Westfield NZ Ltd, and is located at 40-48 Downing Street in the North Shore suburb of Glenfield. It is bounded by Glenfield Road to the west, Bentley Avenue to the north, and Downing Street to the south; and is situated just below the eastern side of a ridge line which runs along Glenfield Road (See Figure 2).

The Mall is surrounded by businesses and community organisations on Glenfield Road and on side streets between High Road (south) and Mayfield Road (north) (see Figure 2). Together, the Mall and these additional businesses and community organisations are referred to in this case study as the Glenfield shopping centre. Further description of the Glenfield shopping centre is contained in the host community profile in Section 4.

Figure 2: Location of Glenfield Mall and the Glenfield shopping centre
Zoning

The Westfield Glenfield Mall is zoned Commercial 2B under the Transitional North Shore City District Plan (Takapuna Section), and Business 2 under the Proposed North Shore City District Plan. These zones provide for a range of shops, restaurants, and commercial services. The Proposed North Shore City District Plan emphasises a centres based approach to retail development, its objectives “to uphold and strengthen the viability of existing commercial centres and to plan for new centres where they meet local needs and achieve the urban form strategy”.

Mall facilities

Westfield Glenfield Mall has a gross leasable floor area of 29,700 square metres, and is sited on seven acres of land. It is a large enclosed Mall with five levels. The Mall can be accessed by foot and by vehicle from Glenfield Road, Bentley Avenue, and Downing Street. Vehicle ramps can be used to travel between levels. There is parking on levels 1, 2, 4 and 5, providing 1,506 car parks, one hundred of which are for staff. There is a large variety of retail activities within the Mall, including four anchor stores, 84 general retail stores, four general retail services, two commercial/financial facilities, two health related services, 18 eating places, and one entertainment/recreation facility (see Appendix A for a detailed list of retail activities within the Mall). There are currently two empty shops.

3.3 History of Westfield Glenfield

Glenfield Mall was built in 1971 with re-developments taking place in 1986, 1991, and 2000 (see Table 2). Westfield took over ownership in May 1996.

Table 2: History of Glenfield Mall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Gross leasable area (m²)</th>
<th>Site area (hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Mall built</td>
<td>12,212</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Major extension to accommodate a major discount department store</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td><strong>Note</strong>: Consent was granted to extend and upgrade the Mall to a gross floor area of 30,080 m². However, due to “difficult economic conditions and changes in ownership” (North Shore City Council 1995), this extension and upgrade was not carried out, and the consent expired in 1993.</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Lower level refurbished with the addition of a food hall and fresh food retail outlets</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Major re-development, upgrade and expansion</td>
<td>29,700</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The focus of this case study is on the effects of the most recent re-development in October 2000 on the Mall’s host community.
3.4 Glenfield Mall’s most recent re-development

Obtaining consent to redevelop - resource consent process

An application for consent to redevelop Glenfield Mall was received by the North Shore City Council in May 1995. Specifically, the application concerned a subdivision consent for a proposed boundary adjustment (to incorporate land at the rear of shops fronting Glenfield Road), and a land use consent for the redevelopment, upgrade and expansion of the existing Mall.

The initial proposal for redevelopment included:

- increasing the gross leasable area and floor area to allow for additional retailing, a public library, a creche and other facilities
- expanding the Mall over three levels
- extending the basement car parking and constructing a new four level car park (increasing the number of car parks from 860 to 1910)
- adding a K-Mart and two major department stores
- new food court facilities
- a ‘winged’ roof design and glass skylight beacon as an identity feature
- landscaping
- creating an external ‘town square’
- removal of the existing service station at the corner of Glenfield Road and Downing Street.
- a new signalised vehicle access point to the site at the intersection of Glenfield and Kaipatiki Roads
- improvements to the surrounding road network.

Written consent was obtained by the applicant (Glenfield Mall Limited) from the following adjoining landowners:

- Family Trust (corner Glenfield Road and Bentley Avenue)
- Skatelands Sports Centre (Downing Street)
- Speedy Holdings Ltd, Speedy’s Bullring Building (407 Glenfield Road).

The applicant (Glenfield Mall Limited) consulted with:

- Glenfield Community Board
- Glenfield Residents and Ratepayers Association
- the Glenfield community via shopper surveys and focus groups
- various departments of Council.

The council received 1,610 submissions\(^{11}\), 35 of which were against the redevelopment, 44 of which were for the redevelopment but had concerns, and 1,531 of which were for the redevelopment.

---

\(^{11}\) An additional 22 late submissions were received (one against, 21 for).
Submissions in opposition and submissions in support but with concerns raised a number of issues, including:

- the size of the centre being too large for the residential area, moving Glenfield to subregional status
- traffic issues - in particular concerns over volume (private vehicles and service vehicles) capacity, traffic flow, exiting and entering residential properties, traffic safety, pedestrian safety, and noise
- parking issues - for example: inadequate Mall parking, parking overflow caused by Mall staff and Christmas period
- insufficient public transport therefore increasing traffic volume effects
- visual impact - for example: lack of “design treatment” on the north, south and east facades of the Mall, “out of place in the environment”
- landscaping - inappropriate positioning of plants
- noise from the Mall - in particular noise from refrigeration and air conditioning units
- ‘undesirables’ being attracted to the Mall and causing security concerns
- integration/linkages (for example pedestrian) with other retailers/organisations in the centre
- adverse effect on retailers in Birkenhead and Northcote centres

Submissions in support raised a number of issues, including:

- the benefits for customers - including meeting their demands for more diverse retail and community services, improving functionality of the Mall through better access and parking, and improving the functionality of the centre through better traffic flows, pedestrian flows and links between businesses and organisations
- the benefits for local businesses - including attracting more customers thereby helping ensure the long term viability of local business
- the benefits for Glenfield area/residents - including increased employment opportunities, provision of a community focal point, upgrading the Mall’s appearance, and possible improvement to public transport links with the rest of the North Shore.

The North Shore City Council planning report relating to this initial proposal identifies a number of issues, including issues relating to compliance with District Plan rules, ‘other relevant matters’, objectives, policies and other provisions in the District Plans, and effects on the environment. Some of the issues are listed in the table below, and where relevant, noted in further detail in Section 5.

A land use consent and a subdivision consent was granted in September 1995. These were appealed by four submitters (three residents on Bentley Avenue, owners of the Glenfield Tavern on Downing Street, International Property Management, and Neil Holdings Limited), but eventually settled by consent orders in July 1996 (adding conditions relating to traffic management within Bentley Avenue and Downing Street, including widening of the vehicle crossings of the appellants’/residents’ properties, and access to the Glenfield Tavern site).

In 1998, the applicant then applied to modify the land use consent by seeking to change or cancel some of the conditions - changes that amounted to quite significant amendments to the approved plans.

---

12 Including submissions from the Birkenhead Business Association and Northcote Mainstreet Inc.
Some of the changes to the original proposal put forward by the applicant include:

- reduction in gross leasable floor area from 33,138 m² to 30,000 m²
- two levels of retail rather than three
- greater use of existing building with less demolition
- reduction in size of discount department store (K-Mart)
- reduction in number of car parks from 1,910 to 1,513
- internal parking layout to be altered
- addition of shops at the Glenfield Road frontage
- removal of the winged roof design, glass beacon skylight and food court projection from plans - replacing with more conventional design with a flat roof and entry tower (pedestrian entry) on Glenfield Road
- removal of reference to a “town square” (although a small paved area will be available to the public for community events)
- improved pedestrian access
- bus shelter added on Glenfield Road frontage.

It was also noted at the time that the amended design allowed for the future development of a cinema. If the cinema were not to go ahead, then the design allowed for an additional level of car parks (level 4). In the event, the cinema complex did not go ahead.

The North Shore City Council planning report\(^{14}\) relating to the amended proposal identifies a number of issues as outlined below, and where relevant, noted in further detail in Section 5.

---

### Table 3: Planning issues relating to the amended proposal to redevelop the Glenfield Mall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues relating to compliance with District Plan rules</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape yard</td>
<td>insufficient landscaped yard on boundary abutting Recreation Zone in the Proposed District Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum height</td>
<td>exceeds height limits in both plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height to boundary</td>
<td>eastern end of building infringes height in relation to boundary control in Transitional District Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking</td>
<td>insufficient car parks using Transitional District Plan method of calculation (however, this incorrectly calculates the number of parks based on gross floor area rather than gross leasable area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum business unit area</td>
<td>proposed major stores exceed maximum business unit area in the proposed District Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>concern that planting around carpark edges not sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle turnover</td>
<td>predicted vehicle turnover exceeds the 100 vehicles per day required to be classified as a permitted or controlled activity in the Proposed District Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues relating to the objectives, policies and other provisions in the District Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with centres based strategy</td>
<td>the redevelopment will strengthen an existing centre which is not performing well, and &quot;reduces pressures for large out of centre locations&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues relating to effects on the environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual impact</td>
<td>new design very different, not as architecturally interesting, and some concern over mitigation of its adverse visual effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic impact</td>
<td>mitigation measures essential, proposed measures will largely mitigate traffic impact on surrounding road network, will be some adverse impact on road users and local residents due to increased volume and noise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consent for the amended proposal to redevelop was granted in March 1998. A number of conditions were attached, including conditions relating to operational noise, external appearance, lighting, landscaping, car parking, and traffic management. Where relevant these have been noted in further detail in Section 5.

**Mall re-development - October 2000**

The Mall redevelopment was completed in October 2000. The redevelopment involved an enlargement of the Mall (from two to five levels), a re-furbishment of the Mall (new food court facilities), an increase in the number and variety of retail activities available, and changes to the amenities available to customers. Although the creche was closed, a number of other amenities were introduced including motorised scooters, wheelchairs, a safe play zone for children, a community display area, and a customer care room.
3.5 Links with the host community

Links with nearby businesses and organisations

There are strong commercial links (including the purchase of business supplies, lunches, and the hiring of car park space) between the Mall and nearby businesses and organisations. There are a number of non-commercial links including the donation of food, lost property and presents to local organisations (such as the food bank). The Mall also has a community site available to organisations for displays and collections.

Mall management report regular attendance at the local business association’s meetings prior to the re-development in 2000. Although this attendance has ceased\textsuperscript{15}, Mall management notes that it is “happy to work with local businesses” on issues in common (e.g. street lighting at Christmas, and graffiti). The coordinator of the Community Centre organised for the Mall manager to be guest speaker at a monthly local network meeting in May 2003. Those businesses and community organisation representatives who attended the feedback meeting with Taylor Baines expressed a desire to meet with Mall management several times a year. They also suggested that contact phone numbers could be exchanged so that any crimes noticed could be followed up immediately. One business person had on several occasions left their premises to locate a Mall security guard in order to report an incident but would have preferred to have been able to phone.

Links with local residents

The Glenfield Ratepayers Association was involved in formal discussion with Mall management prior to the re-development. No association meetings since have involved Mall issues. It should be noted however, that no immediate neighbours of the Mall are members of the association.

Mall management also met regularly with the local community board prior to the re-development, but has since stopped attending due to new rules (Westfield) relating to information dissemination.

The six residents who attended the feedback meeting indicated a keen interest in a small liaison group of residents and Mall management. “It would be good if we could meet periodically” and the exchange of telephone numbers would be helpful. Residents were concerned that small issues could be resolved easily if they knew who to contact, instead of having to phone the North Shore Action Line.

\textsuperscript{15} Note: the Glenfield Business Association has not met as regularly since the Mall re-development.
4 Profile of the host community

4.1 Glenfield - place in the city

Glenfield is located on the North Shore of Auckland City approximately two and a half kilometres\textsuperscript{16} west of the northern motorway (see Figure 2). Glenfield Road, a main arterial route linking Albany to Auckland City, passes through the host community of Glenfield, on a ridge which divides the west and the east areas. These areas drop off either side of the ridge forming a valley setting for residents. The Mall itself is sited adjacent to Glenfield Road above a valley facing east towards Rangitoto Island. Three major North Shore bus companies operate in Glenfield. Bus stops are situated on Glenfield Road outside the Mall.

4.2 The ‘host community’ of Glenfield Mall

As noted in Section 1.3, the extent of the host community described in this research encompasses the area around the Mall and related shopping centre within which residents, businesses, community organisations and users of other community facilities are most likely to experience the full range of direct effects (both positive and negative) of Mall activity and the flows of people and vehicles associated with this activity (See Figure 1).

The host community of Westfield Glenfield Mall is defined in this research to include:

- residents, businesses and organisations to the east of the Mall, including Glenfield Road, Downing Street, Bentley Avenue, Battle Place, Mulberry Crescent, Marlborough Avenue, Camelot Place, Chivalry Road, High Road, and Chartwell Avenue
- residents, businesses and organisations to the west of the Mall, including Glenfield Road, Kaipatiki Road, Peach Road, Waverley Avenue, Powrie Street, Sunward Rise, Raynith Place, Emirau Place, Lancelot Place, Sunnyfield Crescent, Segedin Place, and Mayfield Rd
- neighbouring schools.
(See Figure 1).

Together these areas cover an approximate radius of half a kilometre around the Mall. For the purposes of this report, the host community is referred to as Glenfield\textsuperscript{17}.

\textsuperscript{16} Measured in a direct line.
\textsuperscript{17} Reference to the host community as Glenfield in this research is not intended to apply to the whole suburb of Glenfield.
Figure 3: Location of Glenfield

4.3 The residential character of Glenfield

From rural area to popular suburb

Glenfield is a consolidated suburban area with several large reserves, a skate park and interconnecting walkways linking suburban streets to the reserves, schools and shops.

Glenfield has experienced significant residential development over the last twenty to thirty years. Prior to the 1970s, Glenfield was rural in character with extensive bush, open space and little residential development. Development took off in the 1970s with young couples buying larger homes on larger sections for reasonable prices. The area became known as “nappy valley”. Property rates were affordable. The area offered quick access to the motorway and therefore enabled people to commute to the city. It offered views to the sea within a rural aspect. Local schools with good reputations was another attraction. Residents interviewed for the research cited all of the aforementioned as reasons for choosing to live in Glenfield more than 20 years ago (27% of the residents interviewed).

Whilst the rural aspect of the area has changed and the length of time it takes to access the CBD has increased, residents who have moved into the area less than 20 years ago (51% of the residents
interviewed) still appreciate the access to the motorway and bus services. Choice of schools and proximity to the Glenfield shopping centre as well as the rural aspect were also important reasons for settling in the area. A number of them had come back into an area which they had grown up in, or moved to be closer to family. Prices of property remained reasonable compared with other parts of the North Shore.

Residents who had moved into the area since 2000 (after the Glenfield Mall redevelopment - 22% of the residents interviewed) cited proximity to the number of services in Glenfield as important criteria for choosing to live there. Access to schools, medical facilities, the Mall and surrounding shops, the library and leisure centre were important considerations when choosing a home as well as proximity to family.

Over the last 10 years the North Shore area has attracted large numbers of immigrant families. Migrant numbers have escalated in Glenfield itself. The three real estate agents interviewed for this research all told of an increase in Asian and immigrant customers looking for property. Census data confirm this influx, with an increase from 5.8% of individuals identifying as Asian in the case study area in 1991 to 20.7% in 2001. ‘Other’ ethnic groups also increased from 0.5% in 1991 to 3.1% in 2001. Due to demand, the Glenfield Community Centre offers two classes a day in English as a second language. Both a Chinese and a Korean interpreter are on site. The library has an extensive foreign literature collection and Chinese, Korean, Iraqi and Iranian librarians. The ANZ bank has an Asian speaking teller. Taylor Baines interviewees encountered a number of residents who could not be interviewed for the study because they could not speak English. They also noted a number of Asian businesses operating from private homes such as hairdressers, dressmaking and healthcare.

Nowadays there are more rental properties, with many of the larger properties having been subdivided. Census data reinforce this trend showing an increase in rental properties from 20.3% in 1991 to 25.6% in 2001. This resulted from a regional policy of the North Shore City Council to encourage infill housing in Glenfield. In 1996-99, an Auckland Regional Growth Strategy was developed to assist in the management of population growth within Auckland Region. This plan was based on “intensification” of residential development by rezoning to higher densities and encouraging infilling. The Strategy identified Glenfield specifically as a community where infill housing should be encouraged.

According to the local real estate agents, the average residential property sells for between $210,000 and $250,000. Rental property prices have increased by 30% in the last few years. “Property developers are investing in Glenfield big time” was a sentiment expressed by one agent.

Some differences demographically from the city

Based on the 2001 Census of Population and Dwellings, the population in the study area shows some differences from North Shore and Auckland City as a whole. The main differences as noted above relate to ethnicity and tenure. The Glenfield case study area has significantly higher numbers of Asians (20.7%) and ‘other’ ethnic groups (3.1%) compared to North Shore (11.6% Asian, 1.5% ‘other’) and Auckland City (13.3% Asian, 1.2% ‘other’); and higher levels of rental properties (25.6%) compared with North Shore (20.6%) and Auckland City (23.8%). Census data also indicate there are some differences relating to occupation - Glenfield case study area has fewer professionals (11.5% Legislators, 9.4% Professionals, 11.7% Associate Professionals) compared with North Shore (17.1% Legislators, 16.4% Professionals, 14.6% Associate Professionals) and Auckland City (15.2%
Legislators, 16% Professionals, 13.2% Associate Professionals); and more clerks (17.1% compared with 15.3% and 14.9%) with, sales and service workers (17.3% compared with 14.5% and 13.2%), trade workers (11% compared with 8.4% and 8.4%), plant and machine workers (7.6% compared with 4.5% and 6.8%), and elementary workers (13% compared with 7.9% and 10.9%) than North Shore and Auckland City.

4.5 Retail activities

Retail in the host community, aside from Glenfield Mall, includes the shops on Glenfield Road, Downing Street, and Bentley Ave.

Whilst many of the strip shops existed prior to the Mall being re-developed a number have received facelifts in keeping with the 2000 re-development of the Mall.

Glenfield is a suburban area, which is a focus for the local community and provides services across a wider area as well. The modern centre grew from a small group of local shops and is now based around a large, enclosed shopping Mall, which was expanded and renovated in October 2001. The redevelopment included a new fit-out for the Foodtown supermarket, the development of a new Woolworths supermarket to replace the Big Fresh supermarket, new stores for Farmers and The Warehouse, a new food court, the redevelopment of the speciality stores and services, new parking structures and an upper level link to Glenfield Rd.

Table 4: Composition of retail activities after the 2000 re-development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Inside Mall</th>
<th>Outside Mall in Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchor store</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General retail goods</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General retail services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/financial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health related services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating places</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment&amp;recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial accommodation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Non-retail facilities

The residents of Glenfield are well serviced with the number and variety of non retail facilities. In close association with the retail and other business facilities, such as restaurants and cafes, a pool and leisure complex, a private music centre, CAB and various community organisations such as a senior citizens advice centre, a WINZ office, library, council service centre, two creches, and medical services.
There is a secondary college, an intermediate and a primary school within half a kilometre\(^{18}\) of the centre with another secondary and primary school just outside this area. There are two community centres whose clients are drawn from areas both within and outside of the host community. There are three churches. A foodbank and community food shop are sited opposite the Mall. The Glenfield police station is close to the strip shops. Marlborough Reserve has recently been redeveloped with a skateboard park.

**Table 5: Composition of non-retail activities after the 2000 re-development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Inside Mall</th>
<th>Outside Mall in Centre</th>
<th>Host Community (estimates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools, kindergarten, playcentre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement homes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central government agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary organisations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{18}\) Measured in a direct line.
5 Effects of the retail facility

5.1 Overview of effects analysis

The various aspects of potential effect and impact

There can be various ways in which a large retail facility impacts on those who live or work in the vicinity. This research aims to identify, analyse and describe the nature of such impacts.

A new or upgraded supermarket may provide new opportunities for nearby residents to shop locally, thereby changing the way in which they use their neighbourhood centre and the pattern of their shopping activity. These changes may lead directly to changes in the level of social interactions within the local community. By stimulating other retail activities to co-locate, or attracting social agencies or community organisations to co-locate, a new or upgraded supermarket may also catalyse new opportunities for community focus and social interaction locally. These impacts are contributions to the functional (i.e. shopping-related) and social amenity values of the neighbourhood. The activities associated with building and operating a supermarket and the behaviour of people who visit the supermarket may generate other off-site environmental effects which have social consequences for those living nearby. Finally, the development of a new or enlarged supermarket in one location may impact on the levels of patronage in other neighbouring centres.

Each of these aspects of potential impact is described and analysed in sections 5.2 to 5.4.

5.2 Changes in the contributions to amenity values

Changes in retail (functional) amenity for local residents

Usage of the Mall by local residents - usage level by locals, reasons for use, frequency of use

The development or re-development of a main retail facility may involve the advent of a new mall or supermarket to an area, or changes in design, layout, size, hours of operation and the range of goods and services available. The case of Glenfield Mall involved a major re-development (expansion, upgrade and re-furbishment) of an existing mall facility.

In the analysis which follows, results will be presented for all responses in the host community and also disaggregated between several areas of interviewing. Three sub-areas can be differentiated - responses from residents in the ‘near’ area, ‘east’ area, and ‘west’ area.

Usage level by locals

Interviews with residents in the host community revealed that the Glenfield Mall is a significant local retail destination, with 99% of the residents using the Mall. Usage was similar across all areas of interviewing.
Due to the high levels of usage by local residents prior to its re-development, only very small incremental changes in their usage of the Mall occurred - from 97% beforehand to 99% afterwards\(^1\). 

**Reasons for use**

Residents were asked what they used the Mall for since the re-development in 2000. Responses have been broadly categorised as either:

- main grocery shop
- top-up shopping
- eating/social/entertainment (including use of cafes, restaurants, takeaway, bars)
- retail services (including use of banks, post office)
- other retail (including use of specialty stores and department stores).

‘Retail services’ (85%), ‘other retail’ (85%), and ‘main grocery shop’ (84%) received the highest responses, followed by ‘eating/social/entertainment’ (55%) and ‘top-up shopping’ (49%). The lower response rate in the ‘eating/social/entertainment’ category may reflect an age bias in the interview sample, that is, the high percentage of interviewees over the age of 30 (83%)\(^2\). A number of respondents noted that the Mall was no longer so appealing as a place for eating and socialising due to its perceived new focus on youth. In particular, respondents referred to the prevalence of clothing stores that catered for youth, and the “youth-oriented” food court which failed to take advantage of views down the valley towards Rangitoto Island. In terms of the lower response rate in the ‘top-up shopping’ category, comments from residents interviewed indicate that at times it is more convenient for them to use a small local shop/corner shop for top-up items.

Analysis by areas of interviewing shows some differences, including fewer respondents using the Mall for their ‘main grocery shop’ and ‘top-up shopping’ in the east area. Residents at the feedback meeting noted that because the two supermarkets within the Mall were owned by the same company, there was no competition and largely the same stock. They were therefore in the habit of shopping elsewhere for competitive prices and alternative goods.

Residents were also asked what they used the Mall for prior to the re-development in 2000. Respondents’ use of the Mall for all but one of the purposes has increased since the re-development in 2000. There has been a slight decrease in the number of people using the Mall for their main grocery shop, from 88% to 84%. This decrease is based in the east area where the percentage of residents using the Mall for their main grocery shop has decreased from 83% to 72%, and the west area where their was a decrease from 91% to 89%. Other purposes have increased, ‘top-up shopping’ has risen from 39% to 49%, ‘eating/social/entertainment’ from 31% to 55%, ‘retail services’ from 68% to 85%, and ‘other retail’ from 57% to 85%.

\(^1\) Statistically, this difference would be insignificant.

\(^2\) The percentage of the interview sample below the age of 20 was particularly small (4%).
Table 6: Respondents’ reasons for use of Glenfield Mall before and after the redevelopment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/sub-area</th>
<th>Use for ‘main grocery shop’</th>
<th>Use for ‘top-up shopping’</th>
<th>Use for ‘eating/social/entertainment’</th>
<th>Use for ‘retail services’</th>
<th>Use for ‘other retail’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>After</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>After</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all nearby residents interviewed</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near area</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east area</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west area</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency of use

Residents were asked typically how often they used the Mall over the past 12 months. Ninety seven per cent of respondents reported visits to the Glenfield Mall on a weekly basis or more frequently. Most commonly (55%), local residents use the Glenfield Mall ‘several times a week’, with the next most common frequency being ‘weekly’ at 26% and ‘daily’ at 16%.

Residents were also asked typically how often they had used the Mall prior to the redevelopment in 2000. Ninety one per cent of the respondents reported visits to the Glenfield Mall on a weekly basis or more frequently prior to the redevelopment. There has therefore been an increase in frequency of visits to the Mall. Most commonly (47%), local residents had used the Glenfield Mall ‘several times a week’, with the next most common frequency being ‘weekly’ at 26% and daily at 18%. The largest increase has been amongst those using the Mall ‘several times a week’ - from 47% prior to the redevelopment to 55% after the redevelopment.

In terms of areas of interviewing, there appear to be some differences. The table below shows that respondents in the near area use the Mall slightly more than those in the west and east areas on a weekly or more frequent basis, both prior to and after the Mall redevelopment. Respondents in the west area did however report a significant increase in visits on weekly or more frequent basis after the Mall redevelopment.

Table 7: Respondents’ frequency of use of Glenfield Mall before and after the redevelopment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/sub-area</th>
<th>Visit Mall weekly or more frequently -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prior to re-development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all nearby residents interviewed</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near area</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east area</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west area</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mode of travel to the Mall

When asked their usual mode of travel to the Mall, a similar number of respondents reported travelling to the Mall by foot and by car. While 34% usually walked to the Mall and 23% usually
drew to the Mall, an additional 32% sometimes walked and sometimes drove. For these respondents, whether they walked or drove often depended on whether or not they were doing their main grocery shop or were on the way home from work (in which case they would drive), or whether or not they wanted to exercise or to avoid weekend parking hassles (in which case they would walk). Residents at the feedback meeting who all lived in the ‘near’ area described a very busy weekend carpark at the Mall. In addition to walking or driving, there were several residents who took taxis or got a lift with a friend or relative for mobility reasons.

While similar numbers of respondents in the near and west areas reported walking or driving to the Mall, proportions were quite different in the east area. In the east area there were fewer respondents who reportedly walked to the Mall, and greater numbers of respondents who drove to, or walked and drove to the Mall.

Table 8: Respondents’ usual mode of travel to Glenfield Mall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/sub-area</th>
<th>Usually walk to the Mall</th>
<th>Usually drive to the Mall</th>
<th>Both walk and drive to the Mall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all nearby residents interviewed; n=126</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near area; n=29</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east area; n=43</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west area; n=54</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, on the basis of this research, the Mall re-development has been beneficial for residents of the host community almost all local households now use the Mall for some shopping. There have been increases in the proportions of local residents using it for top-up shopping, retail goods and services and eating/social/entertainment purposes, and increases in the overall frequency of use by local residents.

Changes in usage of the wider Glenfield shopping centre by local residents

Being a major local focus of retail activity, a mall may benefit other retail activities through co-location. This aspect of the Glenfield Mall’s contribution to local retail amenity was explored with residents in several questions.

Usage level by locals of the shopping centre when visiting the Mall

Residents were asked how often over the last 12 months would their visits to the Mall also involve visits to other places in the Glenfield shopping centre. It was not common for residents to ‘always’ or ‘often’ visit both (16%). Approximately two thirds of the respondents however, noted that they would ‘sometimes’ visit both (62%). Twenty two per cent of the respondents said that their visits to the Mall would ‘never’ involve visits to other places in the shopping centre. Residents at the feedback
meeting believed that a lot of the shops on Glenfield Road were no longer managed by the owners and therefore they did not enjoy a personal service that they hitherto had experienced.

A closer look at the three main areas reveals some differences. Those living closer to the Mall (in the near area) are more likely to visit other places in the shopping centre when visiting the Mall. Conversely, those in the west are not as likely to visit other places in the shopping centre when visiting the Mall. Comments from some residents during interviews in the west area indicate that they are more likely to make separate trips to other places in the shopping centre, due in part to their closer proximity to these places, compared with residents in the near and east areas who are to some extent separated from these by the Mall. Respondents gave the impression that this proximity meant that it was fairly easy to ‘pop up’ to the shopping centre to ‘grab something’, rather than having to plan to do it while at the Mall. Arguably, this is reinforced by the number of residents in the west who walk to the Mall (44% who walk + 28% who walk and drive - see above), the high number of residents in the west who use the shopping centre for ‘other retail’ (80% - see below), and the higher visiting rates to individual businesses and organisations in the shopping centre than residents in the near and east areas (see below).

Table 9: Visits by respondents to other places in the Glenfield shopping centre when they visit Glenfield Mall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/sub-area</th>
<th>Visit other places in the shopping centre when visiting the Mall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Never’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all nearby residents interviewed; n = 126</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near area; n=29</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east area; n=43</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west area; n=54</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for use of shopping centre

Residents were asked what other businesses or organisations have they visited in the Glenfield shopping centre over the past 12 months. Responses were broadly categorised as either:

- community organisation (including the community centre, library, leisure centre, play centre, senior citizens, church, second hand shop)
- health/medical facility (including doctors, physiotherapists, pharmacy)
- retail services (including banks, ATMs, lawyers, hair salon, drycleaners, laundromat, video shop)
- other retail (including dairy, liquor store, hardware store)
- eating/social/entertainment (including restaurants, takeaways, bar, chipmunks).

‘Community organisations’ received the highest response (84%), followed by ‘health/medical facility’ (66%), ‘other retail’ (63%), and ‘retail services’ (61%), and then ‘eating/social/entertainment’ (44%).

Analysis of the three main areas indicates that respondents in the west area have particularly high levels of usage compared with other areas.
Further analysis shows that just under three quarters of the residents had used the local library, half had used the pharmacy, just under half had used a bank, the leisure centre, the hardware store, health/medical facilities (for example: doctors), the dairy, or a restaurant/takeaway, and one third had used an ATM. Twenty seven per cent had used the community centre.

The analysis also shows that the level of visits to ‘other places’ in the shopping centre sometimes varied quite markedly between the west area, and the near and east areas, although not in every case. However, in most cases of difference, residents from the west area reported higher visiting rates than their counterparts in the near and east areas.
**Table 11: Other places in Glenfield shopping centre respondents have visited in the past 12 months**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Other place’ in Glenfield shopping centre visited in past 12 months</th>
<th>All nearby residents interviewed; n=98</th>
<th>Near area; n=29</th>
<th>East area; n=43</th>
<th>West area; n=54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure centre/swimming pool</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centre</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior citizens</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play centre</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor/medical centre/clinic</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapist/optometrist</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATM</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair salon</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video shop</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundromat</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry cleaners</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware store</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy/bakery</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor store</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub/bar</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipmunks</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Changes to use of shopping centre**

Whether or not the re-development of the Glenfield Mall has had any effect on the use of this locality by local residents was explored in a specific question.

Prior to the re-development of Glenfield Mall, 71% of all those who were interviewed had visited businesses and organisations in the Glenfield shopping centre, and 29% either did not visit (7%) or did not live nearby at that time (22%).

Of those who did already visit other businesses and organisations in the shopping centre, over two thirds reported no change to their level of use (68%), 18% reported a decrease in use, and 14% reported an increase in use. Of the 37 residents who either did not visit or did not live nearby prior to the re-development, 35 have subsequently begun visiting other businesses and organisations in the shopping centre. Thus, the redevelopment of the Mall has been associated with an increase in visits to the shopping centre by 37% of the nearby residents interviewed for this case study.
Overall, there has therefore been an increase in locals use of other shops in the neighbourhood shopping centre as a consequence of the Mall re-development\textsuperscript{22}.

**Table 12:** Respondents reporting increased use of the Glenfield shopping centre since the Mall re-development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/sub-area</th>
<th>% reporting increased use of businesses and organisations in shopping centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all nearby residents interviewed; n=126</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near area; n=29</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east area; n=43</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west area; n=54</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amongst those who said their use of other shops in the shopping centre had increased, respondents referred to their dislike of the new Mall, the greater variety of businesses in the shopping centre, the Mall redevelopment, increased awareness of what was in the shopping centre, and proximity -

(From the near area)  
“because I live closer”

(From the east area)  
“go to Mall less because does not have facilities there for me and too busy”
“the Mall re-developed, so go there (shopping centre) as well”

(From the west area)  
“Foodtown is so busy, re-development made visits there too long, so easier to go to dairy on main road now”  
“moved closer to the centre”
“don’t like Mall now”
“more variety now”
“closer as get older”
“doctors there”
“new to area at the time and did not know them, now we know what is up there (shopping centre)”

Amongst those who said their use of other shops in the shopping centre had decreased, respondents referred to changes in their use of the Mall, personal reasons (health, age), loss of businesses in shopping centre, and lack of parking -

(From the near area)  
“because I have got older and do not need it as much”
“used to use the bank and pharmacy more”
“due to ill health I do not shop as much”
“more available at Mall”

\textsuperscript{22} As in the previous footnote, this represents another net positive effect of the re-development.
(From the east area)
“don’t go to the Mall as much now as expensive, go to Albany”
“use Mall a bit more”
“go to the Mall now”
“well it is available in the Mall”
“parking is more difficult around this area”

(From the west area)
“do not use the pharmacy anymore”
“Mall re-developed”
“some shops left the centre”
“easier to use shops in Mall when doing grocery shop”

Residents’ rating of the functional amenity value in the Glenfield shopping centre

Residents were asked to rate the Glenfield shopping centre for the extent to which it provided for several amenity values, including a place to go shopping. Their rating was on a 5-point scale from “very important” to “not at all important”.

As a place to go shopping, the highest proportion of responses (43%) rated the Glenfield shopping centre as “very important”, while 38% also rated it as “important”. Responses generally were grouped towards the “very important” end of the spectrum. Averaging responses over all the residents interviewed gave a collective rating of “important” (a numerical score of 4.1 on a scale of 1-5).

Changes in social amenity value

Shopping centres have the potential to provide other aspects of amenity value besides functional (retail shopping) amenity. This may happen in several ways. A centre of retailing activity implies a gathering point for people who wish to go shopping. The concentration of people at certain times creates the basis for potential social interactions or for other functions. Thus, particular businesses associated with socialising activity - cafes, restaurants, bars, cinemas - may establish to take advantage of this opportunity. Similarly, community organisations - for example service centres, libraries, creches - or social agencies may operate within or close to shopping centres and thereby take advantage of the opportunity to access larger numbers of people. Similar co-locational patterns have been observed (Baines et al., 2003) for health-related services such as medical centres, physiotherapy clinics and veterinary surgeries.

Thus it is that the aggregation of shopping activities and the co-location of other business and community activities in and around a shopping centre can contribute to the creation of social amenity value for local residents. Residents may benefit by being able to satisfy several needs simultaneously - the need to purchase goods or services, the need to access other services essential to their personal or household welfare, and the need to socialise with others.

23 Categories of response were given a numerical score on a scale of 5 (very important) to 1 (not at all important). These numerical scores were then summed to produce an average rating. Numerical results are summarised in Appendix B.
Residents' rating of the social amenity value in the Glenfield shopping centre

Residents were asked to rate the Glenfield shopping centre for the extent to which it provided for several amenity values - a place to visit for personal or household services (such as a doctor or bank), a place to walk and browse, and a place to meet friends or family for social purposes. Their rating was on a 5-point scale from “very important” to “not at all important”.

As a place to visit for personal or household services, the highest proportion of responses (42%) rated the Glenfield shopping centre as “important”, while an additional 28% rated it as “very important”. Averaging responses over all the residents interviewed gave a collective rating of “important” (a numerical score of 3.7 on a scale of 1-5).

As a place to go walking and browsing, the highest proportion of responses (28%) rated the Glenfield shopping centre as “important”, while similar proportions rated it as “not important” (25%), and “neither important or unimportant” (22%). Averaging responses over all the residents interviewed gave a collective rating of “neither important or unimportant” (a numerical score of 3 on a scale of 1-5). As noted earlier this may reflect the high percentage of interviewees over the age of 30 (83%) in the interview sample. This is reinforced in an analysis of residents’ rating of Glenfield Mall as a place to go walking and browsing by age. Higher percentages of younger people (16-30 year olds) rated the Mall as a place to go walking and browsing as important (55% of 16-30 year olds, 37% of 31-60 year olds, 40% of 61 year olds and over).

As a place to meet friends or family for social purposes, the highest proportion of responses rated the Glenfield shopping centre as “not important” (32%) and “not at all important” (18%). However, 26% rated it as “important” and 7% rated it as “very important”. The responses in this case were therefore spread more evenly across the whole spectrum. Residents at the feedback meeting commented on the lack of a restaurant or café other than the fast food type or the tavern in Glenfield. Averaging responses over all the residents interviewed gave a collective rating of “neither important or unimportant” (a numerical score of 2.7 on a scale of 1-5). Again, this may be explained by the high number of respondents aged over 30 years. An analysis of residents rating of the Mall as a place to meet friends and family to socialise as important (41% of 16-30 year olds, 34% of 31-60 year olds, 29% of 61 year olds and over). A number of elderly during the course of the interviews talked of the Mall no longer being a place that provided for their age group due to the change in mix of shops and new layout with large food halls.

Numerical results and comparisons with other centres are provided in Appendix B.

Perceptions of the Glenfield shopping centre as a centre of local community

Over half of the businesses and organisations interviewed (58%) consider that the Glenfield shopping centre functions well as a social centre for the nearby residential community. For the most part this was because of its range of shops and services and its function as a meeting place for adults and teenagers, in other words, because of the integration of functional and social amenity -

“because it’s large and it has all sorts of services, it’s a ‘one stop shop’”
“community centre provides services for the locals”
“library acts as centre for the elderly, lot of elderly come every day to talk and meet others, we run Mandarin story time, young mothers swap phone numbers, it is very social, it is good for after school, school children come here, multiple birth groups meet regularly”

“Somewhere for people to go, people get pleasure out of shopping, having coffee - has brought more people to the area”

“lots of services here for people”

“because of all the services that are available locally”

“it’s bigger, more accessible, easy to access, even for disabled”

“the shopping centre provides almost everything for residents, a place where they can gather and share their opinions”

“It’s always busy, so socially a good place to go”.  

“it’s a good place for people to meet”

“people do their shopping then come here (restaurant)”

“it certainly seems to be a meeting point, especially with a food court and on a bus route”

“place to go, coffee etc”

“gathering and communication”

“after school there are a lot of teenagers loitering”

“kids hang out here - good and bad”

“for the youngsters only”

“children congregate at McDonalds, not a social hub for adults”

“For youth it is popular, shops geared for youth, youth go there at lunch times and after school”.

This last group of observations points towards a perception that re-development of the Mall has enhanced the location as a focal point for younger people.

Conversely, over one third of the businesses and organisations interviewed (36%) consider that the Glenfield shopping centre does not function well as a social centre for the nearby residential community. These interviewees referred to the centre’s recent orientation more towards youth, a perceived lack of a social or community focal point, and its increasing patronage from elsewhere, for example -

“not a centre for the elderly because for youth”

“more of a business, convenience centre”

“no focus outside the Mall, no alfresco coffee, no heart to the centre out doors, too many levels in Mall, does not flow, cannot act as a centre”

“not so much now, before the re-development everybody knew each other”

Changes in character of the shopping centre as a result of the Mall re-development

A large majority of business and organisation interviewees (64%) reported changes in the character of the Glenfield shopping centre since the re-development of the Glenfield Mall. Most comments relate to population increase, changing ethnic mix, upgraded appearance of Mall and shopping centre buildings and better integration between the Mall and the wider centre, traffic increase, and increased youth in the area -
“ethnic composition, emergence of Asians and international students”
“old Mall was tired and run down, so new Mall is better”
“bigger ethnic mix”
“it’s certainly busier”
“the area is more central now”
“was dated and dreary, now brighter and something for everybody, sidewalks on Glenfield Road done up, Mall appears to belong to the front of the street now”
“shops around Mall have done up frontages, dressed up, refurbished”
“there seems to be a lower socio-economic group that gather at the Mall, particularly in the evening, its mostly young people”
“more traffic, busier, not as sleepy as it was”
“different types of people around, i.e. different ethnic mix”
“general foot traffic increasing”
“I’d say its improved the whole area, the old Mall was a rat bag of a place”
“more people from outside area, more use of the Mall, and shops around the Mall received facelifts”
“more younger people congregate here, used to go to Takapuna”
“more people in area”
“shops up here have improved their appearance to match with the Mall - new buildings, facades, cleaner”.

At the feedback meeting one community organisation director commented on the change of community identity in Glenfield as a result of different people “flowing into the area from outside Glenfield”, and because there was a significant decrease in the number of local owners of businesses and employees both within and outside of the Mall.

**Meeting local needs**

The extent to which the Glenfield Mall and the Glenfield shopping centre meet the various amenity needs of local residents was explored in a series of questions examining extent, frequency, (shopping) purpose and reasons for going elsewhere. Whether or not this need had changed since the re-development of the Mall is also analysed.

**Visiting other shopping centres**

In the last twelve months, 98% of all residents living near the Glenfield Mall who were interviewed said that they had visited another shopping centre.

Analysis of visits to other shopping centres over this period reveals that visits several times a year have the predominant frequency, although the pattern of visits was spread broadly across frequent and infrequent visits. This holds for all areas of interviewing. However, there are some differences in degree between residents in the sub-areas, as reported below.
Table 13: Frequency of visits by respondents to other shopping centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/sub-area</th>
<th>Frequency of visits to other shopping centres</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weekly or more frequently</td>
<td>fortnightly to monthly</td>
<td>several times a year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all nearby residents interviewed; n=126</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near area; n=29</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east area; n=43</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west area; n=54</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Popular shopping centre destinations other than the Glenfield shopping centre include Takapuna (48%), Albany (45%), Milford (35%), Birkenhead (33%), and Northcote (16%). These shopping centres (the most popular mentioned) are all on the North Shore.

A different range of shops is the reason why 49% of residents visit other shopping centres. Greater choice is important to 17% of residents. Going for ‘something different’ or going to have a look around is important to 14% of people, while going elsewhere for specials or cheaper products is also important for 13% of residents. Eleven per cent of residents noted that they would visit other shopping centres because it was convenient, that is, they were in the area for work, dropping kids off at school or visiting friends. Seven per cent visited other shopping centres to socialise or eat out, while five per cent noted that they made special visits to see their doctor, visit their bank, hairdresser or gym.

For a large majority of residents24 (69%), the re-development of the Glenfield Mall has not made any significant difference to their pattern of visiting other shopping centres. For 14% of residents the re-development of the Mall has decreased their use of other shopping centres. For another 14% however, their use of other shopping centres has increased.

Amongst those who said that their use of other shopping centres had ‘decreased a little’, residents commented -

“go to Mall now because more selection in Mall”
“because Glenfield Mall has all we need now”
“more variety in Mall”
“more services and goods at Glenfield”
“got everything here and older now”
“Mall re-developed, more to offer”
“with Mall re-development, most in Mall”

Amongst those who said that their use of other shopping centres had ‘decreased a lot’, residents commented -

“Glenfield has more shops and its bigger”
“love new Mall - its shops etc”

---

24 Percentage based on residents who use other shopping centres and lived in the area prior to the re-development of the Glenfield Mall.
Amongst those who said that their use of other shopping centres had ‘increased a little’, residents commented -

“not well enough to walk and I rely on my daughter for transportation and the shops are not as convenient for me now”
“because retired, look for bargains, compare prices”
“when my children have time to take me”
“all the shops that are not ‘chain stores’ like haberdashery left the Mall so now I have to go away to get such products”
“because go with friends to Albany”
“don’t like Glenfield Mall and its range of shops”

Amongst those who said that their use of other shopping centres had ‘increased a lot’, residents commented -

“Glenfield Mall is expensive therefore I go to Albany Pak n Save”
“happier with Birkenhead Mall and I can drive so I am not confined to Glenfield Mall”
“easier to get around because it is compact and flat”
“got used to others during Mall re-development, also new Mall is not built for locals, more specialist shops for teens etc”.

There is a general consistency in responses to questions about the use of Glenfield Mall and shopping centre and the use of other malls and shopping centres.

5.3 Effects on other retailers and organisations within the host community

In order to assess possible effects of the Mall re-development on other retailers and organisations within the host community, it is first necessary to understand the nature of the businesses and organisations operating in the locality, their links with each other and their links with the local community.

A total of 33 businesses and organisations in the locality of the Glenfield Mall were interviewed for this case study. Twenty one businesses were interviewed using a fully structured questionnaire. Of these 21 businesses, 15 had been present before the Mall re-developed, two (a finance company and real estate agent) opened in the same year as the re-development, and four (two liquor stores, an Asian restaurant, and Chipmunks - a childrens’ leisure centre) had opened since. Twelve community organisations were interviewed using a fully structured questionnaire. All of these organisations were present prior to the Mall re-development in 2000.

Of the 21 businesses interviewed, at least eight (38%) had previously been located elsewhere. Over half (five) of these had relocated from within the Glenfield locality or from nearby centres (Wairau), while the other three had relocated from further a field in the North Shore (Albany) and Auckland (Otahuhu). Those who had relocated from previous locations relatively nearby explained their move with the following comments -
Of the 12 organisations interviewed, at least three (25%) had previously been located elsewhere. Two of these had relocated from within the Glenfield locality. One noted that the premises they were in was to be used for some other purpose, while the other said that they had out grown their old premises.

A very high proportion of the businesses and organisations interviewed provide off-street parking for their staff (88%), with a slightly lower proportion (79%) - though still high - providing off-street parking for their customers/clients. Quite a number however (seven), noted that this parking provision was limited.

A small number of businesses reported belonging to a local business association. This is in line with comments received from the local businesses association chair person who described the association as somewhat ‘inactive’, with only one meeting a year. The chair person did note however that the association was very active during the Mall re-development, with local businesses showing keen interest in the effects of the re-development on their businesses and possible mitigation strategies. Businesses and community organisations at the feedback meeting expressed an interest in the association becoming more active and were keen to establish links with Mall management by way of occasional meetings.

Perceived advantages of location

Four main themes are apparent when business and organisation interviewees described what they see as the advantages of their business or organisation location in Glenfield. The first two themes are closely related to each other. Forty eight per cent refer to their specific location within the Glenfield shopping centre as providing them with good visibility to customers because their street frontage or proximity exposes them to relatively high volumes of foot traffic and passing vehicle traffic. Linked to this, and referred to by 45% of interviewees, is the advantage of being on a key transport route that channels people in from other areas, and being in a central location which is close to their customer base. Indeed, over half (58%) of the businesses and organisations reported a customer catchment based in Glenfield. A further 30% reported a customer catchment extending throughout the North Shore.

Twenty seven per cent of interviewees also mentioned the convenience and importance of having amenities, and “like minded organisations” close by. Many of the social agencies noted the use of related agencies by their clients, both schools noted their use of recreational facilities, the medical centre and the Mall, and one organisation noted the donations received from local businesses.

For 18% of businesses and organisations, the convenience of the centre for their customers/clients was considered important. In particular, the ‘one-stop’ nature of the centre/Mall, the desire of locals to use the centre/Mall, and the ability for family members to use the Mall while another member visits an organisation in the centre were considered important. One business commented at the feedback meeting that “now that the Mall has redeveloped I take clients there for a coffee”.

“moved because no foot traffic, wanted a more central site”
“wanted more space and visibility”
“moved because of better premises”
“moved because of bigger premises”
Perceived disadvantages of location

Thirty per cent of the businesses and organisations interviewed reported no disadvantages of their location. The main disadvantages that were reported relate to a lack of parking (33%), traffic volume (15%), and poor visibility (12%). Some of the comments received from businesses and organisations include -

- “Westfield workers parking in Downing Street all day long”
- “parking is difficult at busy times”
- “limited/restricted parking as we grow”
- “traffic congestion - patients often arrive late for appointments”
- “pedestrian crossing is not easy on Bentley Avenue, especially for elderly and younger mums, speeding cars are dangerous”
- “busy road - noisy”
- “main road - everything (traffic) is too quick”
- “we would prefer a more visible frontage”
- “not on road, so customers do not know where we are located”.

Both schools commented on the downside of being located near to a shopping centre/Mall, noting that their students at times got into trouble when ‘hanging out’ at the centre/Mall (vandalism, graffiti, stealing etc).

Business/commercial links with others in the Glenfield shopping centre

Sixty one per cent of the businesses and organisations interviewed reported commercial links of some sort with other businesses or organisations in the Glenfield shopping centre. A number also reported common customers/clients.

The most common link with other businesses and organisations (52%) was the buying or selling of goods and services, including the purchase of food, stationary, and hardware, and the selling of discounted gym memberships, hardware, key cutting, photo developing, and the hiring of meeting rooms.

Several businesses also mentioned sponsorship of local sports groups and the use of the local tavern by their social club. One organisation mentioned receiving sponsorship and opportunities for youth to train at local businesses.

Links with the Glenfield Mall

Three types of linkage between Glenfield Mall and other businesses and organisations in the Glenfield shopping centre were explored in the interviews - business links such as sales, purchases, and sponsorships, use of the Mall car park by customers accessing other businesses and organisations, and dealings with the Mall management.

Approximately two thirds (64%) of the businesses and organisations interviewed reported commercial links with the Glenfield Mall. A number also reported common customers. The most common link (36%) was the buying or selling of goods and services, including purchases of food and stationery, and the use of banking services. Several interviewees noted that they had accounts with
some stores in the Mall, for example The Warehouse, Woolworths, and Dick Smith. Two businesses also paid for the use of allocated Mall car parks. Two organisations noted the donations they received from Mall stores (for example: food, lost property, Christmas presents, and money), and the opportunity to use Mall display space.

Reinforcing claims that parking is limited in the shopping centre, 52% of the businesses and organisations interviewed in the shopping centre thought that their customers probably used the Mall car park. While thirty per cent thought that their customers wouldn’t, 18% were unsure.

Just under half (48%) of the businesses and organisations interviewed reported dealings with Mall management. Five of these related to use of display space, three related to off-site issues (youth, lighting, trolleys), another three related to parking issues, one related to school activities, and one to donations. One additional dealing occurred around the time of the re-development and involved re-development issues.

Change since the re-development of Glenfield Mall

Investigation of the changes experienced by local businesses since the Glenfield Mall re-development in 2000 involved an open-ended question (... any changes since ...?) as well as a series of closed questions about specific aspects of change (e.g. opening hours? customer numbers?, etc.).

Three quarters (74%) of the businesses and organisations interviewed had noticed changes since the Mall re-development in 2000. The most common observation (52%) related to the positive impact of increased passing vehicle and foot traffic and a wider catchment area for business. This was corroborated by the one bank manager at the feedback meeting. There were four interviewees however who noted a downturn due to fewer customers and competing businesses. A number of interviewees mentioned changes to the level of contact with others in the shopping centre (increased), parking (more difficult), donations (increased), and public relations (decreased).

Responses to specific questions, are summarised in the following table.
Table 14: Changes experienced by businesses and organisations in the Glenfield shopping centre since the Mall re-development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of change</th>
<th>Local businesses and organisations interviewed - established prior to re-development (n = 27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| different hours of opening                   | 21 - no change  
|                                             | 4 - extended hours  
|                                             | 2 - non response  |
| changes in customer/client numbers          | 14 - no change  
|                                             | 8 - increased  
|                                             | 2 - decreased  
|                                             | 3 - non response  |
| changes in timing of customer/client visits | 21 - no change  
|                                             | 1 - mornings more popular  
|                                             | 1 - afternoons more popular  
|                                             | 4 - non response  |
| changes to traffic flows outside premises   | 24 - increased  
|                                             | 3 - no change  
|                                             | 1 - non response  |
| changes in pedestrian patterns outside premises | 11 - no change  
|                                             | 11 - increased  
|                                             | 1 - decreased  
|                                             | 4 - non response  |

Of the 27 businesses and organisations interviewed that were established in the shopping centre prior to the Mall re-development in 2000, 37% had not experienced any change to turnover/patronage, 22% had experienced an increase in turnover/patronage, and seven per cent had experienced a decrease in turnover/patronage. An additional 30% of interviewees either did not know or would not comment. A closer look at responses from businesses compared with responses from organisations shows a more varied experience by businesses who had experienced a mix of increase (33%), decrease (7%) and no change to turnover (20%). Organisations on the other hand had a more common experience of no change to levels of patronage (58%).

Of those businesses and organisations that reported an increase in turnover/patronage, two noted that it was probably due to the Mall’s presence attracting customers to the shopping centre. For one business and one organisation however, the Mall was seen as having a negative influence on turnover/patronage due to the competition it had created.

**New businesses since the Glenfield Mall re-development in 2000**

Of the 21 businesses interviewed in this case study, only six had been established since the Glenfield Mall re-development in 2000. Rather than representing diversification, these openings reinforce indications that the Glenfield shopping centre is a well established stable centre. Indeed, many businesses, some residents and the business association chairperson noted the upgrading of business and organisation frontages in the shopping centre to bring them into line with the upgraded Mall.

Few business closures were reported by businesses and organisations in the Glenfield shopping centre. If a business does close it is quickly re-opened as a new business according to those at the feedback meeting. While the closure of a skating rink and the relocation of a real estate were noted,
both were reportedly replaced by other businesses. Several also noted the relocation of a number of businesses into the Mall, including a bank, post office and travel agency.

**Relationship between the host community and the businesses in the Glenfield shopping centre**

Just over half of the 21 businesses interviewed have sponsorship arrangements of some kind with a variety of community organisations. Schools, sports groups and churches appear to be the primary focus of support in the local area (seven of the 11 businesses), although the sponsorship of a graffiti cleaning group was also mentioned. Five of the eleven businesses are involved in sponsorships further afield.

**5.4 Off-site effects on residents of the host community**

As described in Section 2.1 on research methods, interviewees were first given an opportunity to report unprompted any positive, negative or other effects that they had experienced as a result of the Mall’s presence and operation. A ‘prompted’ section that followed contained detailed questions relating to a number of potential effects identified in literature reviews, past Taylor Baines work in the retail sector, and resource consent documentation for the Glenfield Mall’s re-development in 2001.

Of the 126 residents interviewed in Glenfield, 13 or 10% reported no off-site effects at all. However, the level of reporting no off-site effects was not evenly distributed across all interview areas, as shown in Table 15.

**Table 15: Residents reporting NO off-site effects from Mall’s operation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview sample</th>
<th>Near area</th>
<th>East area</th>
<th>West area</th>
<th>All interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># interviewees reporting no off-site effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% interviewees reporting no off-site effects</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not surprising that the lowest level of reporting no off-site effects occurred in the ‘near’ and ‘east’ areas of interviewing. For the most part this is further reinforced by data presented in Table 16 which shows the spatial distribution of residents who did report effects.

The following tables provide a summary of the proportions of those interviewed who discussed particular effects in their responses to the structured questionnaire. It is important to note that these percentages do **not** represent the proportions of neighbours who experienced significant off-site impacts as a consequence. These data are shown in the last column.
Table 16: Summary table of responses by residents living in the vicinity of the Glenfield Mall (N=126)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect reported</th>
<th>% Unprompted + Prompted</th>
<th>Number Unprompted + Prompted</th>
<th>Number reporting impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic related:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic volume</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44 (all negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic safety</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31 (all negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic noise</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40 (all negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking overflow</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30 (all negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37 (all negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11 (7 positive, 4 negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational noise</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14 (all negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolleys</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10 (all negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual effect of Mall</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12 (4 positive, 8 negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7 (3 positive, 4 negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth behaviour</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6 (all negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference with TV reception</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (both negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 illustrates the spatial distribution of effects reported in Glenfield. While traffic related effects are prominent in all areas of interviewing, other effects are for the most part concentrated or more prominent in the near area where exposure to off-site effects is greater, for example litter, lighting and visual effects. The only effect which is noticed more in the east and west areas is parking overflow, due to the introduction of parking restrictions in the near area after the Mall re-development.
Table 17: Spatial distribution of effects reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect reported</th>
<th>% Unprompted + Prompted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total sample (N=126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO effects reported</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic-related:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic volume</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic safety</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic noise</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking overflow</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational noise</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolleys</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth behaviour</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference with TV reception</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic

Traffic volume effects

A retail facility will generate considerable vehicle traffic. Traffic volume issues were recognised during the Mall re-development consent process, as evident in planning documents for the re-development and subsequent consent conditions (see below under Mitigation?). Planning reports note a predicted 28% increase or an additional 600 vehicle movements in and out of the Mall between 4:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. under the initial re-development proposal (1995). Similarly, under the amended re-development proposal an increase of 534 vehicle movements was predicted. Analysis in the initial proposal also noted a possible 73% increase in peak hour traffic flow at the eastern end of Downing Street (329 existing, 570 predicted), and a 24% increase on Bentley Avenue between Downing Street and Chartwell Avenue (1,210 existing, 1,500 predicted). It was recognised that as a result, the re-development had the potential to create significant concern for those opposed to it and living on Bentley Avenue, Downing Street and Chartwell Avenue.

Traffic volume effects were also raised by submitters, who noted concerns over traffic volume created by private vehicles and service vehicles, and the potential for this to create problems with congestion, traffic flow, exiting and entering residential properties, traffic safety, pedestrian safety, and noise. There was also some concern that insufficient public transport could add to these effects. There was
however some reference to the possibility of better traffic flows as a result of the re-development from those in support of the proposal$^{25}$.

Just under half of the residents, three quarters of whom were unprompted, discussed traffic volume effects from the Mall. While the East area had the highest percentage of responses, the Near and West areas had a similar level of response. The majority of respondents had lived in the area prior to the re-development in 2000$^{26}$. The table below indicates the proportion of residents who discussed the effect in each of the surveyed areas.

### Table 18: Percentage of respondents who reported traffic volume effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview sample</th>
<th>No. of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
<th>% of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All areas</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near area</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West area</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What effect do they notice? Source of effect? Timing, frequency and trends?**

Residents in all areas commented on traffic volume generated as a result of the Mall’s presence. The senior sergeant for the North Shore City traffic police noted in his daily travels that there “appears to be more traffic on Glenfield Road”. The deputy principal of Glenfield College which is on Kaipatiki Road commented on the increase of traffic since the opening of the Kaipatiki Bridge.

Although most were certain the Mall was a contributor to this volume, over half believed that other sources were also likely contributors. The most likely sources included the Kaipatiki Bridge opening, general traffic using key local roads such as Glenfield Road as a thoroughfare, and the Glenfield Shopping Centre. A few residents also mentioned local schools. Thus the re-developed Mall is only one of a number of significant factors contributing to rising traffic volume in the area around Glenfield Mall. Transport planners interviewed at the North Shore City Council also believed that there were several factors involved in the increase in traffic at Glenfield.

Traffic counts in the streets surrounding the Mall before and after the re-development were not available. However, traffic counts on Glenfield Road between Manuka Road and James Street (approximately one kilometre north of the Mall) were obtained from the North Shore City Council. These provide some indication of traffic volume trends on Glenfield Road around the re-development period. Data collected$^{27}$ in June 1998 and November 2000 show a 26% increase in the number of vehicles per week (from 161,432 to 203,727 vehicles) and the average number of

---

$^{25}$ Note: Due to the high number of submissions (1,610), summaries only have been referred to in this case study. Summaries of submissions do not indicate how many residents discussed traffic volume issues, but provide a list of the type of comments made by three categories of submitter: those opposed (35), those in support (1531), those in support but with concerns (44).

$^{26}$ 53 (84%) prior, 10 (16%) since.

$^{27}$ This data represents vehicles travelling both ways on Glenfield Road. In providing this data, the North Shore City Council noted that it was only an approximate indication of traffic flows due to “limitations of traffic counters and their installation, conversion of axle pairs to vehicles counts, seasonal variations, congestion effects, and various analysis procedures” (Hoyle 2003).
vehicles per day (from 23,062 to 29,104 vehicles). Analysis of changes during specific peak periods reflects this increase in traffic volume - a 17% (from 2,032 to 2,381 vehicles) increase during the ‘weekday a.m. peak’ period (7-9 a.m.), a 23% (from 4,258 to 5,249 vehicles) increase during the ‘weekday interpeak’ period (10 a.m. - 4 p.m.), and a 16% (from 2,151 to 2,490 vehicles) increase during the ‘weekday p.m. peak’ period (4-6 p.m.). Although this data cannot necessarily be attributed to the Mall re-development, it does corroborate observations made by respondents relating to increased traffic volume in the area, in particular increased volume on Glenfield Road - a main thoroughfare on the North Shore.

Traffic volume was noticed by residents in their surrounding streets and on main thoroughfares such as Glenfield Road. Residents in all areas noted increased traffic volume on Glenfield Road. In the East area, surrounding streets included Bentley Avenue, Chartwell Road, Marlborough Avenue, and Downing Street. In the Near area, surrounding streets included Bentley Avenue and Downing Street. In the West area, surrounding streets included Kaipatiki Road, Peach Road, Sunnyfield Crescent, Waverley Avenue, and Mayfield Avenue.

When asked when they are most likely to notice increased traffic volumes, most residents (61%) said peak traffic times (morning and/or afternoon). Thirty six percent thought that the increased traffic volume was noticeable in the weekend, twenty five per cent thought that it was noticeable anytime, while some thought that it was at its worst on Thursday and Friday nights (9%). A few residents reported noticing it during sale days at the Mall (7%) or during holiday periods (5%).

The majority of residents noticed the increased traffic volume effects on a daily basis. Only a few residents noticed it once or twice a week. All of the residents who had lived in the area prior to the 2000 re-development of the Mall, reported the increase in traffic volume since the re-development. The mall manager and residents who attended the feedback meeting strongly endorsed the increase of traffic in the immediate area.

**Mitigation?**

Planning documents related to both the initial redevelopment proposal (1995) and the amended proposal (1998) note the potential adverse traffic impacts of the Mall redevelopment, and the absolute necessity that measures be put in place to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the centre. Measures that were proposed remained essentially the same in the initial (1995) and amended (1998) proposal.

Some of the measures required under the consent (1998) conditions included:

- particular designs for the service areas off Bentley Avenue and off Downing Street
- an obligation to undertake alterations to the Glenfield Tavern’s entrance/exit, car park, road markings, landscaping, and pedestrian measures if required by the tavern
- development of the Glenfield Road-Kaipatiki Road intersection
- modification of layout at the Glenfield Road-Downing Street intersection
- modification of layout at the Glenfield Road-Bentley Avenue intersection
- extension of the central painted flush median on Bentley Avenue eastward to the Downing Street intersection
- widening of the Bentley Avenue carriageway to allow for two recessed kerbside parking bays
- widening of entrances to three residential properties on Bentley Avenue
• modification of layout at the Bentley Avenue-Chartwell Avenue intersection
• construction of a solid median island with provision for pedestrian facilities on Glenfield Road between Kaipatiki Road and Bentley Avenue, and at the car park fronting the western shops on Glenfield Road.

Conditions of the resource consent therefore required significant changes to the roading network surrounding the Mall, with a particular focus on road widening, additional access lanes, traffic control measures (such as islands), and signalised intersections.

Mall management is currently planning to open up an additional entrance to the Mall on Bentley Ave.

**Impacts?**

Forty four of the 56 residents (79%) described resulting adverse impacts. Over one third of the residents commented on the difficulty experienced in exiting their driveways and streets. Some also had to choose a quiet time to take the car out. A few additional residents mentioned the time it took to get anywhere, traffic pollution (fumes and dust), and frustration, annoyance and concern.

One resident interviewed in the Near area had contacted the North Shore City Council about traffic volume in the area.

**Summary evaluation**

Despite the absence of recent traffic count data, case study responses confirmed qualitatively the traffic volume increase predicted at the time resource consent were granted.

Traffic volume effects associated with Glenfield Mall were one of the most prominent off-site effects for local residents, with just under half commenting on the effect. Residents were cautious however, to attribute increased traffic volume solely to the Mall, noting several other likely sources. With Glenfield Road acting as a main arterial route through the North Shore there are no obvious solutions to traffic volume problems in the vicinity of the Mall.

**Traffic safety**

A large facility which generates significant volumes of traffic also has the potential to raise traffic safety issues.

Approximately one third of the residents, the majority of whom were prompted, discussed traffic safety effects from the Mall. A higher percentage of residents in the Near area discussed this effect compared with those in the East and West areas. This would be expected considering the high traffic flows around the Mall and Glenfield Road. Most of these residents had lived in the area prior to the Mall re-development in 2000. The table below indicates the proportion of residents who discussed the effect in each of the surveyed areas.
Table 19: Percentage of respondents who reported a change in traffic safety environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview sample</th>
<th>No. of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
<th>% of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All areas</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near area</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West area</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What effect do they notice? Source of effect? Timing, frequency and trends?

Residents commented on safety issues related to changes to transport infrastructure (residents in the West area), increased traffic, increased parking overflow, and poor driver behaviour. These made it difficult for residents to drive in the area, get in and out of their properties (residents in the Near and East areas), and to cross the road (residents in the East and West areas), therefore increasing risk to their personal safety.

Most of the residents attributed this effect to the Mall. However, several noted possible contributions from an increase in people in the area, general traffic (Glenfield Road is a thoroughfare), and the opening of the Kaipatiki Bridge.

Residents experienced these effects on two main roads, Bentley Avenue and Glenfield Road. Some also experienced this effect on Downing Street and Peach Road.

Residents gave mixed responses as to when they are most likely to experience this effect. While the two most common responses were ‘anytime’ and weekends, residents also indicated Christmas, peak traffic times, sale days, night time, and week days. In terms of frequency, over half of the residents experienced this effect on a daily basis.

All residents reported that they experienced this effect more since the Mall re-development in 2000.

Mitigation?

Refer to the section on mitigation under the traffic volume effects section.

Impacts?

Thirty one of the 38 residents (82%) described resulting impacts. These ranged from taking extra care when out driving or walking in the area to an increased feeling of risk to personal safety. Some also described inconvenience, frustration, worry, and anger. For most residents, the resulting impact was either an increased feeling of risk to personal safety or being wary and taking extra care.

None of the residents interviewed had contacted anybody about traffic safety effects associated with the Mall.

Records held by the Land Transport Safety Authority (LTSA) provide data on reported accidents. Accidents of course are at the extreme end of the spectrum of possible impacts from increased traffic.
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volumes and hazards. Nevertheless, the LTSA data set\textsuperscript{28} comparing 45 accidents\textsuperscript{29} during the 33 months before the Mall re-development in October 2000 with 73 accidents during the 21 months since suggests some changes in trends and patterns since the re-development. Although accidents were recorded on all three streets (and four intersections) surrounding the Mall, the Glenfield Road/Kaipatiki Road intersection, Glenfield Road, and the Glenfield Road/Bentley Avenue intersection stood out with the highest number of accidents (since the Mall re-development)\textsuperscript{30}. Overall, there has been a 154\% increase in accidents on the streets surrounding the Mall, from 16.4 per year during the period before the re-development, to 41.7 per year since the re-development. Increases were experienced in all of the streets and intersections surrounding the Mall, with the most significant increases experienced at the Glenfield Road/Kaipatiki Road intersection (a 406\% increase from 1.8 accidents a year before the re-development to 9.1 accidents a year since), Downing Street (a 240\% increase from 1.5 accidents per year before the re-development to 5.1 accidents a year since the re-development), and the Downing/Bentley Street intersection (a 175\% increase from 0.4 accidents per year before the re-development to 1.1 accidents a year since the re-development). Some changes to the times at which accidents take place is evident with a slight increase in the number of accidents taking place after midday (from 67\% to 76\%). There has been little change however to the day of the week (mostly weekdays), time of the year (all year round), or weather conditions (mostly fine) in which accidents take place.

The data also provide some indication of the particular circumstances of each accident, including whether or not a pedestrian was involved, and whether or not the vehicles were entering or exiting the Mall or a private residence. There has not been any significant change to the proportion of accidents in these particular circumstances. Prior to the Mall re-development, 13\% involved pedestrians, 9\% involved vehicles entering or existing the Mall, and 2\% involved vehicles entering or existing private residences. In the period since the Mall re-development, 10\% of the accidents involved pedestrians, 8\% involved vehicles entering or exiting the Mall, and 3\% involved vehicles entering or exiting private residences.

The location of these accidents changed only slightly. Accidents involving pedestrians occurred on Glenfield Road, the Glenfield Road/Bentley Avenue intersection and the Glenfield Road/Downing Street intersection during the period prior to the Mall re-development, and on Glenfield Road, Bentley Avenue and the Glenfield Road/Bentley Avenue intersection since the re-development. Accidents involving vehicles entering or exiting the Mall all occurred on Bentley Avenue prior to the re-development, and on Bentley Avenue and Downing Street since the re-development. Residents at the feedback meeting commented on the size of the delivery trucks and the fact that they are a safety issue because they block the road when waiting to turn in to the Mall.

\textit{Summary evaluation}

Traffic safety effects were an issue for one third of the residents in the vicinity of Glenfield Mall, in particular, safety effects associated with increased traffic volumes, poor driver behaviour and parking

\textsuperscript{28} Data from 23 January 1998 to 28 June 2003.
\textsuperscript{29} Data were analysed for accident locations along Glenfield Road (between Downing Street and Bentley Avenue), Downing Street (between Glenfield Road and Bentley Avenue) and Bentley Avenue (between Glenfield Road and Downing Street), streets that surround Glenfield Mall.
\textsuperscript{30} Glenfield Road/Kaipatiki Road intersection: 9.1 accidents per year; Glenfield Road: 8 accidents per year; Glenfield Road/Bentley Avenue: 7.4 accidents per year.
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overflow. LTSA data reinforces residents’ observations of increased traffic safety effects since the Mall re-development. Although there are no obvious measures available to address increased traffic, it would seem some measures could be looked at to address safety effects associated with parking overflow, including increased parking restrictions on streets surrounding the Mall, the provision of staff parking in the Mall, and additional Mall car parking for customers.

Traffic noise

A large facility which generates significant volumes of traffic also has the potential to raise traffic noise issues. Traffic noise issues were recognised during the Mall re-development consent process, as evident in planning documents for the Glenfield Mall re-development. Discussion in planning reports notes the likelihood of increased traffic noise as a result of the predicted increase in traffic volume (see above), in particular on Bentley Avenue, Downing Street and Chartwell Avenue which had an existing problem with traffic noise/service vehicles.

Just under half of the residents interviewed, half of whom were unprompted, discussed traffic noise effects as a result of the Mall’s presence. While there were similar levels of response in the Near and East areas, a slightly lower level of response was received in the West area. Approximately three quarters of the residents interviewed had lived in the area prior to the Mall re-development in 2000. The table below indicates the proportion of residents who discussed the effect in each of the surveyed areas.

Table 20: Percentage of respondents who reported change in traffic noise as a result of the Glenfield Mall re-development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview sample</th>
<th>No. of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
<th>% of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All areas</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near area</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West area</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What effect do they notice? Source of effect? Timing, frequency and trends?

Residents interviewed described general traffic noise, including the “hum of traffic”. A small number of residents in each of the areas commented on noise from “burn outs”, “wheelies”, “hoons” or “boy racers”. Residents in the Near and East areas also mentioned noise from delivery trucks to the Mall.

Residents in the Near area believed that they are more susceptible to hearing traffic noise because they are situated on a hill and close to a busy intersection on the corner of Bentley Avenue and Downing Street. This results in an accentuation of general traffic noise such as engine acceleration, changing gears, and braking.

The source of the noise-generating traffic was generally held to be the Mall. However, as was the case with responses on traffic volume, it was thought that the Kaipatiki Bridge opening, general thoroughfare traffic and Glenfield Shopping Centre traffic were likely to be partly responsible. Those who noted noise from hoons or boy racers thought the boy racers were at times using the Mall carpark, and at other times using streets surrounding the Mall. Respondents were uncertain as to
whether those using surrounding streets were attracted to the area because of the Mall (especially with its perceived orientation towards youth) or just passing through. Mall management confirmed the use of the Mall car park at times by boy racers, noting the wear and tear to the waterproofing membrane on the top level car park. The top level car park is accessible to the public 24 hours a day because of a tenancy agreement with the owners of a new bar on Level 5.

The streets from which traffic noise was most reported are consistent with those identified as streets with significant levels of traffic volume (see above), especially Glenfield Road and streets surrounding the Mall.

Residents gave mixed responses as to when traffic noise was most noticeable. While some noted peak traffic times, weekends, and “anytime”, several noted Thursday-Friday nights, sale days, and holidays. While for the most part those who heard noise from delivery trucks experienced it early in the morning, residents at the feedback meeting who lived in these areas noted large trailer trucks delivering to the Warehouse at different times during the day. Those who heard noises from hoons or boy racers generally experienced it at night. A Mall security guard spoken to at the time of the feedback meeting confirmed the problem of boy racers using the top car park as a night time occurrence.

General traffic noise was for the most part heard on a daily basis. Delivery trucks were heard by some on a daily basis and by others once or twice a week. Hoons or boy racers were heard less frequently. While some heard them once or twice a week, others had only heard them a few times ever.

The vast majority of residents believed that traffic noise had increased since the re-development of the Mall in 2000. Only two who lived in the West area believed there had not been any change to the level of traffic noise.

Mitigation?

At Christmas time, Mall management allows large containers of goods to be left on the loading dock in order to minimise the number of truck deliveries to the Warehouse. At the time of research, Mall management had initiated discussion with the owners of the new bar on Level 5 in order to address the ease of access to the car park, especially at night time.

Whilst security guards were very aware of the boy racer problem and endeavoured to make their presence known, the “boy racers had scouts with cellphones warning the racers of the whereabouts of the guards on the roof top”.

Impacts?

Forty of the fifty five residents (73%) reported adverse impacts. Residents noted that they were at times frustrated and annoyed about the level of traffic noise. One resident commented, “all noise has a certain level of annoyance”, while another noted that “sometimes you just want quiet”. For a number of residents, the noise could also interrupt them watching television or interrupt their sleep.

Two residents in the East area had contacted the police about noise from hoons/boy racers. Two residents in the Near area had contacted people (a driver and a supermarket) regarding noise from
delivery trucks. Another resident in this area had contacted the North Shore City Council and the AA about general traffic noise. One resident in the West area had contacted the North Shore City Council about general traffic noise.

**Summary evaluation**

Traffic noise effects associated with the Westfield Glenfield Mall are an issue for just under half of the local residents, who described general traffic noise, noise from delivery trucks and noise from ‘hoons’. The first two of these were anticipated at the planning hearings, but the ‘hoon’ behaviour problem does not appear to have been anticipated. For a significant number of these residents, this noise had resulting impacts ranging from frustration to sleep disruption. For the most part, it would seem that mitigation of traffic noise effects is reliant on management of traffic volume in the area. Actions by Mall management indicate that where feasible, management will take steps to address traffic noise issues specifically related to the Mall.

**Parking overflow**

Residents in the vicinity of a large retail facility may notice the use of their kerbside parking areas by people involved with the facility as workers or customers.

Over one third of the residents interviewed, approximately half of whom were unprompted, discussed parking overflow effects from the Mall. A higher percentage of residents in the East and West areas discussed the effect compared with those in the Near area. A similar number of residents in the East and West areas discussed the effect. It would be expected that fewer residents in the Near area would comment on parking overflow since a large proportion of the area has parking restrictions put in place since the 2000 re-development. Most of the residents had lived in the area prior to the Mall re-development in 2000\(^{31}\). The table below indicates the proportion of residents who discussed the effect in each of the surveyed areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview sample</th>
<th>No. of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
<th>% of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All areas</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West area</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What effect do they notice? Source of effect? Timing, frequency and trends?**

The majority of respondents who discussed parking overflow effects noted an increase in cars parked on their street, with one resident reporting delivery vehicles. Only one resident noted a decrease in the number of cars parked in their street. This person lived on Bentley Avenue and attributed the decrease to new parking restrictions which resulted in easier access to and from their property.

\(^{31}\) 38 (86%) prior, six (14%) since.
Those who had noticed an increase in cars parked on their street attributed the effect to Mall staff and Mall customers. Some backed up these assertions by commenting on how they could recognise Mall customers by their purchases, or Mall staff by their uniforms. Some also noted that they could see car owners walking towards the Mall or saw car owners regularly parking in the same place during work hours. When asked if there could be any other source of the effect, several residents in the West area noted that the Glenfield shopping centre, WINZ, the local secondary school and the rugby club may also contribute to parking overflow problems in the area. One neighbouring business experienced parking overflow outside the premises daily, and had put up a sign requesting Mall customers to use the Mall carpark.

Parking overflow was noticed in the Near area, particularly in Downing Street and Bentley Avenue. In the East area, streets included Marlborough Avenue, High Road, Camelot Place, Glenfield Road, Bentley Avenue, and Battle Place. In the West area, streets included Peach Road, Sunnyfield Crescent, Powrie St, Waverley Street, Kaipatiki Road, Taynith Place, Mayfield Road.

Most residents interviewed noticed parking overflow a few times a year at Christmas and during sales. There were a small number however who noticed it more regularly, during the week and/or weekends. For these residents parking overflow could be noticed daily.

All but three residents reported an increase in parking overflow since the re-development of the Mall in 2000. Of the three who had not noticed an increase, one thought incidence of parking overflow was the same, while two thought there had been a decrease in the number of cars parked on their street.

**Mitigation?**

The initial redevelopment proposal (1995) noted an increase in car parks from 860 in the existing Mall to 1,910 in the new Mall. Under the Transitional District Plan, this did not meet requirements, with a shortfall of 250 parks. However, it was recognised that the method of calculation in the plan was erroneously based on gross floor area rather then gross leasable floor area. More weight was therefore given to the Proposed District Plan which based its method on gross leasable floor area. Under this plan, the proposal met the requirements, actually providing 355 more car parks than the plan required. It was considered that these additional car parks would help address the lack of car parking at Skatelands and the Leisure Centre, both of which had prior agreements with the Mall to use some Mall car parks. Despite the adequacy of car park numbers under the Proposed District Plan, in a traffic assessment carried out by Dickson\(^{32}\), it was recommended that parking be provided for staff at all times to avoid surrounding streets being used.

The amended proposal noted an increase from 860 car parks in the existing Mall to 1,513 car parks in the new Mall. Under the Transitional District Plan this amounted to a shortfall of 362 parks, while under the Proposed District Plan this amounted to an additional 83 parks over what was required. Dickson thought that car parking was adequate, but had some concerns about obstructed access to the Leisure Centre. It was intended that agreements with Skatelands and the Leisure Centre for dual access to car parks would continue.

\(^{32}\) in Elvidge, C. 1998, Non-Notified Resource Consent Application for Amendment to Existing Consent for Glenfield Mall Redevelopment, North Shore City Council, North Shore.
The consent granted in 1998 contained several conditions related to car parking facilities. Conditions state that there are to be at least 1513 on-site car parks (including car parks for disabled people to use), and that “all people working on the site be given priority use of on-site parking at all times except when satisfactory alternative off-street parking arrangements have been made for them”. It also states that planned space for car parks is not to be used for other purposes such as storage of trolleys.

There is one staff car park per shop at the Mall. Many staff park on the surrounding streets. At Christmas time, none of the staff are allowed to park in the carpark at the Mall. On occasion, the local secondary school site has been used as a staff carpark for two weeks prior to Christmas.

Parking restrictions around the Mall have been put in since the 2000 re-development to help address the problem of parking overflow.

**Impacts?**

Thirty of the 44 (68%) residents described resulting impacts. Residents described difficulty in getting in and out of their properties, and at times out of their streets. They also described disrupted traffic flows, increased risks on the street, inconvenience and a heightened sense of annoyance. Two residents also noted that visitors to their properties could not find a park, while two other residents described how parking by strangers reduced their privacy.

Three residents in the Near area, East area, and West area had contacted the North Shore City Council regarding parking overflow effects from the Mall.

**Summary evaluation**

The significance of parking overflow from the Mall is evident in the fact that over one third of the residents interviewed discussed this effect and that approximately half of these were unprompted. A high number of residents reported resulting adverse impacts, some of these experienced daily. Discussions during the resource consent stage appear to have somewhat under-estimated the scale of this effect.

**Litter**

Litter in the streets and walkways surrounding the Glenfield Mall was a major issue for approximately one third of the residents interviewed. However, the majority commented only after they received a prompt to do so. More residents in the Near and West area reported litter compared with the East area. The majority of residents who did comment had lived in the area since before the Mall was redeveloped (77%).
Table 22: Percentage of respondents who reported litter effects in the vicinity of Glenfield Mall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview sample</th>
<th>No. of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
<th>% of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All areas</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near area</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West area</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What effect do they notice? Source of effect? Timing, frequency and trends?

The type of litter described was cans, bottles, plastic and paper bags including fast food wrappers and supermarket bags. The litter was attributed to the Mall in general. However specific outlets within the Mall were named such as the supermarkets and fast food stores. Residents were divided as to whether it was the McDonald’s inside the Mall or the McDonald’s on Glenfield Road that was responsible for the distinguishable wrappers. Specific wrappers and containers pertaining to McDonald’s and KFC were mentioned. One resident thought that the Tavern on Downing Street also contributed to the litter problem in the area. Several residents thought that the strip shops on Glenfield Road may have also contributed. The Mall Operations Manager was aware of the prevailing westerly wind and described a tendency for it to blow from Glenfield Road across the top car park and over the edge. Prior to the re-development, there used to be a gutter inspection every morning in the top car park according to the manager. The topography of the area and the prevailing wind exacerbate the litter problem.

All the streets immediately surrounding were described as having litter lying on them or on the grass verges or in peoples driveways. Downing and Camelot Reserves were also mentioned as well as the myriad of public walkways linking neighbouring streets and public bus stops. Outer lying streets such as Chivalry Road and Marlborough Avenue, which are connected to the Mall by walkways, were also places where neighbours of the Mall observed litter.

The litter was described as being “constantly there” on a daily basis or “most of the time” or “anytime” by the majority of residents. Many of them believed that more accumulated after late nights and weekends. “After a weekend is worst”. Twenty six of the total 46 residents thought that the amount of litter in the area had increased since the Mall had been re-developed.

Residents at the feedback meeting noted that the council street cleaners appeared to come infrequently, and that a lot of the litter lay around the streets and nearby retaining walls for a long time.

Mitigation?

The Mall employs cleaners to clean inside and outside on the Mall premises. They are employed between 6 p.m. and midnight daily, except for late nights (9 p.m. to 3 a.m.). The carparks are swept daily for litter. However a lot of the litter reported by residents was seen lying on the surrounding streets and paths in an area where no one appears to have responsibility for removing it. Quite a few of the residents themselves clean up outside their own homes.
Impacts?

Nine residents did not believe there was an impact they “were just aware” of litter. Fifteen residents described experiencing the litter as “unpleasant” or “annoying” or comments to this effect. Twenty two neighbours made a point of collecting the litter and putting it into their own rubbish. “My husband picks it up three or four times a week” and “I have to pick stuff out of lawns and drain constantly”. One resident “planted to act as a barrier”.

One of the residents living in the Near area had contacted the North Shore Council and the Action Line about the litter.

Summary evaluation

Comments from residents suggest that there is a constant and a significant level of litter on streets in the vicinity of the Mall. This results in a persistent level of impact for a significant number of local residents. It is clear that there are several likely sources of litter in the area, including Glenfield Mall. It is also evident that litter moves some distance from the shopping centre as a result of wind and consumer behaviour. It may therefore be appropriate that any additional responses to the problem of litter involve a coordinated effort between the Mall, other businesses and the North Shore City Council.

Lighting

Large facilities such as malls produce light spill at night time through general lighting, security lighting and signage.

One quarter of the residents interviewed noted the lights on the Mall frontages and in the carparks at night. Eight comments were unprompted and 23 were prompted. The majority of residents who commented lived in the area nearest the Mall or in the valley below the Mall to the east. Most of those who commented had lived in the area prior to the Mall’s re-development.

Table 23: Percentage of respondents who experience lightning effects as a result of the Glenfield Mall re-development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview sample</th>
<th>No. of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
<th>% of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All areas</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near area</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What effect do they notice? Source of effect? Timing, frequency and trends?

Residents interviewed described a “brighter night sky”, “more lights” and for one resident more “visual pollution”. All of the residents thought the source was the increased size and subsequent number of lights on facades of the Mall, particularly that of Farmers and the Warehouse. Twenty one residents commented on the increase in the pattern of light since the Mall had expanded.
One resident in the Near area experienced the bright glare of car lights shining into the bedroom at night as cars turned around and exited the ramp from the top deck.

All of the residents interviewed experienced the light spill only at night time. However, three reported that some of the lights were “dimmed” or “switched off” after midnight, an occurrence that was not evident in the first year of its establishment. Although none of the residents interviewed had initiated a complaint to either Mall management or to the Council, some wondered if the dimming was as a result of someone complaining.

All of the residents living in the East and Near areas who commented on light were aware of the lights from within their homes. The majority of residents who lived in the West area could only see the lights from outside their homes or from the street. The lights were an every night occurrence for all the residents.

Mitigation?

A condition attached to the consent for re-development (1998) states that “all external lighting be designed to ensure minimum light spill beyond the boundaries of the site...”. It also goes on to say that “Lighting of the edges of the building at night shall be suitably baffled or shielded so as to minimise the “brightness” of the building as viewed from residential properties”.

Outside lights in the open car park are turned off at approximately 1 a.m. and the lights for the other levels are reduced to 50% after 10 p.m. when the supermarkets have closed. The signage on the outside of the building is turned off at 10 p.m., as required by resource consent.

Impacts?

For 20 of the residents the lights presented “no great impact”. Residents living in the East tended to experience impacts. Seven residents described the lights as “comforting” and “made the place feel safe”. Two residents described the lights as “annoying at first but with the dimming of them was less bothered nowadays”. Two residents experienced disrupted sleep because of the glare of car headlamps and the brightness within their bedrooms.

Several residents from the ‘near’ area who attended the feedback meeting believed the lights were excessively bright, and reported that they did not need to switch a light on in the early hours of the morning within their own home.

Summary evaluation

The position of the Mall on the eastern side of Glenfield Road means that most of the night time lighting is visible to residents in the near and east areas. It is visible from within their homes and whilst out walking or driving on the streets. For the majority, the lights are only visible in the distance, whilst a few respondents experience the glare inside their homes at night. Some residents living in the west are aware of the Malls Glenfield Road frontage lit up at night. Very few residents experience negative impacts from the light spill; indeed seven of the 31 residents described positive impacts.
Operational noise

The potential for operational noise was recognised during the resource consent process, as is evident in consent conditions (see below under Mitigation?). Operational noise was also identified by submitters, noting the need to ensure that noise from the refrigeration and air conditioning units did not exceed noise standards.²³

Twenty-two residents out of the total 126 discussed hearing noise from the operations of the Mall. Eight of these were prompted and fourteen unprompted responses. All but two of the residents had lived in the area prior to the redevelopment of the Mall. More people living to the East of the Mall could hear the noises at night.

Table 24: Percentage of respondents who discussed operational noise effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview sample</th>
<th>No. of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
<th>% of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All areas</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near area</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What effect do they notice? Source of effect? Timing, frequency and trends?

Eleven neighbours living in the East area described hearing operational noise. Nine residents described Mall machinery type noise such as a “loud hum”. This “hum” was heard mainly at night, although one resident noticed it in the daytime but only in a westerly wind. It could be heard from inside residents’ homes. Residents were sure that the “hum” came from the Mall itself and several were able to describe it as being the “noise associated with refrigeration”. One resident identified it as coming from the air conditioning unit on the top carpark which she had stood beside during the daytime.

Four residents in the East described the “banging and clanging” of truck deliveries and the “rattling” of the trolley collection. The noise of cars moving up and down the carpark ramp was also reported.

These noises were heard from both inside and outside residents’ homes. Although often heard at night - as one resident said “it is quieter then” the noises of the car ramp, the trolley collection and truck deliveries were also loud enough to be heard in the daytime.

Other sounds described were those of truck delivery engines idling, car alarms, and a Mall fire alarm. One resident described the alarm from a traffic light signal within the Mall car park sounding off, and another the music from an entertainment band. Of all the sounds associated with the Mall that were described by residents, no one believed that there could be another contributing factor or source apart from the operations of the Mall.

²³ Note: Due to the high number of submissions (1,610), summaries only have been referred to in this case study. Summaries of submissions do not indicate how many residents discussed issues relating to operational noise, but provide a list of the type of comments made by three categories of submitter: those opposed (35), those in support (1,531), those in support but with concerns (44).
Mitigation?

During the resource consent process (initial 1995 proposal) it was noted by an Environmental Health Officer that there had been a problem with late night and early morning deliveries to the existing Mall causing a noise nuisance to local residents. As a result, it was recommended that no deliveries be made to the new Mall after 10 p.m. or before 7 a.m.

A condition of consent for redevelopment (1998) was that “all air-conditioning and extraction fan noise levels comply with the noise standards in the District Plan”.

During the time of this research the Mall operations manager was actively investigating the “humming” noise after receiving a complaint from one resident. The resident had been asked to keep a log of its occurrence. A night watch was being discussed so that the noise could be tracked. The Environmental Health Officer at North Shore Council had received two complaints in August 2003 and upon investigation had not found the source. Two residents and a security guard at the feedback meeting were able to isolate what they thought was the noise - the fans on the roof top - which are triggered by moisture within the Mall.

The security manager and the operations manager were aware of the security light which had jammed and triggered an alarm. They agreed that it would be annoying to residents. At the time of research they were going to investigate ways of shortening the duration of any alarm event.

Impacts?

Eight of those who reported off-site noise did not believe the noise impacted on their lives. One of these residents thought that they had got used to the noises and were therefore sometimes oblivious to them. Seven neighbours experienced the noises as “annoying” and as a “disturbance of the peace”. One resident thought the hum was tinnitus in her ears, until she learnt that another neighbour also heard it. Six residents experienced “interrupted sleep” as a result of the noise heard from the Mall, mainly from the airconditioning unit.

Two residents at the feedback meeting discussed the humming noise and believed it was a daily occurrence but that the level altered according to the weather conditions. One described it as “a typical noise of air being pushed through” and that it could be very disturbing and suggested a visit be made to their home to listen for it.

Summary evaluation

The most significant and persistent operational noise for residents was the noise from the roof top air conditioning unit which results in significant negative impacts for a small number of nearby neighbours. Complaints from one resident had initiated an investigation at the time of research. Whilst other noises, such as alarms, truck deliveries and occasional music were reported, these were not persistent.

Trolleys

Eighteen residents out of the sample of 126 reported seeing discarded trolleys in their neighbourhood. Seventeen of them commented unprompted and one commented after a prompt.
Table 25: Percentage of respondents who noticed the discarding of shopping trolleys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview sample</th>
<th>No. of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
<th>% of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All areas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near area</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West area</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What effect do they notice? Source of effect? Timing frequency and trends?

Residents noticed supermarket and Warehouse trolleys left outside their homes on driveways and street frontages, as well as on footpaths. All the surrounding roads were mentioned as places where discarded trolleys were seen. Whilst nine residents thought that the discarding of unused trolleys could occur at “anytime” others thought this occurred mostly after a weekend. It “varies but more at a weekend”.

Residents at the feedback meeting commented on the number of trolleys left discarded in the neighbourhood and also the use of them by locals as prams for children. They thought that the trolley collection now seldom went down the streets, compared with when the Mall first opened and the collection was daily.

The majority of residents who had lived in the area since before the Mall was rebuilt thought there were now more trolleys left abandoned on the surrounding streets. It was generally believed that local residents were responsible for discarding the trolleys.

Mitigation?

The supermarket trolley collection is contracted out to a private firm. Two tractors circulate the carparks and do the “occasional run down the local streets” to recover supermarket trolleys. The Warehouse trolleys are collected manually by staff, according to the Mall operations manager. A count is made at the end of each day and missing Warehouse trolleys looked for.

Impacts?

The impacts of discarded trolleys ranged from having no effect at all (eight residents) to “making the area look trashy”. One neighbour had experienced difficulty exiting the driveway until they had physically moved the trolley. Two residents had phoned up Mall management to have them collected.

Summary evaluation

Incidence of trolleys being left on surrounding streets was significant and persistent enough for 17 of the 18 reports of this effect to be unprompted, suggesting that trolley collection should be carried out on a more regular basis.
**Visual**

The construction or re-development of a retail facility such as a mall is a significant structural addition or change to a neighbourhood. Such a change will create visual effects through aspects such as external appearance and height. This was recognised during the Mall redevelopment resource consent process, as evident in planning documents for the redevelopment and subsequent consent conditions (see below under Mitigation?).

Visual impact was also raised by submitters who opposed the proposal, and submitters who were in support. Amongst comments made by those in opposition, it was noted that there was a lack of “design treatment” on the north, south and east facades of the Mall, and that the Mall would look “out of place in the environment”. As mentioned under landscaping, there was also a comment about the inappropriate positioning of plants. From those in support however, there were comments about the upgraded appearance of the Mall being a positive amenity gain from the proposal for the Glenfield area and local residents.

A small number of residents, the majority of whom were prompted, discussed visual effects from the Mall. Only residents in the Near and East area commented on this effect, with a higher percentage of residents commenting from the Near area. This would be expected since the Mall is located in the Near area east of Glenfield Road, and is more visible to residents in the Near and East areas. All of the residents had lived in the area prior to the Mall re-development in 2000. The table below indicates the proportion of residents who discussed the effect in each of the surveyed areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview sample</th>
<th>No. of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
<th>% of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All areas</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near area</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What effect do they notice? Source of effect? Timing, frequency and trends?**

Residents discussed both negative and positive visual effects from the re-developed Mall. Slightly more reported negative effects, noting the loss of view, increased visibility of the Mall, and the unattractive appearance of the Mall structure. One person reported that they experienced shading on their property in the winter, while another expressed the view that the Mall looked “out of place” in its residential setting. The positive comments came only from the Near area, where some residents commented on the improved outlook and the acceptable appearance of the Mall. For most of the residents, these visual effects were experienced from their properties.

While one resident attributed the visual effects to an effective Mall maintenance programme, others attributed the visual effects to the Mall re-development in 2000.
Mitigation?

It was noted during the resource consent process that the Mall had a ‘wide visual catchment’ (a visibility that extended to road users, pedestrians and local residents), and that Mall design was constrained by the ‘difficult’ topography of the site.

The initial proposal (1995) which involved a ‘winged’ roof design, glass beacon and outward looking food court, was said to increase the dominance of commercial buildings in the predominately residential surroundings, but provide a strong identity and presence on Glenfield Road, and help disguise air conditioning and refrigeration equipment. The Senior Urban Design Planner suggested mitigation by way of detailing, colours and landscaping. The amended proposal (1998) involved a significantly different design based around an inward looking ‘stepped’ Mall with a flat roof and ‘entry tower’ on Glenfield Road. The applicant’s landscape assessment noted that it did not have the same degree of architectural interest, but that its overall structure was less visually dominating. The Senior Urban Design Planner considered that this new design failed to mitigate adverse visual effects. However, since the amended proposal was not notified, the implication is that the committee did not consider any adverse effects of the design to be more than minor.

Visual impact can also be mitigated by height controls. The planning reports note that the purpose of the height controls are to “ensure visual compatibility with surrounding residential development, and to minimise loss of amenity on nearby residential properties as a result of visual dominance and obstruction of views”. Both the initial (1995) and amended (1998) proposals exceeded the height controls in the Transitional and Proposed District Plans. Although the amended (1998) proposal’s exceedances were not so great, height controls were still exceeded on the top level and the entry tower. The planning report notes that the site topography is such that it is difficult to meet height controls, and that there is no adverse impact on Glenfield Road as the top level shops are only one storey, as are the Glenfield Road shops (in the centre).

Conditions attached to the consent granted in 1998 required that viewing windows be provided from several tenancies on level 3, that a covered walkway be constructed from Glenfield Road to the centre, and that details of finishes and colours be provided at the time of building consent application to be approved by the Senior Urban Design Planner. Landscaping conditions were also set - see below.

Impacts?

Twelve of the 17 residents described resulting impacts. Eight residents described negative impacts, for the most part noting that it was not pleasant to look at. One noted that they could not enjoy the view anymore. The remaining four who described positive impacts noted that it was more pleasant to look at compared with the structure it had replaced.

None of the residents had contacted anybody about visual effects from the Mall.

Summary evaluation

The visual impact of the Mall was not considered to be as significant as some other off-site effects, as evident in the lower level of responses and the high number of prompted responses. However, 13% had experienced resulting impacts - impacts that were negative for some and positive for others.
Taken together with discussion elsewhere in this report, about connections between the Mall and shopping centre and a perceived lack (for some) of a focal point and community space, this points to a conclusion that the initial outward looking design may have created stronger social amenity, even though the visual impact for some near neighbours might have been no less.

**Landscaping**

Landscaping in association with a large retail facility can assist with the mitigation of adverse visual effect. This was recognised during the consent process, as evident in planning documents for the re-development and subsequent consent conditions (see below under Mitigation?). Landscaping issues were also raised by submitters, who noted concern that the proposed positioning of landscaping plants was inappropriate\(^{35}\).

A very small number of respondents, most of whom were prompted\(^{36}\), discussed landscaping effects from the re-development of Glenfield Mall. A slightly higher percentage of residents in the Near area discussed the effect compared with those in the East and West areas. This would be expected since the Mall is located in the Near area on the east side of Glenfield Road, and is more visible to residents in the Near and East areas. All of the residents had lived in the area prior to the Mall re-development in 2000. The table below indicates the proportion of residents who discussed the effect in each of the surveyed areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview sample</th>
<th>No. of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
<th>% of respondents in area who discussed effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All areas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What effect do they notice? Source of effect? Timing, frequency and trends?**

Residents discussed both negative and positive effects from landscaping around the Mall (in particular landscaping in Downing Street and Bentley Avenue). Slightly more reported negative effects, noting the loss of established trees (a broad band of non natives on Glenfield Road), “poor choice of planting”, a lack of “greener to soften the Mall”, a lack of maintenance, and “uneven cobbled paths with grass growing in between the cobbles”.

Conversely, several commented on beautification and good maintenance.

---

\(^{35}\) Note: Due to the high number of submissions (1610), summaries only have been referred to in this case study. Summaries of submissions do not indicate how many residents discussed landscaping issues, but provide a list of the type of comments made by three categories of submitter: those opposed (35), those in support (1531), those in support but with concerns (44). This comment relating to landscaping was amongst those made by submitters in support but with concerns.

\(^{36}\) Six (67%) prompted, three (33%) unprompted.
Two residents believed there had been both negative and positive effects, noting for example the loss of established trees but the attempt at landscaping during the re-development.

**Mitigation?**

The initial proposal put forward during the resource consent process to redevelop the Mall (1995), described a number of proposed landscaping measures including the planting of trees and flower beds around the Mall, and planter boxes and climbing frames around the car parks. It was noted by the Senior Urban Design Planner that the landscaping proposed was on the low side and that there were some concerns about the high level of maintenance needed. The amended proposal (1998) was based on a similar concept but included some additional landscaping. However, there was still some concern expressed over the amount of landscaping around the car parks.

District Plan rules required that a five metre landscaped yard be established where boundaries bordered a Recreation Zone. This was required of the Glenfield Mall developer as its eastern boundary bordered a Recreation Zone containing Skatelands and the Leisure centre. The initial proposal (1995) did not meet these requirements because of planned car parking, however, the developer did obtain permission from Skatelands to landscape an adjacent bank on their site to compensate. The amended proposal (1998), although improved, also failed to meet fully the requirements, however, the developer obtained written consent from Skatelands and the Leisure centre.

Conditions attached to the consent granted in 1998 required that a detailed landscaping plan be submitted at the time of building consent application, and that the applicant should liaise with the Glenfield Community Board to ensure that the plan was integrated with the proposed landscaping on the Downing Street Reserve. Conditions also required that there be an ongoing landscape maintenance programme to ensure the plans were implemented, seasonal planting was kept up, lost/damaged/poorly developed plants were replaced, and irrigation, pruning, and weed control was undertaken.

Currently, Mall management has an external gardening contract with a firm that comes in once a week to carry out landscaping maintenance, including planting, weeding and watering.

Residents who attended the feedback meeting expressed their views on what they saw as inappropriate planting of trailing plants over the edges of the top car park and the need for proper pathways to be established, for example between the Leisure centre and the Mall.

**Impacts?**

Seven of the nine residents described resulting impacts. Those who discussed negative landscaping effects (four residents) noted sadness at the loss of established trees, the unappealing outlook of poorly maintained grounds, and the dangers associated with uneven cobbles. Those who discussed positive landscaping effects (three residents) noted that the grounds were pleasant to look at.

None of the residents had contacted anybody about landscaping effects from the Mall.
**Summary evaluation**

Landscaping effects associated with the Mall was not found to be as significant as some other off-site effects, as evident in the lower number of responses and the high proportion of prompted responses. For the few residents who did discuss this effect, most had experienced resulting impacts - some negative and some positive. It is very difficult to mitigate in the short term the loss of established trees, once they have been removed.

**Youth issue from a residents’ perspective**

This section focuses on youth behaviours from the perspective of nearby residents. While the Mall is clearly providing social amenity for large numbers of young people, the attraction of the Mall to many youth from outside the neighbourhood raises the possibility that immediate residents can experience other effects locally which would not otherwise occur.

Glenfield as a suburb has a lot to offer families. There are three schools in the immediate vicinity of Glenfield Mall, one high school with a roll of 1,200, an intermediate with a roll of 900 and a local primary school. The area is well serviced by public buses and the opening of Kaipatiki Bridge means that people living in the outer western suburbs can access Glenfield easily. With the number of youth living in this wider area, the re-developed Glenfield Mall is a major attraction.

A North Shore Council study, “The Youth Destinations Plan”, commissioned in 2002/2003 and looking at places youth like to frequent, describes malls as “popular as they are on transport routes, have shelter, food, seating, refreshments, water and a social element in the form of shopping”.

During the course of the Taylor Baines research field work many residents, described the new Mall as being more oriented towards the youth. Especially noting the youth targeted shops. “They love the foodcourt and music stores and the McDonald’s” according to Glenfield College deputy principal. Furthermore, the school was also aware of the number of youth provided with employment at the Mall throughout the year and at Christmas time. More than 90 young people aged 15 years and above work at the two supermarkets and the Warehouse on a regular basis. Interviewees were asked if anyone in the family worked at Westfield Glenfield. Whilst nine replied in the affirmative, a number of residents commented that their children had worked in the Mall as school children. The deputy principal of Glenfield College also noted that the Mall provided opportunities for after school employment to the local youth.

Although only a small number of residents commented on youth related issues, all but one of these observations were unprompted. Five of the residents had lived in the area prior to the Malls redevelopment and the other three had moved into the area subsequently.

**Table 28: Percentage of respondents who discussed youth related issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview sample</th>
<th>No. of residents in area who discussed effect</th>
<th>% of residents in area who discussed effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All areas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**What effect was noticed? Source of effect? Timing, frequency and trends?**

Residents noticed large groups of youth ‘congregating’ around the Mall, ‘outside the entries’, ‘at the bus stop on Glenfield Road’ and in Downing Street Reserve. A total of seven residents believed the Mall acted as a ‘magnet’ providing the youth with a place to meet.

Whilst the majority of those interviewed thought that there were no other attractions for youth congregating other than the Mall itself one resident mentioned the presence of the McDonald’s on Glenfield Road, outside the Mall, as a “lure” for the young. Another resident noted that the opening of the Kaipatiki Bridge had meant that more youth could access the Mall more quickly than previously. Interviews with key informants including Mall security, the community constable, secondary school deputy principal and an ex ratepayers association chairperson noted the ease with which residents from the Beachhaven and Birkdale communities could now access the Glenfield Mall via the Kaipatiki Bridge. The Mall security guard interviewed was aware that the majority of youth he had dealings with at the Mall, of late, were from Birkdale and Beachhaven. He described the Mall “as an attractive place for young people to mill around”.

Problems with large groups of youth gathering around the Mall entrance on Glenfield Road and the bus stop had led to the erecting of signs outside of the Mall on Glenfield Road requesting “no loitering”. The main roads surrounding the Mall such as Bentley Ave, Downing Street, Glenfield Road itself and Peach Road to the west were streets where residents most commonly noticed youth “hanging out”.

The most popular time of the day for the youth to congregate near the Mall was after school finished and in the evenings of the late shopping nights. According to the Mall security guard “the influx of youth after 3:30 p.m. on school days is noticeable”. A close relationship has developed between the school principals and staff, Mall security and the community constable. “The school is phoned if a pupil of ours is thought to be misbehaving or playing at truancy” and any issues are addressed immediately. The Mall has the right to trespass a youth for up to a maximum of two years if this is considered appropriate action. In the last three years approximately 100 youth have been trespassed according to the Mall operations manager.

Evenings, summer months and school holidays were described by residents and the community constable as popular times for youth to visit the Mall and its immediate surrounds. The community constable described “school holidays as the worst time at the Mall” in terms of demands on his time. All five respondents who had lived in the area prior to the Mall’s re-development in 2000, believed that the presence of youth had increased - “the Mall attracts youth with its fastfood outlets, music stores, clothing shops and canned music playing all day and night.”.

**Mitigation?**

The Mall management and secondary school staff are very aware of the attraction Glenfield Mall presents to the youth of the area and liaise with each other over any issues. “The principal is on side with us” according to the Mall management. Pupils are not allowed to the Mall in part uniform, they must be in either mufti or full school uniform.
The area outside of the Mall is close to the main bus stop, close to public seating, close to the strip shops and near the Mall entrance. Youth in large numbers gather here after school each day and can appear “overwhelming to locals” according to the Mall security manager. The plants in the garden outside the Mall have had to be replaced twice due to their being trampled by the large numbers of people gathered beside them. Mall management have installed no loitering signs outside the Glenfield Road entrance and the Mall security visit the area frequently, ‘especially after 3.30 p.m. weekdays’. “By and large these kids are cooperative when we ask them to move on” commented Mall security.

The chairperson of the local business association described the Mall management as “cooperative” and proactive in offering help should the strip shop owners experience any problems.

Mall management can trespass anyone who misbehaves inappropriately on private property. A trespass is usually issued for misbehaviour, fighting, shoplifting, abusive language. When a ‘minor’ is involved the police are requested to attend. They are also asked to attend for other incidents as well. According to the Mall security manager, the youths that have caused the most problems are less likely to be present pupils. This view was corroborated by the community constable who reported most problems with unemployed school leavers from areas throughout the North Shore.

Several residents asked if the Mall would like to be contacted if untoward behaviour was observed and asked who they could get in touch with. Interviewers were not aware of an active neighbourhood residents group in the area of study. Therefore a meeting to establish contact between the Mall management and neighbours would need to be initiated.

**Impacts?**

Two residents were not impacted upon but were “just aware” of the number of youth in the vicinity. One resident was sometimes kept awake at night by the noise of the large numbers of youth outside their home near the Mall. Another interviewee was concerned for her own children’s safety and another for the safety of elderly in the area.

One resident living in the Near area overlooking the Mall and its carpark had observed on one occasion a number of youths throwing trolleys over the walls of the carpark. This resident was concerned by the “vandalism” observed and endeavoured to call the police. However, the call was not followed up on due to other priorities at the time. Not one of the residents interviewed had contacted Mall management or the council with matters related to the youth.

**Summary evaluation**

As a result of increasing numbers of young people visiting the Mall, a few near neighbours have experienced off-site effects of youth behaviour, ranging from occasional sleep disturbance to anxiety. While several instances of vandalism have been observed, no actual threats to residents or their property was reported. A coordinated response mechanism exists involving Mall security management, local schools and the police, which appears to be effective in minimising public nuisances in the shopping centre and environs.
Crime

Although the police are dealing with ongoing crime associated with incidents such as theft, drugs, professional shoplifting and tagging, the residents in Glenfield who were interviewed did not suggest crime was a significant impact of the Mall and its presence in Glenfield.

One resident in the near area made an unprompted comment relating to crime in the area of study. This resident had lived in the area prior to the Mall’s re-development.

What effect noticed? Source of effect? Timing, frequency and trends?

This resident had occasionally noticed graffiti on property around the Mall, and believed the source of the graffiti was “kids with nothing to do”.

According to the security manager who was working at Glenfield Mall prior to its re-development, the old Mall was easier to break into and as a consequence more youth hung around the outside of the Mall at night looking for opportunities to steal. The new Mall is built of concrete and much more difficult to penetrate - “we do not have a problem at night time now”. The main crime issues for the Mall management are theft, vandalism and hooliganism. However those working at the Mall see it as “basically a safe environment” according to its security manager.

Mitigation?

The community constable approached all of the shop owners when the Mall was first re-opened, offering advice and providing contact details. The Glenfield Police station is on Glenfield Road in close proximity to the Mall37. Because of its proximity the uniformed police staff are at the Mall on a daily basis purchasing supplies and “doing a walk around” which is seen as an advantage by both the police and the Mall shop keepers.

The Mall has a number of strategies to deal with crime. A security firm is employed 24 hours a day to patrol the Mall and its carparks, security cameras operate throughout the Mall targeting the most vulnerable areas, and the police are called if there is a theft. Graffiti is dealt with by the Mall contract cleaners. Westfield has a policy to “erase immediately” so that the public never get to see the extent of tagging. There are two local groups who clean up graffiti. One is ‘Wipe Out’, which is run by volunteers who arrange for youth doing community work to erase tagging. The other is ‘Undo’, a one person operation.

Residents who attended the feedback meeting commented on the increased number of security guards in the Mall since the re-development and believed this to be a positive innovation.

Overall, there appears to be a pro-active partnership between the Police and Mall management on matters of crime and security.

37 It was noted during the case study that there are plans to have the police station moved in 2004.
**Impacts?**

The one resident who commented on crime in the area noted that “it doesn’t really bother me”.

**Summary evaluation**

The fact that only one observation of unlawful behaviour was reported in relation to the Mall facility is a clear indication that such crime is not an issue for neighbouring residents. This may in part be due to the mitigation strategies already in place, suggesting that they are effective, worthwhile and should be continued.

**Other**

Two residents living in the Near area of the Mall commented on the inconvenience of having their sky reception interfered with after the Mall was re-developed.

**What effect do they notice? Source of effect? timing, frequency and trends?**

Both residents had their Sky installed prior to the Mall re-development and had not had problems with the reception. They experienced difficulty getting a clear reception after the Mall was re-developed. This is an ongoing problem. They believed that the height of the new Mall was the problem. Sky installers for the Glenfield area confirmed with the research team that “the signal had changed since the Mall was developed”. As UHF signals require direct line of site, “big trees and buildings can get in the way”.

**Mitigation?**

Both residents had Sky installers visit their homes to investigate. The installers had commented on the probability that it was the height of the Mall which was interfering with their reception, and that there was nothing that Sky could do to improve it.

**Impacts?**

A permanently reduced level of service has resulted for a small number of neighbours in a particular location. The residents were “annoyed” and “frustrated” that they could not get good reception particularly with one channel.

**Summary Evaluation**

Interference with Sky television is a problem for a small number of residents on the east side of Glenfield Mall. Currently, there is nothing that can be done to alleviate this problem.
6 Conclusions

6.1 Main conclusions about effects from the Mall re-development

The balance of effects

Residents living nearby have experienced a mix of gains and losses in amenity effects from the re-development of Glenfield Mall. It is not possible to do a simple numerical accounting exercise to weigh up these gains and losses. Nevertheless, some insights are clear -

1. the marginal increases in retail amenity (i.e. beneficial effects) identified for residents in the host community will certainly affect a much larger number of residents than do the negative, off-site effects experienced;

2. amongst all the residents interviewed for this research, only 10% reported observing no off-site effects at all. However, the proportion who experience actual impacts is approximately 40%;

3. the Mall generates a wide range of off-site effects with varying levels of resulting impacts. Traffic volume and related noise received the highest level of response, followed by litter, parking overflow, traffic safety, and lighting. The location of the Mall within a larger retail centre and on a main thoroughfare, has meant that a number of effects, including traffic volume, traffic safety, traffic noise and litter can not solely be attributed to the Mall with any great certainty. However, aspects of some effects such as parking overflow, lighting, operational noise, and trolleys clearly identified them as effects from the Mall;

4. the changes to lighting, landscaping and building form have been experienced by some near neighbours as positive amenity improvements although others have experienced the same changes as negative.

In summary, the Glenfield Mall, as part of the Glenfield shopping centre, exhibits a strong functional (retail) amenity. The re-development of the Mall in 2000 has further enhanced this amenity, confirming itself as a significant district-level destination for retail services, retail goods, and main grocery shopping. The re-development has also had an effect on social amenity, with some gains and some losses.

Functional amenity

The re-development has resulted in a slight increase in use by local residents, and an increase in the frequency of visits. Overall, the re-development has also brought about an increase in visits to other shops and organisations in the Glenfield shopping centre by local residents - a further increase in the functional amenity of the centre.

The re-development of the Mall for businesses and organisations is seen as having distinct advantages relating to increased visibility, although there does not appear to be a strong indication of resulting increases in turnover and levels of patronage.
Social amenity

The impact of the re-development on the centre’s social amenity has varied. The Mall re-development has brought about significant changes to the Mall and the centre, changes with varying consequences to different groups within the community. Significant changes such as the increased size and layout of the Mall, as well as the change in the mix of shops has meant that the Mall is attractive to a younger group of people. Many of the elderly however, struggle to find shops that cater for their clothing and craft needs, find the distances between shops and levels more tiring to access, and for many there is a lack of cosy places to sit and enjoy the company of others. In contrast, the youth enjoy the variety of music, cellphone and video stores, as well as the increase in clothing shops to suit their needs, and the foodcourt and individual food shops.

With an increased customer catchment and an increasingly diverse ethnic mix, the once strong sense of community appears to have been weakened from the perspective of some residents. This is to some extent reinforced by residents’ rating of dimensions of social amenity (such as browsing and socialising) as “neither important or unimportant”. This is not to say that the Mall and the centre do not exhibit social amenity. Strong links between businesses and organisations within the Mall and the centre, the high level of use of community organisations within the centre by local residents, and the centre’s popularity with teenagers are all examples of the social amenity value for different groups in the local community.

Meeting local needs

Visits to other shopping centres did not change significantly after the Mall re-development, which correlates with the already high level of use of the Mall, and only marginal increases associated with the re-development.

6.2 Conclusions about shopping centre development

Although the dense suburban setting in which Glenfield Mall is located limits to some extent shopping centre development, some growth and ‘enhancement’ is evident since the Mall upgrade in 2000. While shops in the wider shopping centre continue to lease, some houses on the outskirts of the centre are being converted into office/commercial space. Existing shops have also upgraded their shop fronts, in order to keep in line with the Mall re-development.

This research has highlighted the importance of links between the Mall and other businesses and organisations and the potential usefulness of a local business association which needs to function pro-actively and not just in response to resource consent procedures when the Mall re-develops.

6.3 Conclusions about effects assessments and management of effects

There is a reasonable matching between the ex-ante assessment of effects carried out for the resource consent process and the ex-post assessment of effects reported here. Although the most prominent effects such as traffic-related effects and parking overflow were considered during the resource consent process, some effects associated with the day-to-day operation of the Mall were not, for example, litter, the discarding of trolleys or the interference with Sky TV reception. This research
reinforces the proposition that these effects are not merely potential effects or even perceived effects, they are real effects and have produced in every case real impacts.

The location of Glenfield Mall in a district shopping centre and on a main arterial route makes it difficult in some instances to attribute the source of effects with certainty. Nevertheless, there are effects which are clearly attributable to the Mall. While some mitigation strategies put in place during the consent process have been implemented and undoubtedly have helped mitigate adverse impacts, there remain some residual effects. The nature and limited extent of these residual effects and impacts, combined with the constructive approach and attitude of the Mall manager to mitigation suggests that, in most cases, these residual effects would be amenable to remedy, particularly if effective communication channels exist between neighbours and Mall management.

Establishing effective communication channels requires willingness and respect from all parties. Neighbours need to know who to contact and know that their concerns will be treated seriously. Mall management should not have to get involved in vexatious complaints or be required to address problems that are not the responsibility of the Mall operation. Experience elsewhere (e.g. Baines and Buckenham, 2000, p.12) suggests that these requirements might best be served when there is a permanent liaison mechanism of some sort that encourages pro-active behaviour rather than focuses simply on complaints-oriented, reactive behaviour.
References


Hoyle, M. 2003, NSCC Traffic Counts, E-mail to B. Buckenham, [Online], 16 Sept., Available: E-mail: b.buckenham@tba.co.nz [September 2003].


Yann, Campbell, Hoare, Wheeler. 1999b, St Lukes Auckland, Exit Survey, detailed tabular findings, prepared for Jebb Holland Dimasi, Melbourne.
Appendix A  Demographic characteristics of Glenfield residents interviewed

It should be remembered that the criterion for selecting interviewees was at the level of the household, not the individual. Sampling was purposive in the immediate vicinity of the Mall (all immediate neighbours) and randomised by household elsewhere.

The following tables summarise the demographic characteristics of the households and individuals who participated in this research case study.

Table A1:  Length of occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of occupation</th>
<th>% in Near area (N=29)</th>
<th>% in East area (N=43)</th>
<th>% in West area (N=54)</th>
<th>% in all areas (N=126)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-22 years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;22 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A2:  Household tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household tenure</th>
<th>N=126</th>
<th>Research sample</th>
<th>2001 Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A3:  Number of people in household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of people in the household</th>
<th>N=126</th>
<th>Research sample</th>
<th>2001 Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One person</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two people</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three people</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four people</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A4:  Work status of individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Status of individual</th>
<th>N=126</th>
<th>Research sample</th>
<th>2001 Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently working</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A5: Age of individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of individuals</th>
<th>Research sample</th>
<th>2001 Census¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Age categories in the census data used here differ slightly from those used to collect data in the research, i.e. 15-19, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, > 60

### Table A6: Sex of individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of individuals</th>
<th>Research sample</th>
<th>2001 Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A7: Ethnicity of individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity of individuals</th>
<th>Research sample</th>
<th>2001 Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B  Comparative Amenity Ratings

The following data are sourced from the three case studies described in Section 1.4 of this report, as well as Yann Campbell Hoare Wheeler (1999).

### Table B1: Residents ratings of the nominated shopping centres as places to go shopping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shopping Centre</th>
<th>% as a place to go shopping</th>
<th>Collective rating: scale of 1 (unimp.) - 5 (imp.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'very important'</td>
<td>'important'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmarket</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Lukes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenfield</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrymead</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Martins</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B2: Residents ratings of the nominated shopping centres as places to access personal and household services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shopping Centre</th>
<th>% as a place to access personal and household services</th>
<th>Collective rating: scale of 1 (unimp.) - 5 (imp.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'very important'</td>
<td>'important'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmarket</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Lukes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenfield</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrymead</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Martins</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

38 Data for Newmarket and St Lukes come from exit surveys of shoppers who use the nominated shopping centre regularly for their main grocery shop, while data for Glenfield, Ferrymeade and St Martins come from the three case studies reported in this research programme.

39 % ‘don’t know’ not included in this table.
Table B3: Residents ratings of the nominated shopping centres as places to meet friends or family or to socialise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shopping Centre</th>
<th>% as a place to meet friends or family or to socialise</th>
<th>Collective rating: scale of 1 (unimp.) - 5 (imp.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'very important'</td>
<td>'important'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmarket</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Lukes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenfield</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrymead</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Martins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In view of the fact that the recently re-developed Glenfield Mall has a strong orientation to youth in its provision of socialising and entertainment venues, it is likely that its rating underscores this due to the fact that the sample of local residents interviewed under-represented youth.
Arial view of Glenfield Mall prior to redevelopment