



# Proposed Plan Change 27

---

Amendments to Schedule 14.1 Historic Heritage Schedule (Errors, anomalies and information update, and deletion of 11 places) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part)

**SECTION 32  
EVALUATION REPORT**

**MAY 2019**

# Table of Contents

1	Introduction .....	4
1.1	Scope and purpose of this report .....	4
1.2	Background to the proposed plan change .....	5
2	The proposed plan change.....	6
3	Reasons for the proposed plan change .....	6
3.1	Development of options .....	7
3.2	Evaluation of options .....	7
3.3	Risk of acting or not acting.....	10
3.4	Reasons for the preferred option .....	10
4	Resource Management Framework.....	10
4.1	Part 2 of the Act .....	10
4.2	Other relevant sections of the Act.....	11
4.3	National Policy Statements .....	11
4.4	National Environmental Standards .....	12
4.5	National Planning Standards.....	12
4.6	Other Acts .....	13
4.7	The Auckland Plan.....	14
4.8	The Auckland Unitary Plan.....	15
5	Development of the Proposed Plan Change .....	16
5.1	Methodology.....	16
5.2	Consultation undertaken .....	19
	Consultation with iwi authorities.....	19
	Consultation with elected members and Local Boards .....	20
6	Evaluation of provisions.....	21
6.1	Overview of the amendments .....	21
6.2	Amendments to Schedule 14.1.....	22
6.2.1	Amendments to ‘Place Name and/or Description’ column.....	22
6.2.2	Amendments to ‘Verified Location’ and ‘Verified Legal Description’ columns .....	23
6.2.3	Amendments to ‘Category’ column, including A* .....	23
6.2.4	Amendments to ‘Primary Feature’ column .....	24
6.2.5	Amendments to ‘Heritage Values’ column.....	25
6.2.6	Amendments to ‘Extent of Place’ column .....	25

6.2.7	Amendments to ‘Exclusions’ column .....	26
6.2.8	Amendments to ‘Additional Rules for Archaeological Sites or Features’ column .....	27
6.2.9	Amendments to ‘Place of Māori Interest or Significance’ column .....	27
6.3	Amendments to the Plan maps (extent of place) .....	27
6.4	Amendments to delete places .....	28
7	Conclusion.....	29

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Scope and purpose of this report

This report is prepared by Auckland Council (**Council**) to fulfil the statutory requirements of section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**the Act**) for proposed Plan Change 27 (**PPC27**) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (**AUP**).

PPC27 introduces changes to Chapter L Schedules, Schedule 14.1 Historic Heritage Schedule (**Schedule 14.1**) and the Plan maps of the AUP. Schedule 14.1 includes information for each scheduled historic heritage place in the AUP, including an identification number (also shown on the Plan maps), the name and/or a description of each scheduled place, the verified location and legal description of each place, and information about the heritage values of the place. Schedule 14.1 also includes columns to identify the primary feature<sup>1</sup> and exclusions<sup>2</sup> for each scheduled historic heritage place. The Plan maps show the identified area that applies to each historic heritage place, which is described in the Plan maps as the Historic Heritage Overlay Extent of Place<sup>3</sup> (**extent of place**) and is shown as purple cross-hatching on the maps. All historic heritage places identified in Schedule 14.1 are already subject to the provisions of AUP Historic Heritage Overlay<sup>4</sup>.

The plan change seeks to amend information in Schedule 14.1 for 73 historic heritage places that are already included in the schedule and, for some of these places, to add or amend the extent of place shown in the Plan maps for the historic heritage place.

The amendments proposed will correct errors and, where appropriate, update information for the historic heritage places included in PPC27. The amendments enable the provisions of the AUP to apply appropriately to these historic heritage places, and will assist in their management and protection.

Section 32 of the Act requires that before adopting any objective, policy, and rule or other method, the Council shall have regard to the extent to which each objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act, and whether the policies and rules or other methods are the most appropriate way of achieving the objectives. A report must be prepared summarising the evaluation and giving reasons for the evaluation.

In accordance with section 32(6) of the Act and for the purposes of this report:

- the 'proposal' means PPC27,
- the 'objectives' means the purpose of the proposal/PPC27, and

---

<sup>1</sup> The primary feature of a scheduled historic heritage place forms the fundamental basis for scheduling a historic heritage place (AUP D17.1 Background)

<sup>2</sup> Features listed in Schedule 14.1 as exclusions do not contribute to, or may detract from, the values for which a historic heritage place has been scheduled (AUP D17.1 Background)

<sup>3</sup> The 'extent of place' of a scheduled historic heritage place defines the location and physical extent of the place and shows the area that contains the historic heritage values of the place and, where appropriate, any area relevant to an understanding of the function, meaning, and relationships of the historic heritage values (AUP B5.2.2(2))

<sup>4</sup> AUP D17 Historic Heritage Overlay

- the ‘provisions’ means the policies and rules or other methods that implement, or give effect to the objectives of the proposal.

The AUP contains existing objectives, policies, and rules or other methods for the purpose of managing historic heritage places<sup>5</sup>. PPC27 is not altering or re-litigating any of these provisions. This evaluation report on PPC27 relates only to the amendment of 73 historic heritage places in Schedule 14.1 within the existing policy framework of the AUP. The policy approach remains unchanged, and this report will not evaluate it in any more detail.

This section 32 evaluation will continue to be refined in relation to any consultation that occurs, and in relation to any new information that may arise, including through submissions on PPC27 and during hearings.

## 1.2 Background to the proposed plan change

The AUP contains objectives, policies and rules to protect significant historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. The AUP methods to achieve this protection are primarily focused on the Historic Heritage Overlay. Schedule 14.1 identifies the historic heritage places that are subject to the Historic Heritage Overlay.

Each historic heritage place identified in Schedule 14.1 was either included in a legacy plan historic heritage scheduled and “rolled over” into the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (**PAUP**) or added to the historic heritage scheduled through the PAUP. Schedule 14.1 of the AUP contains over 2,200 scheduled historic heritage places. These are identified and described in Schedule 14.1 and shown spatially in the Plan maps (by an extent of place). A limited number of places have additional information shown in Schedule 14.3 Historic Heritage Place maps (**Schedule 14.3**). All places are subject to the objectives, policies and rules of the Historic Heritage Overlay<sup>6</sup>.

A number of places in Schedule 14.1 are subject to errors and/or require information to be updated, for example changes to align with the Council’s property information (including updating legal descriptions and street addresses). For 11 historic heritage places included in PPC27, the error identified is that the place does not have sufficient historic heritage value to meet the criteria and thresholds for scheduling in the AUP’s Regional Policy Statement (**RPS**). Some places also require amendments to ensure there is consistency with how similar places are identified within Schedule 14.1.

All the historic heritage places included in PPC27 have been included within Schedule 14.1 primarily for their built heritage values, with the exception of four places<sup>7</sup>. These places are included in Schedule 14.1 for their archaeological values, and three of the four places are also identified in Schedule 14.1 as being of Māori interest or significance.

<sup>5</sup> AUP B5 Ngā rawa tuku iho me te āhua - Historic heritage and special character and D17 Historic Heritage Overlay

<sup>6</sup> AUP D17 Historic Heritage Overlay

<sup>7</sup> ID 00569 Combes/Daldy lime works site R09\_2240; ID 00729 Te Marae o Hinekakea village site, including grave R10\_163; ID 01270 Mill site R11\_1633, site of water-powered mill, including water race and dam; ID 01587 Te Kōpua Kai a Hiku/Panmure Basin, including Mokoia pā site, terrace/midden, and middens R11\_98, R11\_1255, R11\_1377, R11\_1384, R11\_1385, R11\_2158 R11\_2263, R11\_2264, R11\_2265, R11\_2266

PPC27 is the second dedicated plan change to correct errors and update information for scheduled historic heritage places. The Council notified Proposed Plan Change 10: Historic Heritage Schedule (errors, anomalies and information update) (**PPC10**) to the AUP on 25 January 2018. PPC10 proposed amendments to 145 historic heritage places. The decision on PC10 was notified on 21 March 2019.

## **2 The proposed plan change**

PPC27 introduces changes to 73 historic heritage places in Schedule 14.1. The changes proposed are amendments to Schedule 14.1 and/or to the Plan maps to correct errors and update information.

The plan change documents for PPC27 show:

- proposed amendments to Schedule 14.1, and
- proposed amendments to the extent of place mapping within the Plan maps.

An index forms part of the plan change documentation. The index lists the historic heritage places subject to PPC27 and identifies if an amendment is proposed to Schedule 14.1 and/or to the Plan maps for each place.

## **3 Reasons for the proposed plan change**

An evaluation under section 32 of the Act must examine the extent to which the objectives of PPC27 are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.<sup>8</sup> The objective of PPC27, or the purpose of the plan change, is to correct errors and, where required, update information for 73 historic heritage places in Schedule 14.1 of the AUP and in the Plan maps. The amendments include the proposed deletion of 11 historic heritage places from Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps.

The plan change will assist the Council to carry out its functions in order to achieve the purpose of the Act, being to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

Built heritage and character is identified as an issue of regional significance in the AUP's RPS<sup>9</sup>. Chapter B5.1 of the RPS states following issues:

- (1) *Auckland's distinctive historic heritage is integral to the region's identity and important for economic, social, and cultural well-being.*
- (2) *Historic heritage needs active stewardship to protect it from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.*

The approach of the AUP is to protect significant historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development, in the context of the identified values of each historic heritage place. The AUP methods to achieve this protection are primarily focused on

---

<sup>8</sup> RMA s32(1)(a)

<sup>9</sup> AUP B1.4 Issues of regional significance (Note: the name of this issue has been amended in AUP B5 to Historic heritage and special character but the name of the issue in B1.4 has not yet been updated)

Schedule 14.1, which identifies and recognises historic heritage places and applies the provisions of the AUP's Historic Heritage Overlay to those places. The provisions of the Historic Heritage Overlay apply to scheduled historic heritage places on land and in the coastal marine area. These places are identified in Schedule 14.1 and shown on the Plan maps.

A number of historic heritage places identified in Schedule 14.1 are known to contain errors, either in Schedule 14.1 or mapping errors in the Plan maps. PPC27 seeks to correct these errors and, where appropriate, update information for these places. For 11 places included in PPC27, the error is that the place is not considered to have sufficient historic heritage value to be included in Schedule 14.1. These 11 places have been re-evaluated and it has been found that they do not meet the criteria and thresholds outlined in the RPS to be eligible for inclusion in Schedule 14.1. As a result, PPC27 proposes to delete the historic heritage place from Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps.

The amendments in PPC27 will enable the provisions of the AUP to apply appropriately to the 73 historic heritage places included in the plan change, and will ensure that they are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. The amendments will also ensure that places in Schedule 14.1 that do not contain significant historic heritage values are not subject to the provisions of the Historic Heritage Overlay<sup>10</sup>. PPC27 is considered to be the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act, as outlined in the analysis below.

### **3.1 Development of options**

In the preparation of PPC27, the following options have been identified:

**Option 1** – do nothing/retain the status quo

**Option 2** – correct errors at the next AUP review

**Option 3** – a plan change to correct errors, including by deleting places from Schedule 14.1, and update information in Schedule 14.1.

### **3.2 Evaluation of options**

See following table for a summary of analysis under section 32(2) of the Act.

---

<sup>10</sup> Places proposed for deletion are likely to have historic heritage values, but not to the extent, or of significance, that subdivision, use and development is broadly inappropriate.

Options	Efficiency and effectiveness of provisions in achieving the objectives <sup>11</sup>	Benefits	Costs
<p><b>Option 1</b> <b>Do nothing/retain status quo</b></p>	<p>Will not achieve the objective of PPC27, being to correct errors and, where required, update information for the identified historic heritage places in Schedule 14.1.</p> <p>Is not efficient or effective due to increased time and money to assess resource consent applications for historic heritage places when the information about them is incorrect and/or outdated.</p> <p>Is not efficient to owners of the historic heritage places identified for inclusion in the plan change, as the use and development allowed by the AUP for each of these places may not be appropriate to each place because of the incorrect and/or outdated information in Schedule 14.1 for these places.</p>	<p>No cost to Council to undertake a public plan change; an economic benefit.</p>	<p>Historic heritage places may not be appropriately managed and protected due to errors in Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps. These errors could cause the loss of significant historic heritage values through inappropriate subdivision, use and, development.</p> <p>Costs may be imposed on owners of historic heritage places because the errors and outdated information in Schedule 14.1 may impose an additional and unnecessary consenting burden, when the historic heritage values of a place do not warrant the scheduling of the place.</p> <p>The known errors and inaccuracies in Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps may affect the integrity of the Historic Heritage Overlay and the AUP, and cause a reputational cost to Council.</p>
<p><b>Option 2 – wait for AUP review</b></p>	<p>Will not achieve the objective of PPC27, being to correct errors and, where required, update information for the identified historic heritage places in Schedule 14.1.</p> <p>Is not efficient or effective due to increased time and money to assess resource consent applications for historic heritage places when the information about them is incorrect and/or outdated.</p> <p>Is not efficient to owners of the historic heritage places identified for inclusion in the plan change, as the use and development allowed by the AUP for each of these places</p>	<p>No cost at present to Council to undertake a public plan change; an economic benefit.</p>	<p>Historic heritage places may not be appropriately managed and protected due to errors in Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps. These errors could cause the loss of significant historic heritage values through inappropriate subdivision, use and, development.</p> <p>Costs may be imposed on owners of historic heritage places because the errors and outdated information in Schedule 14.1 may impose an additional and unnecessary consenting burden, when the historic heritage values of a place do not warrant the scheduling of the place.</p> <p>The known errors and inaccuracies in Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps may affect the integrity of the</p>

<sup>11</sup> RMA s32(1)(b)(ii)



Options	Efficiency and effectiveness of provisions in achieving the objectives <sup>11</sup>	Benefits	Costs
	<p>may not be appropriate to each place because of the incorrect and/or outdated information in Schedule 14.1 for these places.</p>		<p>Historic Heritage Overlay and the AUP, and cause a reputational cost to Council.</p>
<p><b>Option 3 – plan change</b></p>	<p>The amendment of historic heritage places to correct errors and update information means the places, as well as their values and significance, are clearly identified. This will ensure these places are protected and managed appropriately through the provisions of the Historic Heritage Overlay.</p> <p>For the Historic Heritage Overlay to be efficient and effective, Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps must use correct and up-to-date information.</p>	<p>The plan change will give greater certainty to owners of historic heritage places, as the correction of errors will ensure the regulatory controls relating to their property are applied based on correct, up-to-date and clear information.</p> <p>There are social and cultural benefits through the recognition, protection and appropriate management of significant historic heritage places.</p> <p>The integrity of the Historic Heritage Overlay, including Schedule 14.1 and Plan maps, and of the AUP is protected.</p> <p>There is no economic growth or employment benefits anticipated.</p>	<p>There is a cost to the Council to proceed with a plan change.</p> <p>There is likely to be costs to owners of historic heritage places included in the plan change if there is disagreement with the proposed amendments to the place, through the need to engage in the plan change process.</p> <p>There may be perceived opportunity costs, through particular properties being subject to greater management and protection through the correction of errors in Schedule 14.1 and Plan maps.</p>

### **3.3 Risk of acting or not acting**

Section 32(2)(c) of the Act requires this evaluation to assess the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions. There is considered to be sufficient information about the historic heritage places included in PPC27 for the plan change to proceed.

The section 32 evaluation will continue to be refined in relation to any new information that may arise following notification, including information arising from submissions on PPC27 and during hearings on the plan change.

### **3.4 Reasons for the preferred option**

All places proposed to be included in PPC27 are known to be subject to an error in the way they are identified in Schedule 14.1 and/or relating to the mapping of the extent of place in the Plan maps. To ensure these historic heritage places are identified using correct and up-to-date information, amendments to Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps are required. Therefore, the 'do nothing' approach is not considered to be an appropriate option.

The evaluation of options in section 3.2 of this report shows that the preferred option for meeting the objectives of the proposal, and the most efficient and effective option, is a plan change to the AUP to amend individual historic heritage places within Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps to correct errors and update information. This includes the deletion of 11 places that are not considered to meet the RPS criteria and thresholds for scheduling.

In accordance with section 32(1)(a) of the Act, the objectives of the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. No new objective or policy is proposed in PPC27. PPC27 uses the existing objectives, policies and rule framework for the recognition and protection of historic heritage.

## **4 Resource Management Framework**

### **4.1 Part 2 of the Act**

The purpose of the Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, as defined in section 5(2) of the Act. Part 2 matters in the Act relevant to significant historic heritage as provided for in the AUP include:

- Section 6(f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

Sections 7 and 8 of the Act are also relevant to historic heritage:

- section 7(aa) the ethic of stewardship,
- section 7(c) the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values,
- section 7(f) the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment,
- section 7(g) finite characteristics of natural and physical resources, and
- section 8 the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi).

PPC27 is consistent with Part 2 of the Act, and in particular with the purpose of the Act, as it seeks to provide for the sustainable management of Auckland's historic heritage resources.

The amendment of historic heritage places in Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps will continue to provide for the use, development, and protection of these physical resources and for them to be managed in a way, or at a rate which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being, and for their health and safety.

The management and protection of historic heritage is a core responsibility of the Council's role in exercising its powers and functions under the Act. The scheduling of historic heritage places is an appropriate method for assisting the management of significant historic heritage resources in Auckland. The management of scheduled historic heritage places relies on the use of correct and up-to-date information to identify historic heritage places, both within Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps.

## **4.2 Other relevant sections of the Act**

Section 31(a) of the Act states that a function of the Council is: the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district. It is considered that PPC27 assists the Council to carry out its functions as set out in section 31 of the Act.

Section 74 of the Act sets out the matters to be considered by a territorial authority when preparing or changing its district plan. These matters include any proposed RPS, proposed regional plan, and management plans or strategies prepared under other legislation, relevant entries in the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Kōrero (**NZHL/RK**), to the extent that these are relevant to the resource management issues of the district. The authority must take into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority to the extent that its content has a bearing on the resource management issues of the district, but must not have regard to trade competition.

When determining the date on which a plan change takes effect the Act provides in section 86B(3) that:

*A rule in a proposed plan has legal effect only once a decision on submissions relating to the rule is made and publicly notified.*

Exceptions are provided in section 86B(3) of the Act, but are not considered relevant in relation to PPC27.

## **4.3 National Policy Statements**

National policy statements are instruments issued under section 52(2) of the Act and state objectives and policies for matters of national significance. The AUP is required to give effect

to any national policy statements<sup>12</sup>. The only national policy statement that is relevant to the proposed plan change is the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (**NZCPS**).

### **New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement**

Of the historic heritage places proposed to be amended through PPC27, three are located within the coastal marine area<sup>13</sup>. Other places are located within the wider coastal environment.

Objective 6 of the NZCPS is relevant to historic heritage. This objective seeks to enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and their health and safety, through subdivision, use and development, recognising that historic heritage in the coastal environment is extensive but not fully known, and is vulnerable to loss or damage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

A number of policies in the NZCPS generally relate to historic heritage in the coastal environment. Policy 17 specially relates to the identification and protection of historic heritage in the coastal environment from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

PPC27 gives effect to the NZCPS as it assists in the identification of historic heritage, and therefore the identification and protection of historic heritage places from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

## **4.4 National Environmental Standards**

There are currently five National Environmental Standards in force as regulations, but none of these relate to the management and protection of historic heritage.

## **4.5 National Planning Standards**

The purpose of the National Planning Standards (**Standards**) is to improve consistency in plan and policy statement structure, format and content so they are easier to prepare, understand, compare, and comply with. The Standards will also support implementation of national policy statements and help people observe the procedural principles of the Act.

The Standards were introduced as part of the 2017 amendments to the Act and have been under development since that time. The Minister for the Environment and the Minister of Conservation approved the first set of Standards on 5 April 2019. The Standards must be implemented within the specified timeframes. Unitary councils have ten years to adopt the Standards, unless a full plan review is undertaken within this timeframe (in this case the new plan must meet the Standards when it is notified for submissions). As the first set of Standards has only recently been approved, this plan change is not required to implement them.

---

<sup>12</sup> RMA s67(3) and s75(3)

<sup>13</sup> ID 00569 Combes/Daldy lime kilns work site; ID 0729 Te Marae o Hinekakea village site, including grave; ID 01587 Te Kōpua Kai a Hiku/Panmure Basin, including Mokoia pā site, terrace/midden, and middens R11\_98, R11\_1255, R11\_1377, R11\_1384, R11\_1385, R11\_2158 R11\_2263, R11\_2264, R11\_2265, R11\_2266

## 4.6 Other Acts

### Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (**Heritage NZ**) is the principal agency operating under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (**HNZPTA**). Heritage NZ maintains the NZHL/RK<sup>14</sup> for the purposes of providing information to the public and landowners, and to promote and assist in the protection of these places. The NZHL/RK is primarily an advocacy tool and the inclusion of a place on the NZHL/RK does not in itself protect the place.

Protection of some heritage places is also achieved through the regulatory provisions of the HNZPTA. Part 3 of the HNZPTA requires any person wishing to undertake work that may damage, modify or destroy an archaeological site to obtain an authority from Heritage NZ for that work.

Thirteen places proposed to be amended in PPC27 are included in the NZHL/RK<sup>15</sup>. Amending these places is compatible with the NZHL/RK and the HNZPTA, as the amendments sought are to correct errors and update information about the historic heritage places subject to the plan change.

### Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000

The Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 (**HGMPA**) was established to promote the integrated management and the protection and enhancement of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and its catchments. In order to achieve the purpose of the HGMPA, all persons exercising powers or carrying out functions for the Hauraki Gulf under any Act specified in Schedule 1 must, in addition to any other requirement specified in those Acts for the exercise of that power or the carrying out of that function, have particular regard to the provisions of sections 7 and 8.

Section 7 of the HGMPA recognises the national significance of the Hauraki Gulf. Section 8 of the HGMPA seeks to protect and enhance the Hauraki Gulf's resources, including its historic resources.

The Hauraki Gulf Marine Park includes all the coast and coastal marine area from Mangawhai in the north and to an area beyond the Auckland region in the south. The catchment area of the park extends inland to the first ridgeline. A number of historic heritage places proposed to be included in PPC27 are therefore within the park's boundaries.

---

<sup>14</sup> The NZHL/RK includes historic places, historic areas, waahi tapu and waahi tapu areas

<sup>15</sup> ID 00542 Minniesdale Chapel; ID 01350 Guy Homestead; ID 01354 Flat Bush School House (former)/Murphy Homestead; ID 01444 Metro Theatre (former)/Mangere East Hall; ID 01466 St Saviour's Chapel and Papatoetoe Orphan's Home and School (former); ID 01597 Stoneleigh (former)/Epworth (former); ID 01634 Dilworth Terrace Houses; ID 01642 Dominion Road Methodist Church; ID 01747 Crystal Palace Theatre; ID 01979 George Court Department Store (former); ID 02728 Citizens Advice Bureau (former); ID 02735 Queens Wharf; ID 02745 No Deposit Piano Company Building (note that ID 02728 and ID 02745 are the same place)

The amendment of historic heritage places within the Hauraki Gulf Island Marine Park has particular regard to sections 7 and 8 of the HGMPA as it will assist in the protection and enhancement of these places and is therefore compatible with the HGMPA.

### **Reserves Act 1997**

The purpose of the Reserves Act is for the Department of Conservation (**DOC**) or local authorities (where DOC has delegated responsibility), to administer land for its preservation and management for the benefit and enjoyment of the public. These areas of reserve land possess various values and features, including those that are historic in nature.

Some of the historic heritage places subject to PPC27 are located within reserves managed by Auckland Council. The proposed amendment of historic heritage places within these reserves supports the historic values of the reserves, and has the potential to enhance the benefit and enjoyment of the public of these places, due to the places and their values being identified correctly.

### **Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008**

Of the historic heritage places proposed to be amended through PPC27, four are located within the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area<sup>16</sup>.

The purpose of the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008 (**WRHAA**) is to recognise the national, regional and local significance of the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area and to promote the protection and enhancement of its heritage features for present and future generations. The objectives of establishing and maintaining the heritage area include the protection, restoration, and enhancement of the area and its heritage features, and to ensure that impacts on the area as a whole are considered when decisions are made affecting any part of it.

Amendments to the scheduling of the places within the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area will assist in the protection and enhancement of the historic heritage features within the heritage area. PPC27 therefore gives effect to the purpose of the WRHAA and its objectives, as the plan change proposes to amend to ensure scheduled historic heritage places, including some that are within the heritage area, are correctly identified, both in Schedule 14.1 and in the Plan maps.

## **4.7 The Auckland Plan**

The Auckland Plan includes the following direction 'Ensure Auckland's natural environment and cultural heritage is valued and cared for'<sup>17</sup>. The Auckland Plan states that we must actively seek opportunities to protect and enhance these values (including cultural heritage values) through our short and long-term decisions.

---

<sup>16</sup> ID 00060 Residence; ID 00091 Infant Block; ID 00107 Residence; ID 00119 Church

<sup>17</sup> Auckland Plan, Direction 1

PPC27 will assist with the protection and enhancement of Auckland’s historic heritage, and will help value and care for this heritage, through using correct and up-to-date information to identify these places.

## **4.8 The Auckland Unitary Plan**

When preparing or changing a district plan, Council must give effect to any RPS and have regard to any proposed RPS<sup>18</sup>. The RPS identifies a number of issues of regional significance, including:

### **B5 Ngā rawa tuku iho me te āhua - Historic heritage and special character**

Chapter B5 contains two objectives:

- (1) *Significant historic heritage places are identified and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.*
- (2) *Significant historic heritage places are used appropriately and their protection, management and conservation are encouraged, including retention, maintenance and adaptation.*

These objectives are supported by policies B5.2.2 (1) to (9). The objective of PPC27 aligns with these objectives and policies as it seeks to identify historic heritage places by using correct and up-to-date information and to ensure the places in Schedule 14.1 contain sufficient historic heritage value to be included in the schedule. This will assist the historic heritage places to be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

### **B6 Mana Whenua**

This chapter contains issues of significance to Maori and iwi authorities in the Auckland region, and objectives and policies relating to Mana Whenua. The iwi authorities of the Auckland region were provided information about the proposed plan change, including information that three places included in PPC27 have been identified in Schedule 14.1 as being a place of Maori interest or significance. Iwi authorities were invited to comment or provide feedback on the proposed plan change. No feedback has been received from iwi authorities.

### **B8 Toitū te taiwhenua – Coastal environment**

This chapter contains objectives and policies relating to the natural character of the coastal environment; subdivision, use and development of the coastal environment; public access and open space; and managing the Hauraki Gulf.

Four historic heritage places in PPC27 are located in the coastal marine area<sup>19</sup>, with other places are located within the wider coastal environment. The objective of the plan change aligns with B8 as it seeks to correctly identify these places and therefore assist in ensuring

---

<sup>18</sup> RMA s74(2) and s75(3)

<sup>19</sup> ID 00499 Waiwera Bath House; ID 00569 Combes/Daldy lime works site R09\_2240; ID 00729 Te Marae o Hinekakea village site, including grave R10\_163; ID 01587 Te Kōpua Kai a Hiku/Panmure Basin, including Mokoia pā site, terrace/midden, and middens R11\_98, R11\_1255, R11\_1377, R11\_1384, R11\_1385, R11\_2158 R11\_2263, R11\_2264, R11\_2265, R11\_2266

any subdivision, use and development of historic heritage places is appropriate to their values.

## 5 Development of the Proposed Plan Change

This section outlines the development of PPC27 and the consultation undertaken in preparing the plan change.

### 5.1 Methodology

#### Background

Each historic heritage place included in PPC27 has, as part of a previous plan process, been evaluated for its historic heritage significance. Schedule 14.1 contains over 2,200 historic heritage places, most of which were “rolled over” from legacy regional and district plans into a single historic heritage schedule in the PAUP. In addition, Schedule 14.1 contains historic heritage places added through the PAUP, and places added by Plan Change 7 to the AUP<sup>20</sup>.

The identification of historic heritage places within Schedule 14.1 is required to be in accordance with:

- RPS Policy B5.2.2; and
- the Methodology for Evaluating Historic Heritage Significance (**Methodology**)<sup>21</sup>.

The amalgamation of places from the legacy plan schedules into the PAUP historic heritage schedule was undertaken in 2012 by Heritage Unit staff, assisted by external planning and heritage consultants. This rollover process involved a number of steps to produce a single schedule containing all legacy historic heritage places and new historic heritage places. Considerable work went into identifying the criteria in the PAUP that related to each legacy historic heritage place that was to be amalgamated into the PAUP schedule.

All the historic heritage places included in the PAUP historic heritage schedule were assumed to have considerable or outstanding value in relation to one or more of the RPS evaluation criteria, and have considerable or outstanding overall significance to their locality or a greater geographic area, the threshold set out in the RPS for scheduling a historic heritage place<sup>22</sup>. These places were then identified in the historic heritage schedule and the Plan maps.

Schedule 14.1 is known to contain errors. While many legacy errors were corrected through the AUP process and the creation of Schedule 14.1, some legacy errors not corrected in the rollover, and some new errors were inadvertently introduced. In addition, research on some

---

<sup>20</sup> Plan Change 7, which was notified on 16 November 2017, proposed to add 49 new historic heritage places to Schedule 14.1. The decision on Plan Change 7 was publicly notified on 21 March 2019 and added 44 historic heritage places to Schedule 14.1.

<sup>21</sup> The Methodology is a non-regulatory method of achieving the objectives and policies of the AUP. It provides guidance on the process of evaluating the significance of historic heritage places against the criteria set out in the RPS.

<sup>22</sup> AUP Policy B5.2.2(3)



scheduled historic heritage places has provided supplementary information since the AUP was made operative in part, which now needs to be reflected in Schedule 14.1.

In addition to the errors, some places require amendments to align with the Council's property information, including amendments to legal descriptions and street addresses. Some places also require amendments to ensure there is consistency with how similar places are identified in Schedule 14.1.

Nearly all places included in PPC27 have been included within the Historic Heritage Overlay primarily for their built heritage values. There are however, four places included in the plan change that were scheduled primarily for their archaeological values. These places are:

- ID 00569 Combes/Daldy lime works site R09\_2240;
- ID 00729 Te Marae o Hinekakea village site, including grave R10\_163;
- ID 01270 Mill site R11\_1633, site of water-powered mill, including water race and dam; and
- ID 01587 Te Kōpua Kai a Hiku/Panmure Basin, including Mokoia pā site, terrace/midden, and middens R11\_98, R11\_1255, R11\_1377, R11\_1384, R11\_1385, R11\_2158 R11\_2263, R11\_2264, R11\_2265, R11\_2266.

In general, places identified predominantly for their archaeological or Māori heritage values are subject to a different work programme within the Heritage Unit and will be included in future plan change processes, where appropriate. However, for these four places, there is considered to be either significant risk posed to the place due to an error and/or implementation issues arising from the errors known to exist in Schedule 14.1 or the Plan maps relating to the place.

### **Review of historic heritage places**

Schedule 14.1 contains a number of known errors. Many of these were identified through a systematic review of Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps undertaken by Heritage Unit staff. The purpose of the review was to ensure that the text and maps for scheduled historic heritage places align, and that the information for each place was correct and up-to-date, and any errors were identified.

During the review period, additional research has been undertaken for some places, in particular places in Schedule 14.1 that are category A\*. Category A\* places are the most significant scheduled historic heritage places from legacy plans where the total or substantial demolition or destruction was a discretionary or non-complying activity, rather than a prohibited activity<sup>23</sup>. Category A\* is an interim category until a comprehensive re-evaluation of these places is undertaken and their category status is addressed through a plan change process. The outcome of this research has also resulted in some information needing to be updated in Schedule 14.1.

Some errors in Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps have been identified by Council staff on an ad hoc basis, for example when staff are undertaking site visits to provide advice on resource consent applications relating to scheduled historic heritage places.

---

<sup>23</sup> AUP D17.1 Background

For a limited number of places included in PPC27, the owner has contacted Council to advise that there may be an error in Schedule 14.1 or the Plan maps for their property, or has asked Council to review the scheduled historic heritage place to determine whether it meets the criteria and thresholds for inclusion in Schedule 14.1.

The errors and inconsistencies that have been identified include:

- the extent of place (mapped in the Plan maps) is incorrect, or there is no extent of place mapped in the Plan maps (i.e. a dot only or nothing at all);
- the name of the place is not historically correct;
- the address and/or legal description is incorrect;
- there is no primary feature identified;
- exclusions in Schedule 14.1 are not identified or are incorrect;
- a place has duplicate entries within the schedule;
- the place may not meet the RPS criteria and thresholds for scheduling; and
- minor amendments are required for grammar, sense and consistency.

As part of this review, a principle of “refining management” was introduced. This is defined as ensuring the management of a historic heritage place is appropriate to the values and significance of that place.

To refine management, once a place was identified as containing an error, that place was subject to further review. This is specific to each place, but has involved:

- for category A\* places, a review to determine whether a place meets the RPS thresholds for scheduling as a category A or category B place;
- for places suspected of not having significant historic heritage values, a review to determine whether the place meets the criteria and thresholds for scheduling in the RPS (i.e. whether the place has sufficient historic heritage value to be included Schedule 14.1);
- identification of a primary feature;
- correction/updating of any other column, including name, legal description, exclusions, and heritage values, as required; and/or
- amending or, where required, defining the mapped extent of place.

Where possible, errors were corrected through the clause 20A process under the Act<sup>24</sup>. The majority of Clause 20A errors were corrected through an update to the AUP on 20 June 2017. If errors did not meet the Clause 20A test they were considered for inclusion within a plan change. Errors relating to 145 historic heritage places were amended through PPC10. Errors that were not addressed through that process, and errors that have been identified since, were considered for inclusion in PPC27.

### **Places subject to errors not included within PCX**

Not all places with known errors are included within PPC27. Other scheduled historic heritage places with known errors will be reviewed and a future plan change may be notified

---

<sup>24</sup> Clause 20A of Schedule 1 of the Act allows Council to amend, without using the process in the schedule, an operative policy statement or plan to correct any minor errors

in order to correct these errors. Furthermore, it is expected that errors will continue to be identified. If so, these places are also likely to be the subject of a future plan change.

## **5.2 Consultation undertaken**

In accordance with clause 3 of Schedule 1 of the Act, during the preparation of a proposed policy statement or plan, the local authority shall consult with:

- a) the Minister for the Environment; and*
- b) those other Ministers of the Crown who may be affected by the policy statement or plan; and*
- c) local authorities who may be so affected; and*
- d) the tangata whenua of the area who may be so affected, through iwi authorities; and*
- e) any customary marine title group in the area.*

A local authority may consult anyone else during the preparation of a proposed policy statement or plan.

Letters were sent on 4 March 2019 to the Minister for the Environment, Minister of Conservation, Department of Conservation and Heritage New Zealand, advising the organisations about PPC27. Heritage New Zealand responded to advise they were interested in the plan change and that they would like to be kept updated about it. No response was received from the other organisations.

### **Consultation with iwi authorities**

In accordance with clause 3B of Schedule 1 of the Act, for the purposes of clause 3(1)(d), a local authority is to be treated as having consulted with iwi authorities in relation to those whose details are entered in the record kept under section 35A, if the local authority—

- (a) considers ways in which it may foster the development of their capacity to respond to an invitation to consult; and*
- (b) establishes and maintains processes to provide opportunities for those iwi authorities to consult it; and*
- (c) consults with those iwi authorities; and*
- (d) enables those iwi authorities to identify resource management issues of concern to them; and*
- (e) indicates how those issues have been or are to be addressed.*

In addition to the above, recent legislation changes to the Act introduced the following sections in relation to iwi authorities:

Section 32(4A):

*(4A) If the proposal is a proposed policy statement, plan, or change prepared in accordance with any of the processes provided for in Schedule 1, the evaluation report must—*

- (a) summarise all advice concerning the proposal received from iwi authorities under the relevant provisions of Schedule 1; and*

*(b) summarise the response to the advice, including any provisions of the proposal that are intended to give effect to the advice.*

#### **Schedule 1**

##### **4A Further pre-notification requirements concerning iwi authorities**

*(1) Before notifying a proposed policy statement or plan, a local authority must—*

*(a) provide a copy of the relevant draft proposed policy statement or plan to the iwi authorities consulted under clause 3(1)(d); and*

*(b) have particular regard to any advice received on a draft proposed policy statement or plan from those iwi authorities.*

*(2) When a local authority provides a copy of the relevant draft proposed policy statement or plan in accordance with subclause (1), it must allow adequate time and opportunity for the iwi authorities to consider the draft and provide advice on it.*

In accordance with Schedule 1 clause 4A, copies of the draft plan change and draft section 32 report were sent to all iwi authorities of the Auckland region on 1 March 2019. The letter accompanying this information highlighted the fact that three of the historic heritage places proposed to be included in the plan change had been identified in Schedule 14.1 as being of Maori interest or significance. No feedback from iwi authorities has been received.

#### **Consultation with elected members and Local Boards**

Council staff, along with staff from Panuku, attended a meeting with Henderson-Massey Local Board on 12 February 2019 to update the local board about the amendments proposed in the plan change to ID 00262 Waitakere Civic Centre. The Waitakere Civic Centre is owned by Council. Waitākere Ward councillors, Linda Cooper and Penny Hulse, were also advised of the amendments proposed in PCX to the Waitakere Civic Centre.

Information was sent to local board members and local board advisors on 11 March 2019 to inform them of PPC27. This correspondence provided an explanation of the proposed plan change and included a list of historic heritage places proposed to be amended by the plan change relevant to each local board area. Specific information was also provided about the proposed deletion of any scheduled historic heritage places in local board areas. Feedback was received from several local board members. No issues or concerns were raised.

The Planning Committee approved the public notification of the plan change at its 2 April 2019 meeting<sup>25</sup>. The committee approved the public notification of the plan change, endorsed the section 32 evaluation report, and delegated the authority to make minor amendments to the plan change, if required, to the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Planning Committee, Councillor Mike Lee, and a member of the Independent Māori Statutory Board, Liane Ngamane.

---

<sup>25</sup> Planning Committee resolution PLA/2019/37

## **Consultation with other parties**

The Heritage Advisory Panel was advised of the proposed plan change at its 26 February 2019 meeting. No feedback was received on the plan change at that stage. During the discussion about the proposed plan change at the April Planning Committee meeting, a committee member requested the Heritage Advisory Panel be provided with more specific details about the historic heritage places sought to be deleted from Schedule 14.1 in the PPC27. The committee resolved to delegate to Councillor Lee, who is also a member of the Heritage Advisory Panel, the authority to approve minor amendments to the proposed plan change (in addition to the other persons specified in the resolution, as outlined above). A memorandum was circulated to Heritage Advisory Panel members on 4 April, which provided information about the historic heritage places proposed to be deleted from Schedule 14.1 in PPC27. No feedback was received from panel members on the memorandum.

On 5 March 2019, emails were sent to the following Auckland Council groups or organisations: Parks, Community Facilities, Community Services, Auckland Transport and Panuku. The correspondence advised them of the proposed plan change, and identified places subject to PPC27 that are in their ownership or management. Responses received from Auckland Transport and Panuku sought further information about the amendments proposed. No issues were raised in relation to the amendments proposed in PPC27.

On 11 March 2019, letters were sent to the owners of the 11 historic heritage places proposed to be deleted from Schedule 14.1 as part of PPC27. The letters advised the owners that their property was proposed for inclusion in the plan change, and what the process for involvement in the plan change is, should it be approved for notification. The letters also advised that specific places may not be included in PPC27, should the Planning Committee resolve to remove them from the proposed plan change. Responses were received from the owners, or their representatives, of 37 Waiwera Place, Waiwera, 651 West Coast Road, Oratia, and 19 William Avenue, Manurewa. The owners of these places expressed support for the deletion of these places from Schedule 14.1.

Engagement with owners and/or occupiers of other historic heritage places included in PPC27 has occurred where owners have identified a potential error and/or as part of liaison with owners to access properties for site visits. In some instances this has resulted in ongoing communication between Council staff and particular owners/occupiers.

## **6 Evaluation of provisions**

This part of the report evaluates the provisions contained within PPC27.

### **6.1 Overview of the amendments**

Schedule 14.1 contains the following columns, which include information about each scheduled historic heritage place:

- ID
- Place Name and/or Description

- Verified Location
- Verified Legal Description
- Category
- Primary Feature
- Heritage Values
- Extent of Place
- Exclusions
- Additional Rules for Archaeological Sites or Features
- Place of Māori Interest or Significance

The inclusion of a historic heritage place in Schedule 14.1 means the provisions of the Historic Heritage Overlay apply to that place. This is also known as the scheduling of a place. The Historic Heritage Overlay rules apply to all land and water (including the foreshore and seabed) within the identified extent of place of a scheduled historic heritage place.

The Historic Heritage Overlay is based on a management approach where activities anticipated to have a greater effect on the values of a historic heritage place in Schedule 14.1 are subject to more rigorous management. The identification of an extent of place, primary feature(s), and exclusions is the basis of this management approach, ensuring the management of a historic heritage place is specific to its features, and therefore to the values and significance of that particular place.

The identification of information for each column in Schedule 14.1 for a historic heritage place requires correct and up-to-date information. It is reasonable to expect that the information held by Council on places may increase or change over time, along with the understanding of places and how they should be protected and managed.

The process of refining management (as outlined in section 5.1) responds to these changes in information and in understanding. It aims to ensure that unnecessary consent activity is not generated, and that a property can be subject to reasonable use, while also continuing to protect historic heritage places from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.

## **6.2 Amendments to Schedule 14.1**

There are no amendments proposed to the column 'ID'.

### **6.2.1 Amendments to 'Place Name and/or Description' column**

PPC27 proposes amendments to the names of 25 places. These amendments are predominantly to make the name of the place more historically correct. In some cases the proposed amendment is to ensure the name of a place is more consistent with the identification of similar places in Schedule 14.1. Some of the amendments proposed to this column are to correct spelling and grammatical errors.

### **6.2.2 Amendments to ‘Verified Location’ and ‘Verified Legal Description’ columns**

PPC27 proposes amendments to the address (known as the ‘Verified Location’ in Schedule 14.1) for 14 places. Amendments to the ‘Verified Legal Description’ are proposed for 33 places.

Amendments to the address and/or legal description of a historic heritage place are mainly for the following reasons:

- to ensure the address and legal description are correct;
- to ensure the address and legal description align with the extent of place identified within the Plan maps, or the amended extent of place proposed in PPC27; and
- to ensure the address and legal description align with the Council’s property information, and therefore this information is searchable within the Council’s systems, for both landowners and Council staff.

Some of the amendments to the Verified Legal Description column are to add the legal description for a place in Schedule 14.1, because the schedule does not include one.

### **6.2.3 Amendments to ‘Category’ column, including A\***

PPC27 proposes amendments to the ‘Category’ column for seven places. Schedule 14.1 identifies the category of significance for historic heritage places. Chapter B5 of the AUP outlines the categories of historic heritage place in Schedule 14.1<sup>26</sup>:

- Category A: historic heritage places that are of outstanding significance well beyond their immediate environs;
- Category A\*: historic heritage places identified in previous district plans which are yet to be evaluated and assessed for their significance;
- Category B: historic heritage places that are of considerable significance to a locality or beyond; and
- Historic Heritage Areas: groupings of interrelated but not necessarily contiguous historic heritage places or features that collectively meet the criteria for inclusion in Schedule 14.1.

The AUP makes it clear that category A\* is an interim category until each place can be reviewed<sup>27</sup>. As part of the preparation of the plan change, six category A\* places have been reviewed to assess their significance. The review of each category A\* place involved summarising the history of each place and assessing the place against the RPS evaluation criteria outlined in RPS policy B5.2.2(1). A statement of significance was prepared for each place. Based on this information, the review provides a recommendation about whether the place meets the RPS threshold for scheduling as a category A or category B place.

The review of category A\* places undertaken as part of PPC27 have resulted in the following:

*Amend from Category A\* to Category A*

---

<sup>26</sup> AUP B5.2.2(4)

<sup>27</sup> AUP Chapter D17.1 Background

- ID 01447 Nathan Homestead and gardens; and
- ID 01466 St Saviour's Chapel and Papatoetoe Orphan's Home and School (former).

*Amend from Category A\* to Category B*

- ID 01053 Earnoch;
- ID 01127 Commercial building;
- ID 01330 Meadowbrook; and
- ID 01453 Dutch prefabricated house.

*Dilworth Terrace Houses*

There is one other place in PPC27 where the category is proposed to be changed; Dilworth Terrace Houses (ID 01634) from category B to category A. A historic heritage evaluation for the Dilworth Terrace Houses was prepared in 2018 as part of Council's response to an appeal relating to the Dilworth Terraces Houses viewshaft.<sup>28</sup> The viewshaft was included in the PAUP for the purpose of managing the scale of development to protect the view of the Dilworth Terrace houses from the eastern end of Quay Street. Strand Holdings Limited lodged an appeal to the High Court for a judicial review of the Independent Hearing Panel's recommendation and the Council's decision to relocate the viewpoint of the Dilworth Terrace Houses Viewshaft from Quay Street to The Strand. An appeal on the viewshaft by Strand Holdings resulted in Council reconsidering the most appropriate location for the viewshaft.

Advice on how to proceed with the appeal and the possible alternative location of the viewshaft was reported to Council's Planning Committee in February 2018. One of the resolutions arising from that meeting was that the Planning Committee agrees to investigate changing the status of the Dilworth Terrace Houses from category B to category A in the Historic Heritage Schedule, as recommended in the 2018 historic heritage evaluation<sup>29</sup>.

Council staff have reviewed the 2018 historic heritage evaluation for the terrace houses and agree that the category for this place should be amended from category B to category A, in conjunction with the identification of an appropriate primary feature and exclusions for the place in Schedule 14.1.

#### **6.2.4 Amendments to 'Primary Feature' column**

The primary feature forms the fundamental basis for scheduling a historic heritage place<sup>30</sup>, and Schedule 14.1 includes a column for the identification of the primary feature or features. PPC27 proposes the identification or amendment of primary features for 56 places.

Most of these proposed amendments relate to category B places. The identification of a primary feature for a category B place was introduced during the PAUP hearings (the PAUP historic heritage schedule as notified only identified primary features for category A and A\* places). For this reason, most category B places do not yet have a primary feature identified in Schedule 14.1. The provisions of the Historic Heritage Overlay require that if the primary

---

<sup>28</sup> Dilworth Terrace Houses Historic Heritage Evaluation prepared for Auckland Council by Plan.Heritage, 16 February 2018

<sup>29</sup> PLA/2018/10

<sup>30</sup> AUP D17.1 Background



feature(s) of a category B place is not identified, all features within the extent of place are considered a primary feature for the purposes of implementing the rules of the Historic Heritage Overlay<sup>31</sup>. The identification of the primary feature(s) of 52 category B historic heritage places as proposed by PPC27 will assist in the management of these places, as the key features of heritage significance will be listed in Schedule 14.1 and the Historic Heritage Overlay rules will apply the appropriate activity status depending on whether development is proposed to the primary feature of the category B place or within the extent of place of the place.

PPC27 proposes to amend the primary feature column for two category A\* places, as a result of the review of these places. These reviews have resulted in additional information about the places which has led to the proposed amendment of the primary feature column.

PPC27 also proposes to add a primary feature for ID 01634 Dilworth Terrace Houses as this place does not currently have a primary feature identified. As outlined in section 6.2.3 above, this category B place is proposed to be amended to category A.

The identification of a primary feature is a key part of the management approach of the Historic Heritage Overlay.

#### **6.2.5 Amendments to 'Heritage Values' column**

Heritage values, also known in the AUP as 'criteria'<sup>32</sup>, are the identified values for a place, and are listed in Schedule 14.1 where they have been evaluated to be considerable or greater. The values are referenced with the following letters: a: historical; b: social; c: Mana Whenua; d: knowledge; e: technology; f: physical attributes; g: aesthetic; h: context.

PPC27 proposes amendments to the 'Heritage Values' column for 12 places. For six of these places, the amendments are the result of the A\* review that has been undertaken for the place. For four of these places, the amendments to the heritage values are to reflect the historic values identified in recent historic heritage evaluations or as a result of recent research about the place<sup>33</sup>. For the remaining two places, the amendments to the heritage values are to correct typographic errors introduced when the places were added to the historic heritage schedule through the PAUP<sup>34</sup>.

#### **6.2.6 Amendments to 'Extent of Place' column**

Policy B5.2.2(2) of the RPS requires the location and physical extent of each historic heritage place to be identified. This area, known as the 'extent of place', contains the historic heritage values of the place and, where appropriate, any area that is relevant to an understanding of the function, meaning and relationships of the historic heritage values of the place.

---

<sup>31</sup> AUP D17.1 Background

<sup>32</sup> AUP B5.2.2(1)

<sup>33</sup> ID 00729 Te Marae o Hinekakea village site, including grave R10\_163; ID 01270 Mill site R11\_1633; ID 01587 Wai Makoia, including pa site and middens R11\_2158; and ID 01634 Dilworth Terrace Houses

<sup>34</sup> ID 02494 Mann House and ID 02495 Lush House

PPC27 proposes amendments to the extent of place in the Plan maps for 59 places, including the removal of the extent of place from the Plan maps for the 11 historic heritage places proposed to be deleted (see section 6.3 below).

PPC27 proposes amendments to the 'Extent of Place' column in Schedule 14.1 for two places. For these places, no extent of place was shown in the Plan maps but PPC27 is proposing to add an extent of place. For places in Schedule 14.1 that do not have an extent of place mapped in the Plan maps, the Extent of Place column usually includes the following reference: 'To be defined#'. The # links to the provisions of the Historic Heritage Overlay, and provides for the rules in Tables D17.4.1 and D17.4.2 to apply to all land and water within 50m of the feature annotated with #. This reference is proposed to be amended to 'Refer to planning maps' in Schedule 14.1 for the two places, as PPC27 is proposing to map the extent of place for each place in the Plan maps. This amendment is considered appropriate as it will result in the Historic Heritage Overlay rules applying appropriately to the scheduled historic heritage place.

### **6.2.7 Amendments to 'Exclusions' column**

Some historic heritage places have identified exclusions in Schedule 14.1, for example the interiors of buildings or accessory buildings. Features listed as exclusions do not contribute to, or may detract from the values for which the historic heritage place has been scheduled or, particularly with the interiors of buildings, may not have been evaluated<sup>35</sup>. Activities affecting features identified as exclusions in Schedule are either permitted, or require consent as controlled activities, in order to manage the affect such activities may have on the historic heritage values of the place overall<sup>36</sup>.

PPC27 proposes amendments to exclusions for 42 places, which consist of:

- amendments to add exclusions, where additional features that do not contribute to the heritage values of the place or detract from these values have been identified;
- changes to the wording of existing exclusions, including where the exclusion is incorrect, unclear, or is inconsistent with how similar features have been identified in the Exclusions column of Schedule 14.1; and
- the deletion of specific exclusions, including where the proposed amendment of an extent of place no longer covers the identified exclusion, or where the interior has been assessed as having heritage value (and should therefore not be identified as an exclusion).

The identification of exclusions is a key part of the management approach of the Historic Heritage Overlay, as it helps to ensure that the appropriate level of management is applied to any development proposed, and that this level of management relates to the historic heritage values of the place.

---

<sup>35</sup> AUP D17.1 Background

<sup>36</sup> AUP Table D17.4.1, Table D17.4.2, and Table D17.4.3

### **6.2.8 Amendments to ‘Additional Rules for Archaeological Sites or Features’ column**

Scheduled historic heritage places that are archaeological sites, or contain archaeological sites or features that contribute to the significance of the place, are identified in Schedule 14.1 by the inclusion of the word ‘Yes’ in the ‘Additional Rules for Archaeological Sites or Features’ column<sup>37</sup>. Places identified in this column are subject to additional rules to manage activities that have the potential to adversely affect archaeological values, such as land disturbance activities.

PPC27 proposes to amend the Additional Rules for Archaeological Sites and Features for one place, ID 01330 Meadowbrook, to delete the reference to this place being of archaeological value. The A\* review of this place identified that the place was constructed around 1880 and has two wells. It is known that artefacts found in the wells have already been extracted, meaning the place no longer has archaeological values of a level which are not considered to require management under the provisions of the Historic Heritage Overlay.

### **6.2.9 Amendments to ‘Place of Māori Interest or Significance’ column**

Schedule 14.1 identifies scheduled historic heritage places that are sites or places of significance to Mana Whenua (by the inclusion of ‘Yes’ in the ‘Place of Māori Interest or Significance’ column). Places identified in this way in Schedule 14.1 may also be subject to the provisions of the Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua Overlay<sup>38</sup>.

As outlined earlier in this report, in general places identified predominantly for their archaeological or Māori heritage values are subject to a different work programme within the Heritage Unit. However, PPC27 proposes a change to the ‘Place of Māori Interest or Significance’ column in Schedule 14.1 for one place: Mill site R11\_1633 at the Botanic Gardens Regional Park (ID 01270), due to an error during the rollover of the place from the legacy district plan to the PAUP. This error resulted in the place being wrongly identified as a place of Māori interest or significance. A review of the information relating to this place has confirmed it is a European-era mill site, and that it is not known to be a place of interest or significance to Māori.

## **6.3 Amendments to the Plan maps (extent of place)**

Historic heritage places in legacy district and regional plans were not mapped with an extent of place. Most legacy historic heritage places had no spatial area mapped to show the area that was included in the scheduling and were instead identified with a dot or point on a map (or similar). When legacy scheduled historic heritage places were ‘rolled over’ into the PAUP, an extent of place was defined for most scheduled historic heritage places. The approach to establishing an extent of place generally involved consideration of what the historical boundaries of the place would have been, how the place is perceived at present, what modified areas were appropriate to exclude, and the heritage values that needed to be considered.

---

<sup>37</sup> AUP D17.1 Background

<sup>38</sup> AUP D21 Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua Overlay

A number of mapping errors were introduced through the definition of extents of place for historic heritage places during the PAUP process. These errors include the extents of place in the Plan maps for some places that are too big, too small, or are located on the wrong property. In some cases, no extent of place was mapped in the Plan maps and the scheduled historic heritage place was not mapped at all or was mapped by a dot only. Mapping errors may reduce the protection and management of historic heritage places, or result in the application of the Historic Heritage Overlay onto places that do not contain significant historic heritage values, resulting in the generation of unnecessary consenting activity.

PPC27 proposes amendments to the Plan maps for 59 scheduled historic heritage places.

The identification of an extent of place is a key part of the management approach of the Historic Heritage Overlay, as it defines the geographic area that is subject to the provisions of the overlay. The accurate definition of an extent of place for each scheduled historic heritage place and the correction of errors relating to extent of place mapping is a key method of ensuring the Historic Heritage Overlay provisions are applied appropriately.

## **6.4 Amendments to delete places**

PPC27 proposes to delete 11 places and one record from Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps, including:

- one historic heritage place that is a duplicate record;
- two historic heritage places that were damaged by fire and subsequently demolished; and
- nine places that are not considered to meet the criteria and thresholds in the RPS for inclusion in Schedule 14.1.

As part of its Strategic Vision, the Heritage Unit identified reviewing the schedule as a priority, aligned with the 10-year target of ensuring Schedule 14.1 is robust. As part of the preparation of this plan change, a number of historic heritage places were reviewed to determine whether they continue to meet the RPS criteria and thresholds for scheduling. These places were identified for review following:

- council historic heritage monitoring projects,
- a resource consent application relating to the historic heritage place, or
- a request by the owner of the property.

### *Duplicate record*

One of the places proposed for deletion in PPC27 is a duplicate record. This place, ID 02745 No Deposit Piano Company Building, is currently included in Schedule 14.1 twice, as both ID 02745 and as ID 02728 Citizens Advice Bureau (former). This error was introduced during the PAUP. To correct this error, PPC27 proposes to delete ID 02745 from Schedule 14.1 and delete the associated extent of place from the Plan maps. Amendments are proposed to ID 02728 to ensure the information in Schedule 14.1 for the place is correct, including the amendment of the name to 'No Deposit Piano Company Building', as this is the historically correct name.

### *Places that no longer exist*

Two of the 11 places that were reviewed for deletion no longer exist. These are:

- ID 00499 Waiwera Bath House, which was damaged by fire and was demolished via authority of a resource consent (issued on 11 May 2016), and
- ID 01437 Residence, which was damaged by fire and subsequently demolished by authority of a resource consent issued on 22 May 2001. Resource consent to relocate the existing dwelling onto the property was issued in 2006.

### *Places that do not meet the RPS criteria and thresholds*

For the remaining nine places that are proposed for deletion, a review was undertaken to assess whether the historic heritage values of each place are sufficient to meet the thresholds for scheduling in Schedule 14.1. These thresholds are outlined in the B5.2.2(3) of the AUP RPS, which states:

- (3) *Include a place with historic heritage value in Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic heritage if:*
- a. the place has considerable or outstanding value in relation to one or more of the evaluation criteria in Policy B5.2.2(1); and*
  - b. the place has considerable or outstanding overall significance to the locality or greater geographic area.*

The review of each place summarised the history of each place (with supplementary research undertaken if required) and assessed the place against the RPS evaluation criteria outlined in policy B5.2.2(1). The review provided a statement of significance about each place, and included a recommendation about whether the place did or did not meet the RPS thresholds for scheduling.

For nine of the historic heritage places that were reviewed, the review determined the place did not meet the RPS thresholds for scheduling outlined above. PPC27 therefore proposes to delete these nine places from Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps.

The deletion of 11 historic heritage places from Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps will remove places from the schedule that have been assessed as not having historic heritage value at the level required to be included in Schedule 14.1. The deletion of the 11 places will ensure that the Historic Heritage Overlay does not apply to those places, and will prevent unnecessary consent activity being generated in relation to these places.

## **7 Conclusion**

PPC27 seeks to amend information and/or update the Plan maps for 73 historic heritage places already included in Schedule 14.1 of the AUP. The purpose of the proposed plan change is to amend information in Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps for 73 historic heritage places to ensure the schedule and maps are correct and up-to-date for these places. The proposed amendments will help to ensure the provisions of the AUP Historic Heritage Overlay apply appropriately to the scheduled historic heritage places that are the subject of PPC27 and therefore assist in their protection and management.

The main conclusions of the evaluation under Part 2 and Section 32 of the Act are summarised below:

1. PPC27 is consistent with the purpose of sustainable management in Section 5 and the principles within Sections 6, 7, and 8, and within Part 2 of the Act.
2. PPC27 assists the Council in carrying out its functions set out in Sections 30 and 31 of the Act.
3. Pursuant to Section 75(3)(c) of the Act, PPC27 is consistent with the objectives and policies of the Auckland Regional Policy Statement
4. The evaluation undertaken in accordance with Section 32 concluded:
  - i. The use of the existing objectives of the AUP would be the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.
  - ii. The amendment of 73 historic heritage places identified in Schedule 14.1, including the deletion of 11 historic heritage places and the removal of one record, is the most appropriate means of achieving the objectives identified in section 3 of this report.

<b>Conclusion</b>	This part of the report concludes that the proposed plan change is the most efficient, effective and appropriate means of addressing the resource management issues identified.
-------------------	---