

MEMORANDUM



Urban & Environmental

To: Bruce Young
From: Barker & Associates
Date: 9 April 2020
Re: George Street Plan Change Request: Second RFI Response

Precinct Provisions

RFI	Request	Response
1	The amended precinct provisions do not include the precinct plans. Please ensure that it is included in the revised version. [Required]	Noted. Revised Precinct provisions attached.
2	The S32 states that the precinct is pedestrian orientated, and uses such as service stations etc are discretionary activities. It maybe advisable to insert a specific policy about discouraging these types of uses in the precinct. This may also relate to amending the precinct description, objective 5 or possibly a new objective. [Merits]	Agree. Refer to revised precinct provisions.
3	Consideration of an additional policy on staging of the 'public elements' for providing amenity to residents, workers and visitors.	Disagree. In our view this covered sufficiently within Policy 6.
4	Section IX.5 Notification-Reconsider normal tests for notification matters especially for IX.5(a). [Merits]	Have further refined activities exempt from full notification. Refer to revised precinct provisions.
5	Section IX.6.8 setback- Relates to subsection (3) and (4) referencing rolling height. This was discussed at the skype meeting on 26 March 2020.	Agree. Refer to revised precinct provisions.

Section 32 Assessment report (Track change version)

RFI	Request	Response
-----	---------	----------

MEMORANDUM



Urban & Environmental

1	Pg 19- Height Area A-The 2 nd to last line says Figure X . Please ensure that it refers to the correct figure.	Noted. Section 32 Report updated.
2	Pg 20- Clause 5.1.9. The last sentence refers to any delay in staging of delivery is a discretionary activity. The activity table (A10) classifies this activity as RD. Please correct the appropriate document for consistency.	Noted. Section 32 Report updated.
3	Pg 37- In Scenario B the commercial yield is 35,100m ² . Should this be consistent with Scenario B figure in Table on page 40? This figure is 36,600m ² . Please clarify and make any required amendments.	Noted. Section 32 Report updated.
4	Pg 49- Under subheading 'Efficiency and Effectiveness', the fourth paragraph should read 'This option <u>does not</u> effectively or efficiently achieve Objective B3.3.1(e)...'	Noted. Section 32 Report updated.
5	Waitemata Local Board-You may wish to provide section on sharing the Plan Change information to the Waitemata Local Board on 12 March 2020. A statement in the consultation section of the S32 report would be beneficial. Should the plan change be accepted, the statutory requirement process for formal Local Board feedback will be managed by Plans and Places/Local Board.	Noted. Section 32 Report updated.

Traffic/Transport

RFI	Request	Response
1	Incorporate the information in the Commute letters dated 5 March 2020, into the revised ITA report originally submitted as part of the plan change request.	Noted. Updated ITA attached.
2	Clarify which letters are Attachment A and Appendix A . There is some confusion, and	Noted. RFI response has been incorporated into the ITA. Updated ITA attached.

MEMORANDUM



Urban & Environmental

	the information provided as part of the RFI should be clearly labelled. This information should be incorporated into the original ITA (as much as possible) as referenced in the above point 1 which would make the information much more readable. The AT comments can be attached separately to the ITA report.	
3	In various sections of 'Traffic Assessment Report' (i.e clause 2.3-2.7), the Commute response should specifically refer to the specific section in the planning documents (i.e Precinct provisions or S32 Assessment report), rather than stating 'This matter will be addressed by the applicant's Planner.'	Noted. Updated response to RFI attached.

Urban Design

RFI	Request	Response
1	Dwelling size. – mixed use vs city centre and metro centre provisions. Whether or not using the metropolitan centre provisions for minimum dwelling size have been considered, since the proposed/likely residential density (as a result of the building heights) is more akin to the metropolitan centre. (eg: Studio = 35m ² but can be reduced by 5m ² where a 5m ² outdoor space is provided 1+ bedroom = 50m ² but can be reduced by 8m ² where an 8m ² outdoor space is provided). I noted this difference in reviewing the table comparing the controls of the different zone controls. (Merit)	Disagree. In our view a larger minimum dwelling size within this location is not justified. This site offers an opportunity to increase capacity within a highly accessible location. The smaller minimum dwelling size offers an opportunity to provide greater housing choice and smaller more affordable apartments in a less affordable area.
2	For View I, View J, View K, show the upper part of buildings in an additional set of images. This can use the same Montage photo, but show the outline / tops of	Noted. Refer to revised drawing set.

MEMORANDUM



Urban & Environmental

	buildings, (dotted line acceptable) even if they extend outside of the photo frame. I know that this won't align with the set view methodology of the VIA process, and there will be some distortion, but will at help lay people to acknowledge the building extends outside picture frame, and the indicative extent of this. (Required)	
3	Add reference to Rolling height limit, to the 27m height plane provisions for clarity, in particular since this is the interpretation of the maximum height being used for the assessment of the plan change in the WAM documents.	Noted. Refer to revised drawing set.
4	On each of the street level sections, on pages 58, 60, 62, 64, 66, 68, 70 of the WAM document, please add the height from ground level to maximum height on boundary of plan change provisions as per attachment A to this memo. When extending beyond section area, Eg; to 27m, please note this on the section. (Required)	Noted. Refer to revised drawing set.
5	On page 49 diagrams, consider showing outline of George St Datum plane. Refer to attachment B as an example. (Required)	Council's urban designer has confirmed that this is no longer required.
6	Page 73 WAM document. Is the title meant to be Residential Activity Bulk and Massing Study ? Not Commercial Activity Bulk and Massing Study ? (Required)	Noted. Refer to revised drawing set.
7	Pukekawa is the Maori name for the Auckland Domain area and I understand that this means 'hill of bitter memories'. Consideration should be given to including direct reference to Pukekawa should be included in the plan change text, alongside	Agree. Refer to revised precinct provisions.

MEMORANDUM



Urban & Environmental

	<p>references to the Auckland Domain. This is to reflect the importance of this name and its reference to the historic and cultural significance of the area to Mana Whenua, and to Aucklanders.</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p>I note that the revised criteria IX.8.2 (1) (a) has replaced the reference to Te Aranga Principles, with the words mātauranga and tikanga. In principle, mātauranga can be translated as maori knowledge, and tikanga, as processes and protocols. The criteria requires these to be integrated into the design process. However, in the City Centre provisions, the focus is integration of mātauranga and tikanga into the design of new buildings and public open spaces, the reflects both process, and built outcome, including how the spaces function in terms of ongoing character and relationships. Please provide an explanation of the proposed wording, and consider a more expansive criteria eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The extent to which the design process, and the development integrates mātauranga and tikanga into the design new buildings and public open spaces.</i> 	<p>Agree. Refer to revised precinct provisions which have been updated for consistency with the City Centre zone.</p>