

PWP Workshop notes Day 2

What: Unitary Plan Political Working Party- December direction setting workshop

Where: Victory Convention Centre, Auckland Central

When: Tuesday 4th December 8.30am--5.00pm

Who attended: Deputy Mayor Penny Hulse (Chairperson), Cr Sandra Coney, Cr Ann Hartley, Cr Michael Lee, Cr Des Morrison, Cr Richard Quax, Cr Noelene Raffills, Mr David Taipari, Mr Glen Tupuhi, Cr Wayne Walker, Cr Penny Webster,

Local Board Chairs: Mr Andy Baker, Mr Derek Battersby, Mr Shale Chambers, Mr Bob Howard, Ms Lindsay Waugh, Mr Michael Williams

Officers: Roger Blakeley, Wendy Brandon, Raewyn Catlow, Daniel Sadlier, Penny Pirrit, John Duguid, Claire Richardson, Jacques Victor, Anita Palacio, Jeanette Johnston, Phill Reid, Linley Wilkinson, Angela Morgan, Shelley Glassey, Crispian Franklin, Jane Simmonds, Alastair Child, Rachel Dimery, Katherine Dorofaeff, Mark Tamura, Tony Reidy, Noel Reardon, Jenny Fuller, John Sawyer, Debra Yan, Jarette Wickham, Oliver Roberts, Tony Horton, Rachel Morgan, Jym Jeffries, Morgan Reeve, Omar Barragan, Tim Watts, Simon Harrison, Peter Maxwell, Catherine Taylor, Donna Pokere-Phillips, Louise Gobby, Bain Cross, Bernadette Aperahama, Max Smitheram

Item	Who	Time
Apologies:		
Minute takers: Jeanette Johnston; Phill Reid		
Item 1: Introduction to day 2 The Deputy Mayor advised that a further half day session would be arranged to address outstanding matters – remaining height issues, proposed wording on commercial redress, and any other matters that could not be resolved during the second day of the workshop	Penny Hulse	
Infrastructure (deferred from 3 Dec agenda) Parking Feedback from boards was mixed on proposed approach to parking. Proposed approach was maximum in and around centres and mixed use zones. Minimums everywhere else. Meeting last week with key retailers that raised serious concerns about use of parking maximums. Argument that their customers do not contribute to peak traffic. Some forms of retail need more parking than others. Don't want to be constrained in terms of what they can do to make their business profitable. Don't have the information to take a centre by centre approach, and trying to achieve consistency across the region. Also need to consider the future rather than immediate demands. Can develop a tighter approach as more localised analysis is completed.	Rachel Dimery Katherine Dorofaeff	

Item	Who	Time
<p>Options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximums only in the city centre zone and in other centres or sites where the legacy plans have maximums. Do not limit parking in other areas of intensification. • Option 1 plus maximum for uses which generate commuter traffic or regular daily trips, • Retain proposed approach (max in and around centres (on FTN) and in the mixed use zone; minimums elsewhere) with more permissive maximum for retail. <p>Cr Walker - separation of parking to allow for employees? Any incentive for shoppers' buses?</p> <p>Katherine Dorofaeff- Employee parking not differentiated - all is accessory parking.</p> <p>Cr Webster – large retail can have parking areas empty for much of the year. Prevents people from going near other shops.</p> <p>Deputy Mayor- need some flexibility as we develop. Previous PWP position on parking was a reflection of Auckland Plan and a sustainable approach.</p> <p>Derek Battersby– connection between parking and PT strategy. Need a bold approach to force people to use PT.</p> <p>Michael Williams - haven't done the work to support a significant change and will need an evolutionary approach to dealing with PT. The plan should clearly signal the future direction, but option 1 is the only realistic option at the moment.</p> <p>Roger Blakeley - Main purpose of the UP is to create a new plan for the future of Auckland. Transformational shift in the Auckland Plan is around public transport.</p> <p>John Duguid noted the amount of analysis behind the setting of the maximum levels.</p> <p>Glen Tupuhi – supermarket shopping will be the last private transport that people will surrender.</p> <p>Lindsay Waugh – parking contributions in lieu if parking can't be provided?</p> <p>Katherine Dorofaeff - a parking maximum means you don't have to provide any parking, nor is there cash in lieu.</p> <p>Cr Walker supports original approach, with no minimums.</p> <p>Andy Baker – questions assumption that all town centres have adequate PT. This would have a big impact on service towns like Warkworth and Pukekohe.</p> <div data-bbox="248 1823 1074 2027" style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0f2f7; padding: 10px; margin-top: 20px;"> <p>Direction</p> <p>Support for Option 3 with some reservations. Long term direction is maximum for entire region as soon as possible.</p> </div>		

Item	Who	Time
<p>Transmission corridors</p> <p>Feedback from boards supported Restricted Discretionary Activity (RDA) in the inner corridor only. Transpower is seeking to make this non-complying activity status.</p> <p>In rural areas only residential buildings need a consent.</p> <p>Recommendation is to retain discretionary status for inner corridor and permitted in outer corridor.</p> <p>Michael Williams – should be a clear rule not to build under transmission lines. Need to encourage undergrounding. Incentive is uplift in development value of the land.</p> <p>Concern raised by stakeholders that we are putting business activities through a stricter test.</p> <p>Mcihael Williams suggested non-complying for new residential and RDA for business.</p> <p>Cr Coney – is this approach aligned with WHO standards?</p> <p>Direction</p> <p>Discretionary activity status in the inner corridor and permitted in the outer corridor supported by majority with four people in favour of non-complying.</p> <p>Agreed to make new residential building non-complying.</p> <p>Tree management protocols</p> <p>Feedback from utility providers is that the approach developed by council arborists is overly restrictive.</p> <p>Cr Coney supports retaining the original UP proposal. Utility companies need their activities constrained.</p> <p>Cr Walker – need to consider loss of tress across Auckland with intensification so need to protect trees on the verge. Agrees with Cr Coney about practices of utility companies.</p> <p>Cr Webster – rural areas need a different approach to protect farming operations.</p> <p>Shale Chambers – restrictiveness of the proposal is a concern. Need to know council officers’ response to these concerns. What is the impact on trees on private property?</p> <p>Rachel Dimery- This only applies to street trees and reserves.</p> <p>Some support for a combined option. Officers have tried to bring these positions together.</p> <p>Cr Coney – power lines are not just along road corridors – they cut through the regional park in the Waitakere Ranges. Vector wanted to remove everything to ground level. An agreement was eventually reached.</p> <p>Glen Tupuhi- other utilities are less forgiving e.g. pipes.</p>		

Item	Who	Time
<div data-bbox="220 219 1059 405" style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0f2f7; padding: 5px;"> <p>Direction</p> <p>Officers to work with utility companies to develop an agreed position on tree management protocols and report back to PWP.</p> </div> <p>Standalone network utility chapter</p> <p>Recommendation to retain a standalone approach for network utility chapter.</p> <p>IMSB representatives questioned the impact on Waahi Tapu provisions and sites of significance/cultural values. Rachel advised the overlay is more restrictive and will include reference to the overlay in this chapter to make the restrictions clear.</p> <p>Aircraft noise</p> <p>Proposal is prohibited activity for sensitive activities (residential, education, overnight medical) within the high airport noise area.</p> <p>Being supported by the airport. Second runway will mean additional noise.</p> <p>Education facilities require ability to sit outside so airport noise has an impact on that environment.</p> <p>Unintended consequences for Auckland airport? Only considering for permanent accommodation. Main impact would be no new dwellings. Existing use rights apply to what is there.</p> <p>Approach aligns with national standards.</p> <p>Cr Morrison supports the approach and clear identification of no development areas.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit - council should be looking at a different zoning for this land, to transition to some kind of light industrial general business activity. Keep the zone and allow for other activities or be more transparent and change the zone.</p> <p>David Taipari- concerned at possible impact on Maori land and restricting what can be done on the land in terms of papakainga and marae.</p> <p>Cr Goudie. Need to see maps to assess impact. Need to keep in mind not everyone can live in quiet secluded places. Could make housing a discretionary activity with design solutions.</p> <p>Cr Webster – need to ensure airports can operate. Need to look at impact of helicopter bases.</p> <div data-bbox="252 1738 1046 1899" style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0f2f7; padding: 5px;"> <p>Direction</p> <p>Agreed to bring back a way forward on airport noise to the PWP.</p> </div>		
<p>Item 2: Residential</p> <p>Recap on four zones and proposed development controls.</p> <p>Six red flag matters raised by local boards.</p>	John Duguid	

Item	Who	Time
<p>1. Location criteria for the THAB and MH zones</p> <p>Concern from some local boards about the relatively simple approach. Some local boards have proposed specific changes (e.g. Howick).</p> <p><i>Recommendation: Continue to refine the maps to ensure logical zone boundaries while retaining the general approach. Where an alternative approach has been proposed by a local board that does not have a significant impact on capacity for growth, adopt the changes proposed by the local board.</i></p> <p>2. Heights of buildings permitted in the THAB zone</p> <p>Concern from some local boards about the six storey height control applied to the THAB zone adjacent to the metro centres and larger town centres; concern from the development sector that four storeys is not high enough.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: Retain the existing maximum permitted heights in the THAB and MH zones.</i></p> <p>3. Minimum lot size for removal of the density control in the THAB and MH zones</p> <p>Concern from some local boards that 1500m² is too low; concern from the development sector that 1500m² is too high.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: Reduce to 1200m² (subject to workshop with Watercare) but apply an increase in the minimum site width for five or more dwellings.</i></p> <p>4. Threshold for dwellings as a permitted activity</p> <p>Preference from parts of the development sector to allow for a greater number of dwellings as a permitted activity (subject to detailed design-based performance standards).</p> <p><i>Recommendation: Option 1 – Up to 4 dwellings Option 2 – Up to 2 dwellings</i></p> <p>5. Approach to infill development on rear lots</p> <p>Concern from some local boards about the quality of rear lot development</p> <p><i>Recommendation: Address through a minimum site width control for 3-4 (15m) and 5+ dwellings (20m).</i></p> <p>6. Approach to minor dwellings</p> <p>Support from some local boards to provide greater scope for minor dwellings.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: Maintain current approach of providing for two dwellings within an existing house.</i></p> <p>Penny Pirrit pointed out that the large number of new dwellings required annually will mean a proportion of new stock can go through a simplified process, i.e. permitted activity. The development controls to apply to permitted activity will address issues relating to design concerns, though BEU has a different view. Examples of new controls:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frontage control (garage set from boundary and the front of the house; • Habitable room glazing at the front; 		

Item	Who	Time
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fencing controls. <p>Cost of consents can be up to \$20,000. Need to consider the rules and practicality of on-going enforcement of them when it comes to design issues such as colour of buildings. Balance quality of urban design with housing affordability.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Cr Hartley sought clarification on minor units.</p> <p>John Duguid confirmed no separate minor units but can divide a large house into two. Cr agrees with no minor units and proper title on a divided house.</p> <p>Lindsay Waugh – assumptions about impact on scale of surrounding housing, and take up of the rapid transit network.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit confirmed a move to requiring outdoor living space to be oriented to receive sun. Sites that don't provide this would be RDA and a non-notifiable discussion with planners about design solutions.</p> <p>Cr Walker- what are Watercare's issues with reducing the 1500m2 threshold? Lack of confidence in market to deliver quality without tight controls. Need to ensure green space and trees.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit- Greenfield still RDA because need a comprehensive proposal. Have learned many lessons in the past 15 years. Going as far as we can but stopping short of control over materials for four units or less. Can't impose rules in RMA to override the Building Act. Will be challenged on this. Have gone ahead with the minimum unit size and dimensions for living and bedrooms, but can't go further.</p> <p>John Duguid - for five plus units landscaping would be required. For smaller development 40% has to be permeable but not willing to go further in directing how this should be done.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit - new requirement for fences is that front yard fence beyond 1.2m has to be 50% transparent. Not requiring fencing of outdoor living spaces.</p> <p>Cr Raffills – supports the package approach. How we put it out there is the key.</p>		
<div data-bbox="229 1487 1067 1729" style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0f2f7; padding: 10px;"> <p>Direction 1 zone boundaries</p> <p>Confirmed support for recommendation 1. <i>(Where an alternative approach has been proposed by a local board that does not have a significant impact on capacity for growth, adopt the changes proposed by the local board.)</i></p> </div> <p>Red flag 2 Height</p> <p>Concern that a 6 storey height limit will not work where it adjoins 8 or 6 storey town centres.</p> <p>An alternative approach proposed and Michael Williams noted the need to maintain some flexibility.</p> <p>John Duguid - can use an overlay to address areas close to the coast to reduce the height.</p>		

Item	Who	Time
<p>Michael Williams – include these words in the plan and communicate this clearly.</p> <div data-bbox="236 293 1062 600" style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0f2f7; padding: 10px;"> <p>Direction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General principle that townhouses should not be taller than apartments, i.e. outer ring of centre should not be higher. • Reduce to five around a 6 storey centre • Remain at four adjoining a 4 storey centre. </div> <p>Michael Williams noted the need to maintain some flexibility.</p> <p>John Duguid - can use an overlay to address areas close to the coast to reduce the height.</p> <p>Michael Williams – include these words in the plan and communicate this clearly.</p> <p>Red flag 3 minimum lot size</p> <p>Watercare concerns with increased density and ability to service this.</p> <p>Cr Raffills what we want is what we should enable buying three sites is more complicated than 2. Would push back on Watercare.</p> <p>Michael Williams – less appropriate in a suburban environment. Need to say 1500 but if existing dwelling's removed it drops to 1200, or retain 1500 for areas further from the CBD. Would need criteria to apply this.</p> <p>Lindsay Waugh– helps to unlock potential that has been curbed by the position on height.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit advised that the THAB and MH zones cover large areas of isthmus and North shore. MH will be the predominant urban zone in Auckland. Width is 20m for 1200m2. Objectives and policies for this zone need to be tight about the permitted activity threshold.</p> <p>Cr Webster agrees with the recommended approach (1200m2).</p> <p>Michael Williams – issue in Howick with infill taking away future development opportunity. Would like 1500m2 but reduce to 1200 if removing existing buildings to discourage infill. Roger Blakeley concerned at restricting for an unlikely scenario.</p> <div data-bbox="236 1608 971 1758" style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0f2f7; padding: 10px;"> <p>Direction</p> <p>Confirmed reduction of minimum lot size to 1200m2.</p> </div> <p>Red Flag 4 Density</p> <p>Penny Pirrit -over a certain number of dwellings need to be able to deal with it case by case. Would need to maintain the density controls. UP to four dwellings this can be managed as permitted activity. RDA no density above 4 units is the best approach.</p> <p>Shale Chambers – rules need to be strictly applied.</p> <p>Michael Williams – issue with rules 1-2 dwellings. Should be 1 per 350</p>		

Item	Who	Time
<p>or 400.</p> <p>Tim Watts – options 1 and 2 require strong design based policies. Option 1 is a new approach so have some concerns that don't understand the default built form for option 1, in current plans there is an urban design assessment for all development over 4 units so have less influence over built form.</p> <p>Cr Walker higher level of control to start with and remove over time if the market performs.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit- We are not leaving it to the market. There are additional controls. Balance between providing capacity to meet demand for affordable housing but providing for adequate oversight and control for larger development.</p> <p>MfE is expecting a cost benefit analysis of the approach to getting quality design in Auckland. Will be doing a full analysis. Won't have the information until next year.</p> <div data-bbox="256 786 1070 958" style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0f2f7; padding: 10px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>Direction</p> <p>Confirmed option 1 (up to 4 dwellings on a site as a permitted activity) noting some concerns raised.</p> </div> <p>Red Flag 5 Infill development of rear lots – minimum site widths for 3-4 dwellings (15m) and 5+ (20m)</p> <p>Applies more to mixed housing zone. Controls in THMB would discourage development of rear lots.</p> <p>Cr Walker - concerns at localised site issues for stormwater.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit- general Auckland wide rules to address these issues. Requirement to be outside 100 year floodplain and 40% permeable surface.</p> <p>Derek Battersby – concern at quality of rear lot development. Would prefer to see this stay as bush. Need to restrict poor development.</p> <p>John Duguid requirement would prevent more than one dwelling on an existing rear lot.</p> <p>Lindsay Waugh - questioned site width was measured. John Duguid advised street frontage and full width of site – needs to be clear within the rules.</p> <p>Glen Tupuhi – Supports recommendation to address housing affordability and new entrants to the market.</p> <p>Cr Coney- concern with poor quality of infill housing. Need more controls round this.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit advised we are adding controls to ensure improved outcomes.</p> <p>Michael Williams – rear lots in his area are ecological corridors. Minimum size of 400m would be the appropriate size for rear sections.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit – we are increasing the limit from 6m to 15m so this will severely constrain infill.</p>		

Item	Who	Time
<div data-bbox="229 219 1072 474" style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0f2f7; padding: 5px;"> <p>Direction</p> <p>Confirmed minimum site width control for 3-4 (15m) and 5+ dwellings (20m).</p> <p>Cr Coney and Cr Walker - infill should not be a permitted activity but restricted discretionary</p> </div> <p>Red flag 6 Minor dwellings</p> <p>Recommending provision for two dwellings in an existing house. Applies to a single house zone.</p> <p>Michael Williams- difference between having a house configured for a split or adding on an addition for separate occupation.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit feedback from community on single house zone was to retain look and feel, while retaining flexibility. In MH zone an addition should follow same density rules so would require 600m site and meeting the other controls.</p> <p>Glen Tupuhi - enabling families to look after their older relatives needs to be supported.</p> <p>Cr Coney – minimum size for a house before it can be split? Has qualms about this proposal, in particular unintended consequences. Warrant of fitness for landlords?</p> <p>Penny Pirrit - too restrictive to apply a minimum size but can do more work around this. Will check building act for controls and report back on 12 Dec PWP.</p> <p>Deputy Mayor - a lot of this is picked up in the housing strategy.</p> <div data-bbox="256 1238 1042 1408" style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0f2f7; padding: 5px;"> <p>Direction</p> <p>Deferred for further discussion at 12 December workshop continuation.</p> </div>		
<p>Item 3: Historic heritage and character</p> <p>3 key issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Existing historic character areas – notification <p>Recommended approach proposing full notification for demolition, as a result of feedback from boards and Heritage Advisory Panel. This is a change from PWP’s previous direction of limited notification.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Growth and management of historic heritage and character <p>Boffa Miskell maps identifying settlement patterns.</p> <p>Recommended approach – overlay based on settlement maps as an interim protection measure. Demolition of building prior to overlay date would require a non notified consent process and assessed against the criteria already in the plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Linking new buildings with applications to demolish <p>Not supported because:</p>	<p>Tony Reidy, Noel Reardon, Jenny Fuller</p>	

Item	Who	Time
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would place an unreasonable burden on property owners without any certainty that consent will be granted. • The criteria in the draft Unitary Plan are sufficient to ensure new buildings are in keeping with their surroundings. • Once demolished, the Council is unable to enforce a condition that requires the new building to be immediately constructed. <p>Discussion issue 1</p> <p>Shale Chambers sought clarification of approach to notification.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit- Full notification for demolition in existing character areas is a change from the PWP's previous direction of limited notification.</p> <p>Waitemata prefers North Shore approach based on criteria (section 95 process). Discretion is a fall-back position as an alternative to limited notification. Limited notification does not address community view on character value. Need to be more granular to solve the problem.</p> <p>Lindsay Waugh – neither board asked for full notification. Settlement maps don't match Res 3 zoning.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit- one overlay for existing res 3 and a precautionary overlay based on the settlement map, excluding existing character. This is a bit like the Maori alert layer.</p> <p>Cr Goudie full notification will capture a lot more people for what outcome. Small group of people that will waste council and property owners money to what end. Full notification will not achieve protection.</p> <p>Cr Coney HAP didn't advise full notification but remaining silent on notification and case by case. Need heritage staff fully involved in applications for demolition. This needs to be cemented into the process – can the UP ensure this?</p> <p>Noel Reardon - need to give guidance to consents team on when notification is appropriate.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit - Need to be clear on outcomes in the objectives and policies. Demolition is removal or change to 30% of the original building.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0f2f7; padding: 10px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>Direction</p> <p>UP to remain silent on notification for demolition of existing historic character. Officers to apply standard section 95 tests on a case by case basis to determine if notification should apply.</p> </div> <p>Discussion issue 2</p> <p>Interim approach :within mapped area demolition requires a non-notified resource consent.</p> <p>Will first assess against scheduling criteria for historic heritage, and schedule if appropriate. Would then assess for contribution to character.</p>		

Item	Who	Time
<p>Interim blanket approach will be refined once the heritage assessment of an area is completed.</p> <p>Recommending non-notification because these areas already outside existing character zones.</p> <p>Derek Battersby– support for compact city. Housing NZ homes going to be redeveloped and will fall into the 1944 model. Why would you not exclude these to enable replacement with terraced housing?</p> <p>Lindsay Waugh– criteria based on contribution to a group of buildings. Previous discussion of when buildings are scattered.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit- character is different from scheduling. Character is about a group of buildings from a similar era.</p> <p>Cr Coney – Interim approach puts some protection in place prior to a full heritage assessment of an area. Need a priority list of where to do the assessment first even if this is not part of the UP.</p> <p>Could make this a link on the website so it can be changed. Anything attached to the UP needs a plan change to modify.</p> <p>Glen Tupuhi - defence properties have been provided as part of Treaty settlement. Concerned at devaluing of these assets. This decision will impact on the value of Treaty settlement land.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit - this will overlay all 4 residential zones. Need to give direction - will this overlay also put on hold development rights (e.g. infill.) or allow additional units provided sympathetic to existing building? Resource consent would be required. Need to offer some opportunity to intensify.</p> <p>Cr Webster – we should allow this. It is a growing city</p> <p>Cr Raffills supports development potential. Integrity of style, not copies.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit - gentle intensification would only work if new development is behind existing buildings to maintain the existing character streetscape. Should not allow development at the front until heritage assessment completed.</p> <p>Cr Lee – removing a house can diminish character of an area and adding in can also do this, so depends on how dominant and visible new buildings are so site by site.</p> <p>Shale Chambers -shifting and raising of buildings?</p> <p>Cr Coney in absence of the full assessment the individual application on a particular site could compromise the heritage or character values of a site.</p> <p>Cr Walker – requested testing and examples.</p> <p>New dwellings need resource consent with consideration of impact on existing character surroundings.</p>		

Item	Who	Time
<p>Direction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce an overlay to the Draft Unitary Plan based on the Boffa Miskell settlement map as an interim protection measure • Exclude existing historic character areas from this overlay • Demolition or shifting of buildings constructed prior to 1944 within the new overlay would require a resource consent (non-notified) • Underlying zoning will continue to direct new additions and alterations. • Demolition proposals assessed against the following: Step 1 – Historic heritage scheduling criteria – if criteria met consent should be declined and a plan change initiated. Step 2 – Criteria based on the contribution the building makes to a group of buildings within close proximity that have a consistent architectural style. If criteria met, proposal assessed against further criteria that address the impact of the loss of the building on the character of the local area. The condition of the building would also need to be taken into account <p>Discussion issue 3</p> <p>Application would have to prepare architectural drawings and heritage input which would mean \$25-50,000 for the application which is an unreasonable burden.</p> <p>The UP criteria are sufficient to ensure new buildings are in keeping with their surroundings.</p> <p>Council can't enforce such a condition.</p> <p>Direction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for recommended approach i.e. <i>not</i> linking new buildings with applications to demolish 		
<p>Item 4: Natural environment</p> <p>Issue requiring guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mangrove management • SEAs and overlays - concerns from mana whenua, rural community and infrastructure providers. <p>Mangroves</p> <p>Recent plan change to coastal plan more enabling. Managed best as part of an integrated management plan.</p> <p>Local board concerns about costs and difficulty. Issues raised as follows:</p>	<p>Mark Tamura, Dominic McCarthy, Jenny Fuller John Sawyer</p>	

Item	Who	Time
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harbour-based management plans – promoted by existing framework and already being developed and applied. • Permitted activity - Regional consenting process – consistency already applied but there is no one size fits all approach • Waterways and beaches- Definition of waterways is broad and effects uncertain but could look at removal from beaches, though need a careful definition of beach. Seedlings can already be removed, and could allow non-motorised tools. <p>Current controls – proposed to modify to allow hand held motorised tools.</p> <p>Hybrid approach - retain current permitted activity and add provision for mechanical seedling removal; introduce controlled activity to remove mangroves from areas that were free of mangroves in 1996 where adjacent to public reserve or Maori land and within 5m of a navigable channel.</p> <p>Controlled activity enables a discussion to confirm the 1996 extent and the navigable channel.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Lindsay Waugh– much earlier records than 1996. This threshold is too recent. Navigable waterways - historical references to these channels being used. Mangroves have destroyed the fishery resources that Kaipatiki was named for. Want to open up historically significant waterway that has been choked by mangroves.</p> <p>Cr Raffills – cost of consenting process to remove large areas in Mangere Bridge. This area has lost the coastline. Te Atatutu another area where waterway access has been lost - scows used to come to a flour mill; ancestral records of portage. Agrees 1996 too late.</p> <p>Cr Webster – this is hugely important to a lot of people throughout Auckland.. Both coasts in Rodney being strangled by mangroves. 1996 not far enough back. Go back to 50s and 60s and monitor growth.</p> <p>Natural environment team does not support the hybrid approach, and prefers to retain the current provisions until detailed studies completed.</p> <p>Cr Walker – product of siltation and erosion rather than time. Need a scientific base for the approach. Linked to range of other environmental processes. Mangroves are a natural response to sedimentation. Supports current approach rather than the proposal. Where will the costs of the consent process lie? More work required.</p> <p>Mark Tamura acknowledged the approach involved the risk of leading to more extensive removal.</p> <p>Dominic Mccarthy– fatal flaws with hybrid proposal. Could be difficult to limit e.g. multiple applications to remove. Allowing a small area will lead to pressure to clear much bigger areas. The 1996 line may not pick up the areas that people want to clear.</p> <p>Cr Hartley –suggested a sub group of working party and staff to develop some provisions.</p> <p>Cr Coney – what has happened to the rest of the coastal plan?</p> <p>Mark advised this was one of the controversial issues. PWP signed off eh approach to coastal policy in November last year so have been</p>		

Item	Who	Time
<p>working on it since then, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access for free anchorage and discharges. • Seamless management approach to land and sea boundary. <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>Direction</p> <p>Agreed to consider further at a later date with more information provided.</p> <p>Roger Blakeley to convene a subgroup to develop a proposal: Cr Coney Cr Webster, Cr Raffills, Lindsay Waugh, Cr Walker, Andy Baker.</p> <p>Officers to carry out the additional work on options and impacts as input to the group deliberations.</p> </div> <p>Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs)</p> <p>As an area increases in ecological significance, the conservation effort increases correspondingly. Regulatory tools and other options such as facilitation and incentives are applied.</p> <p>The draft approach is a passive management regime. NGOs want to see a more proactive approach to assets with highest biodiversity value.</p> <p>Proposed distinction between significant, high significance and critical – retain approach for March draft, pending feedback we could review whether a tiered approach is needed for significance in the notified version.</p> <p>Information provided of extent to which various zones are affected, and the impact on various types of activities.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Cr Coney – concern at implications of three levels, and no surprises approach with March draft.</p> <p>Mark Tamura - don't have time to do the work for March and don't know what the wider community will think of the approach. Rural stakeholders are opposed to even the passive regime.</p> <p>Cr Coney – these areas don't stand still. Less than 5% of wetlands have survived – we should look after all our wetlands. Doesn't support differentiation between SEAs. Hard to measure difference in ecological terms. Different regime for lesser SEAs could prevent them from developing and becoming more significant over time.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit confirmed that a special overlay is being developed for the Waitekere Ranges heritage Area and it will be incorporated into the UP.</p> <p>Cr Walker – what are we trying to do? Ecologically we are in a poor state. Differentiation increases the risk for less significant sites.</p> <p>Cr Morrison – how we treat the critical areas is different and this is how we effect a change. Can be more directive. Would take more work than needed to deliver in September. Have a solid base to start from and</p>		

Item	Who	Time
<p>develop the graduated approach. Package of regulatory and incentives.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit Could test this in the March version by including in tier 1 objectives and policies a management approach that applies a different management approach depending on level of significance. Detailed rules could be developed for September.</p> <p>Cr Webster – how far can we impose on private land? No recognition that a lot is protected already (QEII covenanting) and why do we need more? Farming community in Rodney is upset about this issue.</p> <p>Shale Chambers - What do you want to achieve, then determine how you get there? Need to have the policy in place first.</p> <p>Lindsay Waugh – would this tiered approach prevent mangrove removal to improve degraded areas?</p> <p>Penny Pirrit confirmed if there is an overlay with greater restriction this will take priority over other things. This means the SEA would override the mangrove removal.</p> <p>Andy Baker – should be using the advice coming from the Rural Advisory Panel (RAP) as they have done a lot of work on this. SEAs seen as an impingement on rural activity with no clear purpose. Get rid of the coastal area and reclassify as rural production with a SEA overlay.</p> <p>Cr Morrison – RAP began working on Auckland Plan two years ago and one of the concerns was that the perspective was too business focused so brought in environmental groups. Need to connect the work on land with the coastal areas.</p> <p>Penny Pirrit - need clarity around the criteria and the process. Concerns raised about classes of SEAs and opposed views – too many vs too few. Also need to consider mana whenua concerns about impact on their land and how they can use it and utility provider concerns about impact on operations.</p> <p>Glen Tupuhi – IMSB came to the workshop yesterday prepared to have debate on overlays. It is not preferential treatment but application of legal rights. Any rules that impede progress of Maori through their legal rights will be overturned by due process</p> <div data-bbox="233 1509 1066 1944" style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0f2f7; padding: 10px;"> <p>Direction</p> <p>PWP to consider SEAs further on 12 December, in particular whether a different approach is required for Maori land.</p> <p>Officers to provide information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new areas proposed vs what is already protected. • How much of the new is on public land or conservation land vs private land <p>IMSB team to work with officers to have a constructive discussion.</p> </div>		
Item 5: Rural subdivision	Mark	

Item	Who	Time
Deferred to 12 December agenda	Tamura	

	Summary of decisions	By whom	Due
1.	Agreed further half day session would be arranged to address outstanding matters – remaining height issues, proposed wording on commercial redress, and any other matters that could not be resolved during the second day of the workshop		12 Dec
	Infrastructure		
2.	Supported option 3 for parking (Retain proposed approach (max in and around centres (on FTN) and in the mixed use zone; minimums elsewhere) with more permissive maximum for retail) with some reservations.		
3.	Confirmed long term direction for parking is maximums for entire region as soon as possible.		
4.	Confirmed discretionary activity status in the inner corridor and permitted in the outer corridor with four people in favour of non-complying.		
5.	Agreed to make new residential building a non-complying activity in the inner transmission line corridor.		
6.	Supported development of an agreed position on tree management protocols.		
7.	Agreed to report back to PWP on a way forward on airport noise.		12 Dec
	Residential		
8.	Confirmed where an alternative approach to zone location boundary has been proposed by a local board that does not have a significant impact on capacity for growth, adopt the changes proposed by the local board.		
9.	Agreed in respect of height that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General principle that townhouses should not be taller than apartments, i.e. outer ring of centre should not be higher. • Reduce to five around a 6 storey centre • Remain at four adjoining a 4 storey centre. 		
10.	Confirmed reduction of minimum lot size to 1200m ² .		
11.	Confirmed option 1 (up to 4 dwellings on a site as a permitted activity) noting some concerns raised.		
12.	Confirmed minimum site width control for 3-4 (15m) and 5+ dwellings (20m). Note Crs Coney and Walker's dissenting view that infill should not be a permitted activity but restricted discretionary.		

	Summary of decisions	By whom	Due
13.	Minor dwellings deferred for further discussion at 12 December workshop continuation.		12 Dec
	Historic Character		
14.	UP to remain silent on notification for demolition of existing historic character. Officers to apply standard section 95 tests on a case by case basis to determine if notification should apply.		
15.	<p>Supported proposed interim approach to protection of historic character:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce an overlay to the Draft Unitary Plan based on the Boffa Miskell settlement map as an interim protection measure. • Exclude existing historic character areas from this overlay. • Demolition or shifting of buildings constructed prior to 1944 within the new overlay would require a resource consent (non-notified). • Underlying zoning will continue to direct new additions and alterations. • Demolition proposals assessed against the following: Step 1 – Historic heritage scheduling criteria – if criteria met consent should be declined and a plan change initiated. Step 2 – Criteria based on the contribution the building makes to a group of buildings within close proximity that have a consistent architectural style. If criteria met, proposal assessed against further criteria that address the impact of the loss of the building on the character of the local area. The condition of the building would also need to be taken into account. 		
16.	Supported officer recommendation not to link new buildings with applications to demolish.		
	Mangroves and SEAs		
17.	Agreed to consider mangrove management further at a later date with more information provided. Roger Blakeley to convene a subgroup to develop a proposal: Cr Coney Cr Webster, Cr Raffills, Lindsay Waugh, Cr Walker, Andy Baker.		
18.	PWP to consider SEAs further on 12 December, in particular whether a different approach is required for Maori land.		12 Dec
19.	Rural subdivision deferred to 12 December.		12 Dec
	Summary of actions	By whom	Due

	Summary of actions	By whom	Due
1.	Circulate agendas for next ordinary PWP meeting (11 Dec) and the further half day workshop (12 Dec)	PP	5 Dec
2.	Officers to follow up with the people who were involved in the agreement regarding Vector's corridor through the Waitakere Ranges regional park.	Rachel Dimery	
3.	Officers to work with utility companies to develop an agreed position on tree management protocols and report back to PWP.	Rachel Dimery	
4.	Report back on airport noise	Rachel Dimery	12 Dec?
5.	Option of using an overlay to address areas close to the coast to reduce the height to be included in the plan and communicated clearly.	John Duguid	
6.	Check Building Act for controls relating to minor dwellings and report back on 12 Dec PWP.	PP	12 Dec
7.	Officers to carry out the additional work on options and impacts as input to the mangroves sub-group deliberations (see decision 17 above).	Mark Tamura	???
8.	Officers to provide information for 12 December workshop on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new SEAs proposed vs what is already protected. • How much of the new is on public land or conservation land vs private land. 	Mark Tamura	12 Dec
9.	IMSB team to work with officers to have a constructive discussion on impact of SEAs and overlays on Maori land.	Mark Tamura	

Next meeting: 11th December, 9.00am-12.00pm, level 15 committee room, Civic Building, Auckland Central