



Proposed Plan Change 7

Additions to Schedule 14 Historic Heritage
Schedule, Statements and Maps in the
Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part)

**SECTION 32
EVALUATION REPORT**

7 November 2017

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Scope and purpose of this report	3
1.2	Background to the proposed plan change.....	4
2	The proposed plan change.....	4
3	Reasons for the proposed plan change	4
3.1	Development of options	5
3.2	Evaluation of options	6
3.3	Risk of acting or not acting.....	13
3.4	Reasons for the preferred option	13
4	Resource Management Framework.....	14
4.1	Part 2 of the Act	14
4.2	Other relevant sections of the Act.....	14
4.3	National Policy Statements	15
4.4	National Environmental Standards.....	16
4.5	National Planning Standards.....	16
4.6	Other Acts	16
4.7	The Auckland Plan.....	18
4.8	The Auckland Unitary Plan.....	18
5	Development of the Proposed Plan Change.....	20
5.1	Methodology.....	20
5.2	Consultation undertaken	23
	Consultation with iwi authorities.....	23
	Consultation with other parties.....	24
6	Evaluation of provisions.....	25
6.1	Effect of scheduling.....	25
6.2	Reasonable use	25
6.3	Designations.....	27
6.4	Interiors.....	27
6.5	Category A place	27
6.6	Modifications to the place	28
6.7	Historic heritage areas.....	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 7 (**PPC7**) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) (**AUP**).

PPC7 introduces changes to Chapter L Schedules, Schedule 14 Historic Heritage Schedule, Statements and Maps (**Schedule 14**) of the AUP. Schedule 14 is made up of three parts: Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage (**Schedule 14.1**), Schedule 14.2 Historic Heritage Areas – Maps and statements of significance (**Schedule 14.2**), and Schedule 14.3 Historic Heritage Place maps (**Schedule 14.3**). The changes proposed in PPC7 are the addition of historic heritage places, including historic heritage areas¹, to Schedule 14.1. The addition of HHAs will require information to be added to Schedule 14.2. No changes are proposed to Schedule 14.3.

The plan change seeks to recognise the values of identified historic heritage places by adding them to the AUP's Historic Heritage Overlay², as identified in Schedule 14.1 and the GIS viewer/planning maps. The addition of historic heritage areas to Schedule 14.1 ensures the provisions of the AUP apply, including the Historic Heritage Overlay provisions. This will assist in the management and protection of the historic heritage places.

Section 32 of the Act requires that before adopting any objective, policy, 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 PPC7,
- the 'objectives' means the purpose of the proposal/PPC7, and
- the 'provisions' means the policies, 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 and protecting historic heritage places. PPC7 is not altering or re-litigating any of these provisions. This evaluation report on PPC7 relates to the addition of historic heritage places to 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.

¹ Note: Schedule 14.1 contains three types of historic heritage place: Category A places, Category B places, and historic heritage areas.

² AUP Chapter D17 Historic Heritage

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 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 Schedule 14.1, which identifies and recognises historic heritage places, and includes these places in the Historic Heritage Overlay.

A number of places that have potential significant historic heritage values were identified. These places were identified as part of:

- heritage evaluations funded by the Albert-Eden and Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Boards,
- Council-led heritage surveys and evaluations,
- Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (**PAUP**) Pre-1944 surveys, and
- evaluations of heritage places nominated by the public.

All the places proposed to be included in PPC7 have been identified primarily for their built heritage values.

2 The proposed plan change

PPC7 introduces changes to Schedule 14.1, Schedule 14.2 and to the GIS viewer/planning maps. The proposed changes are to add 49 historic heritage places (including three historic heritage areas) to Schedule 14.1, and to add this information to the GIS viewer. The proposed addition of historic heritage areas also requires information to be added to Schedule 14.2; this information comprises a statement of significance for each historic heritage area and a map showing the extent of each historic heritage area.

The plan change affects a number of properties throughout Auckland. The plan change documents for PPC7 show:

- proposed text amendments to Table 1 Places and Table 2 Areas of Schedule 14.1, including the addresses and legal descriptions of all properties affected by the plan change,
- the proposed text and maps to be included in Schedule 14.2, and
- maps illustrating the proposed amendments to the GIS viewer/planning maps, showing the scheduled extent of place for each historic heritage place and historic heritage area included in PPC7.

3 Reasons for the proposed plan change

An evaluation under section 32 of the Act must examine the extent to which the objectives of PPC7 are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.³ The objectives of

³ RMA s32(1)(a)

PPC7, or the purpose of the plan change, are to protect and manage the significant historic heritage values of the places identified by adding them to the Historic Heritage Overlay. To add these places to the overlay, they have been added to Schedule 14.1 and mapped in the GIS viewer/planning maps⁴.

The plan change should 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 Regional Policy Statement (**RPS**)⁵. Chapter B5.1 of the RPS identifies the following issues relating to built heritage and character:

- (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. These values are shown in Schedule 14.1.

The provisions of the Historic Heritage Overlay manage the protection, maintenance, modification, relocation, and use and development of historic heritage places included in Schedule.14.1. The inclusion of historic heritage places in Schedule 14.1 means activities including demolition and destruction, relocation, modifications, and new buildings and structures may require resource consent.

The evaluation of historic heritage places identified as part of PPC7 concludes that there are a number of places of significance to be included in Schedule 14.1. The significance of these places and the importance of protecting them from inappropriate subdivision, use and development are considered to be the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act, as outlined in the evaluation of options below.

3.1 Development of options

In addition to consideration of the extent to which the objectives of PPC7 are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act, section 32 requires an examination of whether the provisions in PPC7 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the proposed plan change by identifying other reasonably practical options for achieving the objective. In the preparation of PPC7, the following options have been identified:

Option 1 – do nothing/retain the status quo

Option 2 – non-regulatory methods

Option 3 – other regulatory methods

⁴ This is known as 'scheduling'

⁵ AUP B1.4 Issues of regional significance

Option 4 – a plan change to add places to Schedule 14.

3.2 Evaluation of options

In accordance with section 32(1)(b) and (2) of the Act, the options have been assessed on their appropriateness, efficiency, effectiveness, costs, benefits and risks. The results of this evaluation are included in this section and in Table 1.

Option 1 – Adopt a ‘do nothing’ approach/retain the status quo

The ‘do nothing’ option means the historic heritage places that have been evaluated as having significant historic heritage values are not managed in any way, including not being identified in Schedule 14.1, and therefore are not subject to the provisions of the AUP, including the Historic Heritage Overlay. By doing nothing, the values of these places will not be protected, which may lead to the loss of their significant historic heritage values through inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

Option 2 – Non-regulatory methods

Non-regulatory methods for the protection and management of historic heritage places include advocacy, education, and the provision of information. This option is an alternative to including places in Schedule 14.1.

Heritage information held by Council includes GIS-based archaeological alert layers identifying recorded sites and areas where there is a high likelihood of unrecorded or unidentified sites. Council also holds information on land and project information memoranda (LIMs and PIMs), which is provided as advice notes on resource consents. Advice about places on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero (**NZHL/RK**) and the National Historic Landmarks/ Ngā Manawhenua o Aotearoa me ōna Kōrero Tūturu is also available. All of this information can be useful to assist landowners in becoming more aware of any historic heritage values their property may contain.

Non-regulatory methods to manage and protect places with significant historic heritage values include non-statutory plans and strategies (e.g. a park masterplan), and the use of Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) and interagency agreements with, for example, other regulatory agencies such as government departments and agencies, Council Controlled Organisations, and/or with other entities including Mana whenua groups.

Funding and assistance such as heritage incentives and grants can also encourage the non-regulatory management and protection of historic heritage places. However, it should be noted that the investment of funding usually requires some manner of legal or statutory control over a place, such as a historic heritage place being identified in Schedule 14.1.

Option 3 – Other regulatory methods

Scheduling historic heritage places is not the only approach for providing regulatory protection and management. The AUP recognises the use of heritage orders under the Act and covenants under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (**HNZPTA**) as other methods to protect historic heritage places. Various statutory requirements under the

HNZPTA are also available, and the use of the Reserves Act 1977 to create historic reserves is another method for protection of historic heritage places.

Option 4 – Plan change to add historic heritage places to Schedule 14

The AUP provides for the protection and management of historic heritage places by their inclusion in the Historic Heritage Overlay, as identified in Schedule 14.1 and in the GIS viewer/planning maps.

The objectives of the Historic Heritage Overlay are:

- to support and enhance the protection, maintenance, restoration and conservation of historic heritage places included Schedule 14.1,
- to protect these places from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, and
- to enable the appropriate subdivision, use and development of these places.

The Historic Heritage Overlay policies seek to manage the use and development of historic heritage places to avoid significant adverse effects on these places.

The Historic Heritage Overlay rules are triggered when proposed development has the potential to affect the values of a historic heritage place. Maintenance and repair of these places, for example, is permitted (subject to standards), while demolition and destruction is either a prohibited activity or a non-complying or discretionary activity, depending on the category (significance) of the historic heritage place.

The addition of historic heritage places to Schedule 14.1 will provide for the identification and protection of these places, and will ensure their historic heritage values are considered when the use and development of these places is proposed.

Table 1 – Summary of analysis under section 32(2) of the Act

Options	Efficiency and effectiveness of provisions in achieving the objectives ⁶	Benefits	Costs
<p>Option 1 Do nothing</p>	<p>The do nothing option is not an effective or efficient option to achieve the objectives of PPC7 (to manage and protect significant historic heritage values) as this option will do nothing to protect these values that have been identified.</p>	<p>There is no financial burden on the Council to undertake a public plan change.</p> <p>Landowners would not be required to obtain a resource consent to undertake any development of their properties that affects historic heritage.</p> <p>The historic heritage values of the identified properties will not need to be taken into account in relation to any growth and development opportunities – this could be perceived as a benefit to landowners.</p>	<p>There are likely to be costs to the environment through the potential loss of significant historic heritage values. Such a loss would be contrary to the provisions of the AUP. This loss will be to both current and future generations.</p> <p>The historic heritage values of the identified places will not need to be taken into account in relation to any growth and development opportunities – this could be perceived as a cost to society.</p>
<p>Option 2 Non regulatory methods</p>	<p>The provision of information to landowners, as well as the use of education and advocacy, may help landowners understand the values and significance of historic heritage places and how these places are best managed. However, consideration of these matters is at the discretion of the landowner as this option is non-</p>	<p>There is no financial burden on the Council to undertake a public plan change.</p> <p>Landowners would not be required to obtain a resource consent to undertake any development of their properties that affects historic heritage.</p>	<p>There are likely to be costs to the environment through the potential loss of significant historic heritage values. Such a loss would be contrary to the provisions of the AUP. This loss will be to both current and future generations.</p> <p>The historic heritage values of the identified places will not need to be</p>

⁶ RMA s32(1)(b)(ii)

Options	Efficiency and effectiveness of provisions in achieving the objectives ⁶	Benefits	Costs
	<p>regulatory. This could lead to inefficiency, if efforts are put in to the provision of information, education and advocacy, but such efforts do not result in any additional protection of significant historic heritage values.</p> <p>Funding, such as grants, is a non-regulatory method of assisting with protection of historic heritage values. However, such funding usually first requires a regulatory method such as scheduling to ensure a place receives priority consideration for a grant.</p> <p>In summary, non-regulatory methods are not considered an efficient or an effective option to achieve the objectives of PPC7 on their own, as these methods are unlikely to protect the significant historic heritage values that have been identified.</p>	<p>The historic heritage values of the identified properties will not need to be taken into account in relation to any growth and development opportunities – this could be perceived as a benefit to landowners.</p>	<p>taken into account in relation to any growth and development opportunities – this could be perceived as a cost to society.</p>
<p>Option 3 – other regulatory methods</p>	<p>One historic heritage place evaluated as part of PPC7 is subject to a covenant with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (Heritage NZ). The covenant is registered on the title and protects the exterior of the building and its interior woodwork. A covenant such as this is an effective method to achieve the objectives of PPC7.</p> <p>Heritage orders are also an effective option to protect the values of significant historic heritage places.</p>	<p>The significant values of historic heritage places will be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. This environmental benefit will be on an ongoing basis, for current and future generations.</p> <p>Other regulatory options for protecting historic heritage provide certainty to landowners as the regulatory controls are clearly set out, and relate to the significance of a historic heritage place.</p>	<p>There are costs associated with the preparation and registration of a covenant on each certificate of title. The financial burden usually falls on the Council if the covenant is in favour of the Council.</p> <p>There are costs associated with the preparation of a Heritage Order, as each order requires a notice of requirement and submissions process and, like decisions on a plan change, the local authorities recommendation on</p>

Options	Efficiency and effectiveness of provisions in achieving the objectives ⁶	Benefits	Costs
	<p>Historic reserves can be created for the purpose of protecting and preserving in perpetuity such places, objects, and natural features, and such things within the reserve that are of historic, archaeological, cultural, educational, and other special interest. This option may be effective in protecting and managing historic heritage values.</p> <p>However, the protection and management of each historic heritage place included in PPC7 by methods such as heritage orders, covenants or historic reserves is likely to be a time consuming and costly administrative process, as each place would require a separate regulatory process.</p> <p>In summary, other non-regulatory methods may be effective in achieving the the objectives of PPC7 but are not the most efficient option to achieve the objectives of the plan change.</p>		<p>a heritage order may be appealed to the Environment Court.</p> <p>There are costs associated with the creation of historic reserves; this method would require a notification and submission process under the Reserves Act 1977.</p>
Option 4 – plan change	<p>The addition of historic heritage places to Schedule 14.1 means the places, their values, and significance are clearly identified. The management regime applying to these places (e.g. Historic Heritage Overlay) is clearly established as an effective method of protecting significant historic heritage values.</p> <p>One plan change to add 49 places is a</p>	<p>The significant values of the identified historic heritage places will be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. This environmental benefit will be on an ongoing basis, for current and future generations.</p> <p>The identification of a place on Schedule 14.1 provides an opportunity to increase landowner awareness of</p>	<p>There are financial implications relating to undertaking a public plan change, which may extend to an appeal to the Environment Court.</p> <p>There are opportunity costs relating to the addition of historic heritage places to Schedule 14.1 and the application of the Historic Heritage Overlay provisions. This is particularly relevant</p>

Options	Efficiency and effectiveness of provisions in achieving the objectives ⁶	Benefits	Costs
	<p>far more efficient way to meet the objectives of PPC7, rather than the many separate regulatory process that would be required to effectively protect the historic heritage values of the places identified through methods such as covenants or heritage orders.</p> <p>The inclusion of the identified places in Schedule 14.1 will help ensure the objectives of the AUP are achieved, as well as the Council's statutory requirements for the AUP to give effect to its RPS section.</p> <p>The historic heritage places proposed to be included in PPC7 will be clearly identified in Schedule 14.1 and in the planning maps. The management regime applying to them is efficient and effective, as it is clearly established for Council, landowners and interested parties. Policies provide a framework for the appropriate use and development of historic heritage places. Rules are an effective way to enable protection, maintenance and adaptation of scheduled places. Permitted activity statuses allow maintenance and repair to be undertaken without the need for resource consent.</p> <p>The identification and management of historic heritage places by including them in Schedule 14.1 is considered the</p>	<p>historic heritage values, and may lead to beneficial outcomes to the place in terms of the protection of these values.</p> <p>The addition of places to Schedule 14.1 provides certainty to landowners as the regulatory controls are clearly set out, and clearly relate to the significance of a historic heritage place. Protection is provided to priority places so their heritage values are retained. This provides social and cultural benefits through the recognition, protection and appropriate management of significant historic heritage places.</p> <p>Support is offered to landowners of scheduled historic heritage places through provisions relating to the use and development of scheduled places, including reducing or waiving consent application costs, provision of free expert advice, and transferable development rights (in some areas).</p> <p>The identification of a historic heritage place in Schedule 14.1 is likely to afford a landowner a higher priority for grants and other financial assistance, as this method of support usually relies on some manner of legal or statutory control over a place.</p>	<p>where properties are zoned for higher density development. Costs to landowners may arise in relation to the loss of development opportunity.</p> <p>There are costs to Council relating to the provision of heritage advice on additional historic heritage places and for processing consents received that relate to these places.</p>

Options	Efficiency and effectiveness of provisions in achieving the objectives ⁶	Benefits	Costs
	most efficient and effective means to achieve the objectives of PPC7 and the purpose of the Act.		

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 values of the places included in PPC7 to proceed with the plan change.

This section 32 evaluation will continue to be refined in relation to any new information that may arise following notification, including during hearings on PPC7.

3.4 Reasons for the preferred option

All places proposed to be included in PPC7 have been evaluated against the AUP factors and thresholds and have been determined to be eligible for inclusion in Schedule 14.1 (see information on the development of PPC7 in Section 5). The places have been determined to be of such historic heritage significance that if they were destroyed or modified in an inappropriate way, historic heritage values of significance to Auckland's heritage will be lost. Therefore, the 'do nothing' approach is not considered to be an appropriate option for the management of these places.

Non-regulatory methods used in isolation are not an appropriate way to meet the objectives of PPC7 as they are unlikely to effectively protect the values of historic heritage places where pressure for development and redevelopment is high, or where the landowner does not appreciate the historic heritage values of the place. It is considered that non-regulatory methods are more appropriately used in conjunction with Schedule 14.1, rather than being the only approach taken.

Other regulatory methods, such as heritage orders and covenants, may provide effective protection to historic heritage places, but this is not considered the most efficient way to protect the places subject to PPC7 as the process to introduce such regulation is not efficient. Regulatory methods such as the historic heritage floor area bonus, if used in isolation, may not be effective in providing protection for historic heritage places where pressure for development and redevelopment is high. Also, the floor area bonus relies on the identification of places through Schedule 14.1, further weakening its effectiveness. Regulatory methods are more appropriately used in conjunction with Schedule 14.1, rather than in isolation.

The addition of historic heritage places to Schedule 14.1 is considered to be the most efficient and effective option to meet the objectives of PPC7 as it is the method that protects and manages the values of the places identified as part of PPC7 in a clear manner. On a regional scale, only a small number of places are scheduled. Places proposed to be included in PPC7 are some of the most significant historic heritage places in the region, with some places also being recognised as being of national importance. The identification of these places in Schedule 14.1 provides benefits to landowners in terms of advice and assistance in relation to the management of the values of the historic heritage place.

The evaluation of options conducted in this report demonstrates that the preferred option for meeting the objectives of PPC7 is a plan change to the AUP to add historic heritage places to Schedule 14.1.

In accordance with section 32(1)(a), 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 PPC7. PPC7 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.

Historic heritage is also relevant to sections 7 and 8 of the Act:

- 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).

PPC7 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 addition of historic heritage places to Schedule 14.1 of the AUP will provide for the use, development, and protection of these physical resources 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. Through their identification, evaluation, and addition to Schedule 14.1, historic heritage places are subject to appropriate objectives, policies and rules. Schedule 14.1 is therefore an important tool to assist in avoiding, remedying and mitigating adverse effects on historic heritage places in order to protect them from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

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 PPC7 assists the Council to carry out its functions as set out in section 31 of the Act. PPC7 is an appropriate method to manage the effects of use and development on Auckland's historic heritage resources.

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, and relevant entries in the 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.

However, exceptions are provided in section 86B(3), where a rule in a proposed plan has immediate legal effect if the rule:

(d) protects historic heritage.

Schedule 14.1 is a rule in the AUP, and the proposed addition of historic heritage places to that schedule is a rule that protects historic heritage. In accordance with section 86B(3) of the Act, PPC7 should have immediate legal effect.

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 statements⁷. The following national policy statements are relevant to PPC7.

New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS)

Of the historic heritage places proposed to be added to Schedule 14.1 through PPC7, only one is located within the coastal marine area, being the Richmond Yacht Club (former)/Herne Bay Cruising Club.

Objective 6 of the NZCPS is relevant to historic heritage. The 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 vulnerable to loss or damage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

⁷ RMA s67(3) and s75(3)

A number of policies in the NZCPS generally relate to historic heritage in the coastal environment⁸. Policy 17 specially relates to the identification and protection of historic heritage in the coastal environment from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

The addition of Richmond Yacht Club (former)/Herne Bay Cruising Club to Schedule 14.1 gives effect to the NZCPS as it assists in the identification, recognition and protection of this place from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016

This national policy statement sets out the objectives and policies for providing development capacity under the Act. It recognises the national significance of urban environments and the need to enable them to develop and change, and the provision of sufficient development capacity to meet the needs of people and communities and future generations in urban environments.

As a result of this section 32 evaluation, some historic heritage places that had significant development potential available on the property proposed to be scheduled were considered. It was determined that some of these places would not be included in PPC7 because, on balance, the development capacity was considered to outweigh the historic heritage values of the place.

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 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, which were introduced as part of the 2017 amendments to the Act, are currently under development. The first set of Standards is expected to be formally notified in April 2018 so is not yet relevant to PPC7.

4.6 Other Acts

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014

Heritage NZ is the principal agency operating under the HNZPTA. Heritage NZ maintains the NZHL/RK⁹ 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 this list does not in itself protect the place.

⁸ NZCPS policies 1(2)(g), 6(1)(j), 20(1)(e) and 26(1)

⁹ The NZHL/RK includes historic places, historic areas, waahi tapu and waahi tapu areas

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.

Two places proposed to be added to Schedule 14.1 through PPC7 are included in the NZHL/RK – the Royal New Zealand Air Force Institute Building (former)¹⁰ and the Royal New Zealand Air Force Headquarters (former)¹¹, both in Hobsonville. As outlined above, the RPS sets out factors and thresholds against which historic heritage places are to be evaluated to determine whether they warrant inclusion in Schedule 14.1 of the AUP. The threshold or inclusion for scheduling is generally aligned with criteria outlined in the HNZPTA for inclusion in the NZHL/RK¹². Including these places on the Schedule within the AUP is generally complementary to, and compatible with, the NZHL/RK and the HNZPTA.

Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000

The Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 (**HGMPA**) was established to promote 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.

The Hauraki Gulf Marine Park includes all the coast and coastal marine area from Mangawhai in the north 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 PPC7 are therefore within the park's boundaries.

The following sections of the HGMPA are of particular relevance to PPC7:

- section 7 recognises the national significance of the Hauraki Gulf,
- section 8(b) – the natural, historic and physical resources of the Gulf's islands and catchments are to be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced,
- section 8(e) – the natural, historic and physical resources of the Gulf's islands and catchments which contribute to the social and economic well-being of people and communities are to be maintained and, where appropriate, enhanced, and
- section 8(f) – the natural, historic and physical resources of the Gulf's islands and catchments which contribute to the recreation and enjoyment of the Gulf's coastal marine area for people and communities are to be maintained and, where appropriate, enhanced.

The addition of historic heritage places within the Hauraki Gulf Island Marine Park to Schedule 14.1 of the AUP has particular regard to sections 7 and 8 of the HGMPA, as it will assist protecting, and possibly enhancing, these places.

¹⁰ NZHL/RK #9710

¹¹ NZHL/RK #9711

¹² HNZPTA s66

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 the purpose of providing, for the preservation and management for the benefit and enjoyment of the public, areas of New Zealand possessing various values and features, including those that are historic in nature.

Six historic heritage places proposed to be included in PPC7 are located within reserves managed by Auckland Council. The identification of historic heritage places within these reserves, and the proposal to include them in Schedule 14.1 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 historic heritage values that will be identified and protected.

4.7 The Auckland Plan

The Auckland Plan seeks to protect and conserve Auckland's historic heritage for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations¹³. Specific targets associated with this direction include:

- increase the number of scheduled historic heritage places by 100% from 2,100 to 4,200 by 2030,
- increase the percentage of area in Auckland that has been assessed for historic heritage values from 30% to 100% by 2040, prioritising areas identified for growth and intensification, and
- from 2013, ensure a year-on-year increase in community satisfaction with heritage management in Auckland, achieving an 80% satisfaction rate by 2020.

PPC7 will assist with the protection and conservation of Auckland's historic heritage for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations, and the addition of 49 places to Schedule 14.1 will also directly assist in meeting the historic heritage targets set out in the plan.

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 RPS¹⁴. The RPS identifies a number of issues of regional significance, and several of these are relevant to PPC7.

B2: Tāhuhu whakaruruhau ā-taone - Urban growth and form

Chapter B2 sets out the objectives and policies for growth and form in the region. The chapter states that a quality built environment is one which enhances opportunities for peoples' well-being by ensuring that new buildings respond to the existing built and natural environment in ways that promote the plan's objectives and maintain and enhance the amenity values of an area.

¹³ Auckland Plan, Strategic Direction 4

¹⁴ RMA s74(2) and s75(3)

Relevant objectives and policies provide direction on urban growth and form, a quality built environment, residential growth, and commercial and industrial growth.

PPC7 aligns with these objectives as it does not unnecessarily constrain urban growth or impact on land capacity. Some historic heritage places proposed for inclusion in PPC7 have an underlying zone that provides capacity for increased growth and density. This is particularly the case for proposed historic heritage places located within Business zoned land or in the Residential Townhouse and Apartment Building (**THAB**) zone.

The inclusion of a place in Schedule 14.1 and the application of the Historic Heritage Overlay to it has the potential to affect the development of a place; for example subdivision of a historic heritage place is a discretionary activity in all parts of the overlay (except for non-contributing sites in an historic heritage area), and new buildings or structures is a discretionary or restricted discretionary activity. However, it is important to recognise that maximum development potential under the AUP is affected by a range of factors, not just the Historic Heritage Overlay. The underlying zone of a property, and any relevant precinct, other overlays, and any other AUP controls that apply to a property mean other objectives, policies and rules will apply that may also affect the development potential of a property.

By protecting specific places, PPC7 recognises their significant historic heritage values and applies a management regime that requires consideration of those values when development, including subdivision, is proposed.

B3 Ngā pūnaha hanganga, kawekawe me ngā pūngao - Infrastructure, transport and energy

Chapter B3 emphasises the importance of infrastructure, transport and energy to the Auckland region, and sets out objectives and policies to recognise this importance, but also to manage the adverse effects of infrastructure, transport and energy on the quality of the environment and, in particular, natural and physical resources that have been scheduled in the AUP, including historic heritage.

Several historic heritage places included in PPC7 are part of Auckland's infrastructure (e.g. several schools), and these places are subject to designations under the AUP. Designations are discussed below in section 6.3.

B5 Ngā rawa hanganga tuku iho me te āhua - Built heritage and 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).

Chapter B5 sets out the objectives and policies for historic heritage and special character. The chapter states that significant historic heritage places should be identified and protected

from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. The chapter also supports the use of historic heritage places, where this use will support the retention of, or will not detract from, the historic heritage values of the place.

The objective of PPC7 aligns with these objectives and policies as the plan change seeks to identify and protect historic heritage places by adding them to Schedule 14.1 of the AUP.

B6 Mana Whenua

The objectives and policies in B6.3 Recognising Mana Whenua values are relevant to PPC7. Council staff have met representatives from Waiohua – Te Ahiwaru - Makaurau and Te Kawerau Iwi Tribal Authority & Settlement Trust to discuss the proposed plan change. Council has not yet received any feedback from the other iwi authorities, as outlined in the section 5.2 below. However, if feedback is received, it will be considered as part of PPC7.

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. Objectives and policies relevant to PPC7 include:

- policy B8.3.2 (2)(b), which seeks the avoidance of urban activities in areas with natural and physical resources that have been scheduled in the AUP for historic heritage, amongst other values, and
- objective B8.5.1, which seeks that the management of the Hauraki Gulf gives effect to sections 7 and 8 of the HGMPA (see analysis in section 4.6 above).

As already mentioned, only one historic heritage place included in PPC7 is located in the coastal environment. The objective of the plan change aligns with the coastal provisions of the AUP as it seeks to identify this place and ensure that any subdivision, use and development of the place is appropriate to its values.

5 Development of the Proposed Plan Change

This section outlines the development of PPC7 and the consultation undertaken in preparing the plan change.

5.1 Methodology

Evaluation and peer review of historic heritage places

Each historic heritage place included in PPC7 has been evaluated for its historic heritage significance in accordance with the Council's Methodology for Evaluating Historic Heritage Significance (**Methodology**). The evaluations were undertaken between 2014 and 2017.

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 factors set out in the RPS.

The methodology outlines the process of evaluating historic heritage significance, which is based on the following steps in the RPS:

1. Identify and evaluate heritage value against historic heritage significance factors set out in Policy B5.2.2.(1) of the AUP, being (a) historical, (b) social, (c) Mana whenua, (d) knowledge, (e) technological, (f) physical attributes, (g) aesthetic, and (h) context.
2. Prepare a statement of significance.
3. State whether the place meets the threshold for scheduling as a historic heritage place (Category A or Category B), or an historic heritage area.
4. Recommend whether the place should be scheduled and, if so, define the extent of the area recommended for scheduling.

Each historic heritage place included in PPC7 has been recommended for scheduling as it has been evaluated as having considerable or outstanding value in relation to one or more of the RPS evaluation factors, and has considerable or outstanding overall significance to its locality or a greater geographic area (AUP Policy B5.2.2.(3)).

PPC7 includes one Category A historic heritage place, 46 Category B places, and three historic heritage areas. Policy B5.2.2.(4) outlines the classification of historic heritage places into categories:

- **Category A** historic heritage places that are of outstanding significance well beyond their immediate environs;
- **Category B** historic heritage places that are of considerable significance to a locality or beyond.
- **Historic heritage areas** are groupings of interrelated but not necessarily contiguous historic heritage places or features that collectively meet the criteria for inclusion in Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage in Category A or B and may include both contributing and non-contributing places or features, places individually scheduled as Category A or B, and notable trees.

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', is the area that 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.

The known heritage values, the primary feature(s), and the exclusions from protection of each historic heritage place are identified in the historic heritage evaluation and this information is shown in Schedule 14.1 (RPS Policy B5.2.2.(5)).

Each evaluation was peer reviewed and approved for release by the Council's Manager Heritage. The peer review process ensured consistency with the AUP, as some evaluations were undertaken during the PAUP, before the Independent Hearing Panel's recommendations and Council's decisions were issued. Where an evaluation preceded the AUP being operative in part, the primary feature of Category B places were not required to

be identified. For these evaluations, the peer reviewer has identified the primary feature and added it to the evaluation¹⁵.

Places not progressing following historic heritage evaluation

Following the evaluation and peer review, it was determined that some places would not be included PPC7. The reasons for places not going forward include:

- the evaluation concluded the place did not meet the RPS factors and thresholds for scheduling,
- further research and information was required to complete the evaluation of a place, and
- one property is subject to development, with consent granted to subdivide the property and relocate the building of historic heritage interest outside the Auckland region.

Further review

Following the evaluation and peer review process, 62 places were recommended for scheduling. These places were reviewed as part of this section 32 evaluation, to determine whether the proposed scheduling of each historic heritage place was the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. The section 32 evaluation resulted in decision not to include some historic heritage places that had been evaluated as meeting the RPS factors and thresholds, as it was more efficient for these places not to be identified in Schedule 14.1 and therefore not be subject to the Historic Heritage Overlay. The reasons for these places not progressing include:

- requiring further consideration of Mana whenua values where the place is located on or adjacent to the Tūpuna Maunga, and of the relationship of these places with the Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua process;
- the historic heritage place or a feature within it (e.g. tree) is already protected, for example by a covenant, by being within the extent of place of an already-scheduled historic heritage place, or by being subject to the provisions of another AUP overlay (e.g. Notable Trees Overlay) – if this is the case, the place or feature is already protected in some way and the additional layer of control imposed by the inclusion of the place in the Historic Heritage Overlay was considered to be unnecessary duplication of regulations to the landowner;
- significant development potential being available on the property proposed to be scheduled, which in the context of other AUP objectives for urban growth was considered to outweigh the historic heritage values of the place; and
- further research and information being required.

In addition to places not progressing, the section 32 evaluation recommended changes to a number of the historic heritage places proposed to be included in PPC7. The proposed changes include: identifying the interior of building(s) as an exclusion in Schedule 14.1;

¹⁵ Note, where this has occurred, it is clearly marked in the evaluation

- adding other exclusions to Schedule 14.1 to reflect features that do not contribute to, or may detract from, the values for which the historic heritage place is proposed to be scheduled; and
- amendments to the proposed extent of place to ensure the area is that that is integral to the function, meaning and relationships of the place, and illustrates the historic heritage values identified for the place, and is appropriate in the context of other AUP objectives.

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. A letter was sent on 24 July 2017 to the Ministry for the Environment and Heritage New Zealand. No response was received from either party.

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.*
- (c) a summary of all advice received from iwi authorities on the proposal (section 32 (4)(a) of the Act).*

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.

Letters were sent on 24 July 2017 to all the iwi authorities (19) that are recorded by Council as being associated with the Auckland Region. The letters provided an explanation of the proposed plan change and sought their interest on receiving a copy of the draft plan change prior to notification.

Four iwi authorities responded (Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust; Waiohua – Te Ahiwaru - Makaurau; Te Kawerau Iwi Tribal Authority & Settlement Trust; and Ngati Whatua o Orakei). In summary, the iwi authorities who responded sought further information about the proposed plan change, which was provided. In the case of Waiohua – Te Ahiwaru – Makaurau and Te Kawerau Iwi Tribal Authority & Settlement Trust, Heritage Unit staff met their representatives to discuss the proposed plan change.

In accordance with Schedule 1 clause 4A, a draft of the plan change and draft section 32 report was sent to all the iwi authorities that are associated with the Auckland region. No response was received.

Consultation with other parties

On 1 August 2017, an email was sent to Auckland Council and Council Controlled Organisations (Watercare, Auckland Transport, Panuku, Community Facilities) to advise them of the proposed plan change, and identify historic heritage places proposed to be included in PPC7 that are in Council ownership or management. Responses were received from a number of organisations, which in some cases resulted in the provision of further information and/or ongoing communication in relation to specific places.

Feedback was sought on two separate occasions from the Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority about proposed historic heritage places on or adjacent to Tūpuna Maunga. As outlined above, the response to this feedback resulted in several places not being included in PPC7.

The landowners of a number of places included in PPC7 were advised in writing that Council was researching places that may have historic heritage value, including the place they owned. Some landowners responded to Council's letter and, in some cases, this resulted in ongoing communication between the Heritage Unit and particular landowners.

The Heritage Advisory Panel was advised of PPC7 at its 26 September meeting. No feedback was received from the panel on the proposed plan change.

6 Evaluation of provisions

This part of the report evaluates the provisions contained within PPC7. The evaluation that follows relates to the key themes arising from the proposed addition of 49 historic heritage places to Schedule 14.1.

6.1 Effect of scheduling

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 provisions provide a regime of more rigorous activity statuses commensurate to activities that are anticipated to have a greater effect on historic heritage places. Activities that are anticipated to generate significant adverse effects, such as total or substantial demolition or destruction, are prohibited, non-complying, or discretionary. Minor works that are unlikely to detract from the values for which the place was scheduled, such as maintenance and repair, are permitted, subject to development controls.

Exclusions are identified for each historic heritage place, if appropriate, and listed in Schedule 14.1. Activities affecting features identified as exclusions are permitted or controlled.

The intent of the AUP is to ensure that unnecessary consent activity is not generated, while protecting historic heritage places from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Put simply, the scheduling of historic heritage places is a method by which more than minor works to a scheduled place will require resource consent. The requirement for consent ensures that the heritage values and significance of a place will be taken into account by both landowners and decision makers.

6.2 Reasonable use

All places included in PPC7 have been evaluated as having sufficient historic heritage value and significance to warrant ongoing protection and appropriate management under the AUP.

Some places are on publicly-owned land and others are in private ownership. The scheduling of a place in the AUP imposes restrictions on the use of that land. These restrictions can cause tension between the need to protect significant historic heritage and the public benefits of this, and the ability of landowners, both private and public, to use their land.

The Act recognises that a rule or other plan provision can have an effect on how landowners can use their land. Section 85 of the Act allows landowners to challenge a provision on the basis that it would render the land incapable of reasonable use¹⁶ and that it would place an unfair or unreasonable burden on the landowner¹⁷. Section 85 states that ‘reasonable use’:

*includes the use or potential use of the land for any activity whose actual or potential effects on any aspect of the environment or on any person other than the applicant would not be significant.*¹⁸

The AUP recognises that the continued use of scheduled places is integral to their survival, and the AUP’s provisions seek to recognise and provide for the reasonable use of historic heritage places. As already outlined, a flexible management regime is used, based on the values and significance of the place, and whether the proposed use and/or development will assist with the ongoing management and protection of the place. The RPS seeks to provide for the occupation, use, seismic strengthening, development, restoration and adaptation of historic heritage places, where this will support the retention of, and will not detract from, the historic heritage values of the place¹⁹. This policy is supported by the objective D17.2(3) in the Historic Heritage Overlay.

Policies in D17 also support the use and development of scheduled historic heritage places, where it does not detract from the heritage values of the place and will not have significant adverse effects²⁰. Policy D17.3.(5) provides mechanisms to support use, development and adaptation appropriate to scheduled historic heritage places including grants and other incentives, reducing or waiving consent application costs, providing transferable development rights, and the provision of expert advice. The AUP provides for a historic heritage bonus floor area in the City Centre zone. This regulatory incentive may be granted when buildings of historic heritage value and significance are retained and conserved. .

As previously mentioned, the repair and maintenance of scheduled historic heritage places is a permitted activity (subject to standards).

At a place specific level, each place included in PPC7 has been considered as part of this evaluation to determine the best method of management, as detailed in Section 3.2. The specifics of what could be considered the reasonable use of individual historic heritage places proposed to be included in PPC7 have been considered.

Some scheduled places included in PPC7 have established uses that are integral to their historic heritage values and significance. Often these uses serve a community function, such as schools and churches, and/or are part of required infrastructure (e.g. as part of the water network). In a number of cases, the original historic use continues, and in other instances the place is now used for a different purpose. In all cases, the question of reasonable use and how the AUP allows for effective and efficient use of a place needs to be carefully

¹⁶ RMA s85(2)

¹⁷ RMA s85(3)

¹⁸ RMA s85(6)

¹⁹ AUP RPS objective B4.2.2(9)

²⁰ AUP policies D17.3(3), D17.3(4)

considered. This has been done by the identification of the extent of place and primary feature(s) of each historic heritage place, and the use of exclusions, where appropriate.

6.3 Designations

Several historic heritage places included in PPC7 are subject to designations. Works undertaken in accordance with a designation are not subject to AUP provisions, including the Historic Heritage Overlay. The scheduling of the place can be used to advocate for positive heritage outcomes within the outline plan of works and other designation processes. Scheduling of these places also ensures that if the designation is uplifted, or works occur that are not in accordance with the designation, the historic heritage place is subject to the provisions of the AUP.

6.4 Interiors

Several historic heritage places included in PPC7 have the interiors of the buildings proposed to be included in the scheduling. Interiors include the interior layout, spatial arrangement, and significant features and materials. The Methodology provides guidance for determining when to include the interior of a building in the scheduling of a historic heritage place.

It is best practice to regard a historic heritage place as a whole and to avoid itemising its features within the regulatory framework. However, in some circumstances, it may be appropriate to include portions of an interior, particularly if significant features remain but other parts have been modified. The section 32 evaluation resulted in this approach being applied to one place, St Cuthbert's College, where a portion of one building has the interior proposed to be included in Schedule 14.1, but the interiors of the other buildings in the place are identified as exclusions to allow for reasonable use.

The Methodology acknowledges several reasons why it might not be appropriate to include the interior of a building in Schedule 14.1, particularly if it has not been viewed, or if the interior has been modified to an extent that its contribution to the identified values of the place has been lost. The interiors of buildings are not considered for historic heritage areas.

A number of the evaluations recommended the interiors of historic heritage evaluations be included in Schedule 14.1. However, in some cases this section 32 evaluation determined some interiors be excluded for planning reasons, for example where the inclusion of an interior would not enable the reasonable use of a place.

6.5 Category A place

Only one historic heritage place in the plan change is proposed to be Category A – St David's Church on Khyber Pass Road, Grafton. This Category A place is of outstanding significance well beyond its immediate environs. The evaluation of St David's Church concluded the place had exceptional local significance for its historical and context values, exceptional regional significance for its social and physical attributes values, and considerable significance under other criterion.

Category A historic heritage places are subject to a more rigorous management regime, as is fitting for these places of outstanding historic heritage value. The demolition or destruction of 70 percent or more of these places, or the relocation of their features beyond the scheduled extent of place, is a prohibited activity, and other demolition and destruction and relocation activities are non-complying. As with other scheduled historic heritage places, minor works that are not anticipated to detract from the values of the place, such as maintenance and repair, are a permitted activity.

6.6 Modifications to the place

Many of the historic heritage places proposed to be included in PPC7 have been modified over time. This is not unexpected, particularly given the age of some of the places proposed. Modifications to buildings and features of places proposed to be included in PPC7 are described in the evaluation for each place, which also describes whether the modifications are complementary to, neutral, do not contribute, or detract from the values of the historic heritage place. In most cases, modifications that have been identified as non-contributing or detracting have been recommended by the evaluator to be identified as an exclusion in the Schedule 14.1. The section 32 evaluation has identified further exclusions for some historic heritage places, and these exclusions are also proposed to be identified in Schedule 14.1.

6.7 Historic heritage areas

Three historic heritage areas (**HHAs**) are proposed in the plan change:

- Winstone Model Homes Historic Heritage Area,
- Waiuku Town Centre Historic Heritage Area, and
- Point Chevalier Road Shops Historic Heritage Area.

The process of evaluating the historic heritage significance of a HHA is the same as for individually scheduled historic heritage places. However, the Methodology provides additional guidance for HHA's, including defining the boundary of the area and identification of exclusions.

The emphasis of a HHA is on the collective values of the area, rather than the significance of individual places. This is reflected in the management of the HHA, where there is generally a less onerous resource consent regime for the demolition of buildings and new buildings than for individually scheduled historic heritage places. In addition, the HHA provisions provide for the development and use of non-contributing sites and features, where these are compatible with the historic heritage values of the area.

The land included in the Winstone Model Homes Historic Heritage Area is zoned Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone and the properties range in size from 506m² – 647m². This provides an opportunity to increase the intensity of residential development beyond the single house currently on each site. The ability to maximise intensity may be constrained by the HHA overlay. However, there is the ability to double the density by conversion of an existing dwelling into a maximum of two dwellings as a permitted activity in the zone, subject to meeting specified development controls. Continued use of the site for residential development is provided for and the level of management is such that it does not render land

within a HHA incapable of reasonable use. It is noted that this HHA includes only ten properties, which would have an insignificant impact on the opportunity for maximising urban growth in the locality.

Properties included in the Point Chevalier Road Shops Historic Heritage Area are zoned Business - Neighbourhood Centre Zone. This zone applies to single or small shopping strips located in residential neighbourhoods. Development is expected to be in keeping with the surrounding residential environment. The zone provisions require resource consent for the construction of new buildings and some modification to existing buildings. The HHA provisions require resource consent to demolish an existing building, modify an existing building, or to construct a new building. The requirement to obtain resource consent for works in the Point Chevalier Road Shops Historic Heritage Area is therefore not an additionally onerous constraint. A range of commercial and residential uses can continue as the HHA provisions do not control uses.

In the case of Waiuku Town Centre Historic Heritage Area, almost all the land is zoned Business – Local Centre zone. This zoning requires resource consent for the construction of new buildings and modification to some existing buildings. It also provides for a wide range of activities, some of which are subject to resource consent. The HHA may constrain the ability to maximise the 18m building height (4-5 stories) as the buildings are predominately single-storey. The HHA provisions do not prevent additional development or change where it does not adversely affect the historic heritage values of the area.

7 Conclusion

PPC7 seeks to add 49 historic heritage places to Schedule 14.1 of the AUP. The purpose of the proposed plan change is to recognise the values of identified historic heritage places by adding them to Schedule 14.1 and ensure the provisions of the AUP Historic Heritage Overlay apply and therefore assist in managing and protecting them.

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

1. PPC7 is consistent with the purpose of sustainable management in Section 5 and with the principles in Sections 6, 7 and 8 and Part 2 of the Act.
2. PPC7 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, PPC7 is consistent with the objectives and policies of the RPS.
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 addition of 49 historic heritage places to Schedule 14.1 is the most appropriate means of achieving the objectives identified in Section 3 of this report.

Conclusion	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.
------------	---