

## Appendix 3.39.2

### Consultation list for the following S32 evaluations;

- **City centre**
- **Business**
- **Business building form and design**
- **Traffic in centres**

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
<p>External Advisory Panel Meeting<sup>1</sup></p> <p>06-07-2011</p>	<p>The Panel discussed the need for consistency of rules for the following:</p> <p><b>Air quality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already at least 3 different air categories in Regional Plan: Urban rural and industrial</li> </ul> <p><b>Signage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rules are currently over the top</li> <li>• Need for consistency rural, residential, business, town centres, CBD</li> </ul> <p><b>Carparking &amp; Access Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do we need min parking standards?</li> <li>• Currently based on floor space technique</li> <li>• Standard regionally – different regions have different needs i.e. Close to public transport and those where there is low / no public transport</li> <li>• Set by plan or resource consent</li> <li>• UP Proposed to set maximum carpark requirements</li> </ul> <p><b>Retail, commercial and industry</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria for office and retail developments</li> <li>• Retail issues specifically around land area and transport</li> <li>• Office Parks</li> <li>• Industry – noxious vs. passive</li> </ul>
<p>Report to Business Advisory Panel: Business and the Unitary Plan<sup>2</sup></p> <p>10-11-2011</p>	<p>Issues the Unitary Plan will have to address:</p> <p><b>Out-of-centre retailing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring of business activity shows that an increasing amount of retail (LFR and bulky retail) and office activities have been locating outside of growth centres.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Distributed Minutes External Advisory Group 2011-07-06 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\((Unitary Plan - 2011)\MEETINGS 0103\External Advisory Panel E004\2011-07\Minutes and Agenda 0010

<sup>2</sup> BAP paper 2 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\((UP 2011 - Business)\REPORTING 0144\Advisory Panels 1091

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By becoming more dispersed and less centres-based, these developments are less sustainable than a centres based development and dilute the land use and transport integration that Council is trying to promote.</li> <li>• They also consume business land intended for industrial development which has contributed to the shortage of industrial land. Reasons for this include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- higher cost of land in centres,</li> <li>- difficulties in assembling sites of sufficient size in centres</li> <li>- insufficient commercial land zoned in centres</li> <li>- costs and delays in seeking consent or rezoning</li> <li>- Competitive advantage from locating separately away from competitors and also being able to provide ample carparking.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Large Format Retailing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The standard LFR model requires large sites; however it is feasible for most forms of LRF to locate in centres. This may require LFR to adapt its preferred style of development to one that is suitable for town centres. UK examples show this can be done.</li> </ul> <p><b>Bulky good retailers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is less feasible for bulky goods retailers to locate in centres due to the products they sell. Edge of centre corridor locations could be more suitable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Office Use</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most forms of office use are suitable for location in centres.</li> </ul> <p>The Auckland Plan encourages retail and commercial activities to locate in centres and corridors and seeks to avoid the negative impacts of dispersed economic activity on centres. The UP will give effect to this strategic direction.</p> <p><b>Protection of industrial land</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industrial activities typically use a lot of land and have a low employment rate per hectare and seek cheap sites away from centres</li> <li>• It is important they locate away from more sensitive uses due to the adverse effects they can have on neighbouring areas</li> <li>• Retail, office and residential uses often seek to locate on this cheaper land as it is lower than in centres or corridors. The industrial use is then displaced.</li> <li>• Industrial land needs to be protected from displacement by other uses.</li> </ul> <p><b>Intensity of business land use</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Auckland Plan follows a compact-city model. If business land can be used more intensely less of it will be required to meet the regions needs and less Greenfield land will need to be developed. It also results in fewer car trips and more vibrant and interesting places to live and work</li> <li>• It is recognised however that the nature of some business uses is to have low employment density and that these uses are critical to the region i.e. industrial</li> </ul>

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensification in centres and corridors rely on capacity in these existing areas. This requires a combination of clear policy mandate for business land intensification in these areas; and the zoning providing capacity for intensification to take place and the development economic providing sufficient financial incentive.</li> </ul>
<p>Unitary Plan Political Working Party Meeting on the Built Environment<sup>3</sup></p> <p>28-10-2011</p>	<p>The Political Working Party accepted the following to enable the development of option papers:</p> <p><b>Transforming Brownfield business areas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need for a mixture of non regulatory approaches (around capacity) and regulatory.</li> <li>The need to get the balance between the carrot and the stick right.</li> <li>How to make development of Brownfield land more permissive with clearer interpretation</li> </ul> <p><b>Business Activities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need to delineate business uses (industrial manufacturing, distribution) from other uses e.g. retail.</li> <li>And again from office – they all have different needs and outcomes</li> <li>These different uses all have different needs and outcomes and need to tease out the different issues for each.</li> </ul> <p><b>Auckland Plan directives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The difference between PC6 to the RPS and the centres hierarchy in the Auckland Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Intensification</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need to ensure intensification happens around public transport nodes.</li> <li>What will intensification will mean for parking rates?</li> </ul> <p><b>Reverse Sensitivity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need to protect business from reverse sensitivity.</li> </ul>
<p>Business Advisory Panel<sup>4</sup></p> <p>21-11-2011</p>	<p>Identification of Issues relevant to business that the Unitary Plan will have to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responding to pressure from retail and other commercial activities to locate out-of-centre</li> <li>Protection of land for industrial activities from the displacement by other uses</li> <li>Encouraging intensification of business land use in centres and corridors</li> <li>Parking – maximum and minimums</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> Draft Minutes 2011-10-28 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\((Unitary Plan - 2011)\MEETINGS 0103\UP Political Working Party 0165\2011-10\Minutes and Agenda 0010

<sup>4</sup> BAP FINAL 2011-11-21.doc - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\((UP 2011 - Business)\REPORTING 0144\Advisory Panels 1091

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
<p>Retail Group Meeting – Shopping Centres &amp; LFR (mostly commercial operators involved in Change 6 RPS hearings)<sup>5</sup></p> <p>28-02-2012</p>	<p>The group discussed the following:</p> <p><b>Plan Change 6</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreement that change 6 should not be altered</li> </ul> <p><b>Auckland Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern at lack of identified corridors and that the corridors identified don't connect areas that well.</li> <li>• Group feels there are too many centres and the market can't support them. Focus on the success of a few town centres rather than 40+ in close proximity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Parking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If parking maximums are to be used need to be careful that this does not prevent development occurring.</li> <li>• Group is in favour of minimum parking requirements as RDA, but maximum parking limits aren't working</li> <li>• Issues arise where some uses need to provide parking, and others don't – creates an unfair burden. New Lynn was used as an example.</li> </ul> <p><b>Definitions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group would like a definition for LFR – footprint size preferred over operation as the determinant of definition.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concept Plans and Comprehensive Development Plans</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDPs shouldn't be mandatory should be used as an incentive</li> <li>• Take to PWP for direction. Cost &amp; Time may be the deciding factor on this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Integrated Traffic Assessments and development in centres</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to be clear on when and how ITAs should be required.</li> <li>• Council should not ask for ITAS for developments in areas where they have already indicated the use is encouraged there.</li> <li>• Council should have traffic modelling as part of identifying the areas for intensification.</li> <li>• Development in centres is harder than outside which leads to out-of-centre development. Need to ensure that development in centres is easier than outside centres.</li> </ul> <p><b>LFR Zones</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This zone would be appropriate around town centres to stop the vacuum effect. Acknowledge that its better to identify and offer guidance but this is difficult given the timeframes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Rules vs. Assessment criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need a balance where the rules set out the basic criteria and give certainty to everyone.</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> Shopping Centres & LFR SW Minutes 2012-02-28 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\ (Unitary Plan - 2011)\CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT 0040\Sector engagement workshops\Minutes and Agenda 0010\Feb March 2012 workshops

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UP is looking to elevate objectives and policies to use as assessment criteria</li> </ul> <p><b>Design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In favour of using North Shore PC 30 – which deals with centres, malls and supermarkets.</li> </ul>
<p>Sector Workshop Minutes – Business Park Owners <sup>6</sup></p> <p>02-03-2012</p>	<p><b>Inappropriate Office development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group would like UP to cap office uses in LIZ to prevent take up of industrial land.</li> </ul> <p><b>Centres and Business parks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBRE report found there was plenty of latent capacity for office floorspace in centres, but most business parks are around centres anyway.</li> </ul> <p><b>Parking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Business Park owners want to build as few car parks as possible because they have no financial incentive. But have to provide what the market wants.</li> <li>Disagree with parking maximums because they don't want to provide more than what is required.</li> </ul> <p><b>Definition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group feels there is no need for a business park definition.</li> <li>Minimum size of business parks would start at 20,000sq.m</li> <li>Group thinks council should facilitate existing business park areas particularly if they are intense and close to corridors.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Business Park areas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group found no need to provide for new areas, just enable new entrants according to policy</li> </ul> <p><b>Concept Plans</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concept plans will have the same outcomes as they do currently with no changes.</li> </ul>
<p>Sector Workshop Meetings – Fast food outlets (Quick Service Restaurants)<sup>7</sup></p> <p>05-03-2012</p>	<p><b>QSR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industrial locations and generally on a corridor and are appropriate places to service catchments.</li> </ul> <p><b>Definitions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group prefers Quick Service Retail QSR may not correspond with drive towards plain English.</li> <li>Group is happy with “Drive Through Restaurants” used to define fast food outlets. Discussion about</li> </ul>

<sup>6</sup> Business parks SW Minutes 2012-03-02 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\((Unitary Plan - 2011)\CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT 0040\Sector engagement workshops\Minutes and Agenda 0010\Feb March 2012 workshops

<sup>7</sup> Fast food SQ minutes 2012-03-05 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\((Unitary Plan - 2011)\CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT 0040\Sector engagement workshops\Minutes and Agenda 0010\Feb March 2012 workshops

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>whether separate definitions are required for QSR drive through activities and activities without drive through.</p> <p><b>Design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design is a fundamental issue for QSRs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Parking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be done based on seating. McDonalds has a rule of thumb to provide 1 park for every 3 seats including staff carparking</li> <li>• Group does not want parking maximums in the UP</li> <li>• Inaccurate having GFA rules for backroom areas as it does not relate to the amount of customers. Need a rule that relates to the public area – but this may run into issues when a playground is included.</li> </ul> <p><b>Traffic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• QSRs are located on arterials for convenience. Arterials are built to serve traffic and so best place for QSRs to locate.</li> <li>• ITAs should be to be removed on corridors.</li> <li>• AP prioritised Metropolitan Centres for development – shouldn't send a conflicting message, encouraging development there, but discouraging by requiring traffic assessments. This is harder to justify for corridors and an ITA is likely to be required</li> </ul> <p><b>Signs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group thinks that signs should be dealt with under the RMA process not bylaws</li> </ul> <p><b>Buffers to residential zones</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group is ok with consent requirement in these areas, but the criteria should be limited as the effects on neighbouring residences are often not significant.</li> </ul>
<p>Retail Group Meeting – Bunnings<sup>8</sup></p> <p>16-03-2012</p>	<p>The Retail Group discussed the following:</p> <p><b>Preferred Model – location, size, nature of business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difference between industry and building supplies.</li> <li>• Option of an overlay was discussed to provide a lower activity status for activities close to an arterial.</li> </ul> <p><b>Design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design controls will be needed in the commercial core, but some design aspects may be reduced on the fringe of the centre and on corridors.</li> <li>• It is important that applicants have certainty around urban design. Concerns around Discretionary activity status and requiring an entire application to be looked at in detail when it is only the Urban Design requirement that are of concern.</li> </ul>

<sup>8</sup> Shopping Centres & LFR Bunnings 2012-03-16 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\(\Unitary Plan - 2011)\CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT 0040\Sector engagement workshops\Minutes and Agenda 0010\Feb March 2012 workshops

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p><b>Traffic and Parking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The business model needs parking, so be wary of maximums.</li> <li>Don't want ad hoc development e.g. New Lynn had increased development rights but still required and ITA</li> </ul> <p><b>Definition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bunnings in support of defining LFR using a sq.m tool.</li> </ul> <p><b>LFR Zone</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bunnings disagreed a LFR zone is necessary.</li> </ul>
<p>CBD Board Workshop<sup>9</sup></p> <p>24-05-2012</p>	<p><b>Quarters</b></p> <p>The Unitary Plan team should consider recognising the quarters identified in the City Centre Masterplan.</p> <p><b>Key Precinct Attributes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a distinctive built character (e.g Queen St Valley/High St);</li> <li>Comprises activities with specific functional requirements (e.g. Port); and/or</li> <li>Offers significant transformational development opportunities (e.g. Wynyard/Tank Farm).</li> <li></li> </ul> <p>It was noted that precincts can have elements of some or all of these attributes.</p> <p><b>Precincts – General Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The precinct map shown is a first draft prepared by the Unitary Plan team in order to get feedback from key stakeholders and decision-makers.</li> <li>Precincts should include both sides of the street in the boundary.</li> <li>The name of Precincts should not just describe the place - they should try to explain the character/function/transformation e.g. Civic Precinct as opposed to Aotea Precinct.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a need to ensure the Unitary Plan is clear about the land use and built form outcomes for the city centre and the precincts within it, while providing sufficient flexibility in the provisions to respond to changes in the</li> </ul>

---

<sup>9</sup> CBD Board Workshop Minutes 2012-05-24 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\UP 2011 - City Centre)\MEETINGS 0103

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>market.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Unitary Plan is one of many tools that will be used to implement the Auckland Plan and City Centre Masterplan. Acknowledging that the city centre is a dynamic, mixed use environment, the main aspects of development that the Unitary Plan can manage are land use and built form. A more detailed summary of the role of the Unitary Plan in relation to other non-regulatory methods will be provided in the coming weeks (refer action points below).</li> <li>• Potential seismic strengthening requirements may limit the ability to protect heritage/character buildings given the additional financial burden. Report from the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Christchurch Earthquake will address this and will be released in the coming weeks.</li> <li>• Consider whether the Unitary Plan can include minimum size requirements for retail tenancies. General consensus is that this would be difficult to require under the RMA and the urban design and retail outcomes may be at odds.</li> </ul> <p><b>Port/Waterfront</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point Erin Park was incorrectly shown on the precinct map as being part of the Westhaven Precinct and will be deleted.</li> <li>• Westhaven will have a waterspace precinct for coastal provisions e.g. reclamations.</li> <li>• Britomart West should be recongised as a precinct given the re-development plans for the area contained in the City Centre Masterplan. The area fits the transformational precinct criterion.</li> </ul> <p><b>Residential</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anzac Ave Residential Precinct - could look to extend to a wider area so long as activities are compatible with residential. The Unitary Plan team will review this.</li> <li>• Include additional residential precinct at the southern end of Hobson/Nelson Streets. The rules may only limit noisy activities such as bars/nightclubs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Queen Street Valley</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to broaden the scope of this precinct to recognise the commercial function of the wider engine room.</li> </ul>



Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p><b>Quay Park</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leasehold land makes re-development challenging. Need to ensure an appropriate scale of development at the waterfront edge. Heights should also be respectful of existing heritage and character elements/features.</li> </ul> <p><b>Civic Heart</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a need to recognise the unique civic function of the area around Aotea Square. Although, it was acknowledged that the area has a variety of functions and it should not be limited to civic activities.</li> </ul>
<p>External Advisory Panel Meeting<sup>10</sup></p> <p>18-05-2012</p>	<p><b>Office status in Heavy Industry zone</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed Prohibited status for stand alone office building in Heavy Industry Zone</li> </ul> <p><b>Building Frontage design in centres</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No need for a rule that tailors the building in relation to the street - it's ok to have some uncertainty in the consent process.</li> </ul>
<p>Political Working Party Meeting<sup>11</sup></p> <p>27-07-2012</p>	<p><b>Zoning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed approach to zoning and activity status is intended to protect industrial land from commercial activities and to encourage activity into centres.</li> <li>Land supply needs to be managed to ensure that Brownfield development is attractive. Impact of LFR is a concern - The approach to out of centre activity needs to ensure the right results.</li> </ul> <p><b>Activities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarries will be addressed by a specific zone. Waste and waste minimisation would be considered as heavy industry and waste transfer as light industry</li> <li>In vessel composting, biogas production and onsite electricity generation needs to be taken into account and enabled.</li> <li>Churches need to be specifically identified as these are increasingly taking up light industrial land.</li> </ul> <p><b>Heavy Industry</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of HIZ in Auckland was questioned – very little is left in the region. Many areas have been</li> </ul>

<sup>10</sup> Draft Agenda 2012-05-25 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\(\Unitary Plan - 2011)\MEETINGS 0103\External Advisory Panel E004\2012-05\Minutes and Agenda 0010

<sup>11</sup> PWP Minutes 2012-07-27 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\(\Unitary Plan - 2011)\MEETINGS 0103\UP Political Working Party 0165\2012-07\Minutes and Agenda 0010

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>compromised by the encroachment of housing so these areas may not be zoned HIZ in the UP. The RUB team is looking at other possible areas to zone for industry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PWP suggested asking industry groups what should be classified as heavy industry and where it is best located. There needs to be a suitable location in the north, otherwise everything has to be trucked from the south.</li> <li>• Offices and lunch bars need to be allowed in the zone to service heavy industry activities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Light Industry</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach needs to be managed - once you have a trade supplier then other big box retail will follow. If office activity is allowing this, it will introduce pressure for other retail.</li> <li>• Argument was made that offices should be able to locate near customers, and add to the businesses in the zone. The external advisory panel countered that most LIZ are small and do not provide enough pool of clients to justify location of offices in this zone.</li> </ul> <p>PWP endorsed the proposed approach to business zones and activities, i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage commercial activity into centres, while enabling out-of-centre activity in certain areas following the recently negotiated 'RPS Change 6' policy approach.</li> <li>• Prohibit non-ancillary residential, large format retail and non-ancillary office activities in the Heavy Industry Zone.</li> <li>• Non-ancillary residential and most retail activities should be non-complying in the Light Industry zone.</li> <li>• Non-ancillary office activities should be non-complying in the Light Industry zone.</li> </ul> <p><b>City Centre</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City centre has own zone in the UP with separate precincts;</li> <li>• Aligns with City Centre Masterplan;</li> <li>• Water around the port is integrated into the city centre zone;</li> <li>• Little change is proposed to areas that have undergone recent plan changes e.g. Wynyard and learning precincts;</li> <li>• Permissive height and site intensity controls;</li> <li>• Bonus system but moving away from accommodation bonus to incentives protection of character, sunlight and outlook;</li> <li>• Enabling commercial activity throughout city centre;</li> </ul>

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significance of employment reflected in objectives and policies;</li> <li>• Enabling housing choice and managing reverse sensitivities;</li> <li>• Activities further managed in precincts.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>Recommendations from the CBD Advisory Board to include additional precincts - still being worked through and will be reported back to the board in September.</p> <p>The approach needs to be integrated with the work of the sustainable design team.</p> <p>The draft provisions will take into account the changing nature of precincts.</p> <p>The floor area ratio and bonus approach was explained in more detail.</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>The proposed approach was supported as a draft on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The change in certain approaches would be presented to the CBD Advisory Panel for information.</li> <li>• The City Centre Rail Loop is integrated into the UP.</li> </ul>
<p>Business Advisory Panel Presentation<sup>12</sup></p> <p>06-08-2012</p>	<p><b>Business Activities and their locations</b></p> <p>Directives from the Auckland Plan are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New retail and office activities will be focused in centres(Para 588)</li> <li>• Auckland's network of centres will be the primary focus for retail and other commercial activity (Directive 10.8)</li> <li>• Auckland's restricted store of industrial land will be managed to ensure that industrial activity is not impeded. This requires the safe guarding of existing industrial- zoned sites (Para 390)</li> </ul> <p><b>Business Land supply</b></p> <p>The Auckland Plan has identified a shortage of business land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land for commercial activities in centres is practically difficult to redevelop due to high cost and the difficulties in assembling sites of sufficient size</li> <li>• Light industrial land is fragmented</li> <li>• There is a shortage of land for heavy industry and sites for land extensive to industrial activities</li> </ul> <p>Ensuring sufficient business land supply is not just about creating new business land, but protecting certain types of business land from use by other activities e.g. minimising retail</p>

<sup>12</sup> Business Advisory Panel 2012-08-06 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\UP 2011 - Business)\CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT 0040\Presentations 0011

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>activities in industrial zones.</p> <p><b>Role of centres and out-of-centre commercial activity</b>  The Auckland Plan follows a centres based strategy reasons for this include :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More opportunity to provide and use public transport and increase walking and cycling</li> <li>• Reduced infrastructure costs</li> <li>• Increased productivity, economic growth and job opportunities through clustering and agglomeration</li> <li>• Greater vitality and security of urban areas through increased social activity and interaction</li> <li>• Greater preservation of natural environment through a reduced urban footprint.</li> </ul> <p>It is not always possible or appropriate to locate into centres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not always possible due to fragmentation of site ownership and the small size of sites</li> <li>• Stores that sell bulky goods and need large sites to do so are not always suitable for centres. They can detrimentally affect centres as they use up too much land, which could be better used by more intensive activities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy guidance for out of centre commercial activity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal to follow recently negotiated RPS PC6 policy approach</li> <li>• Encourage commercial activity in centres</li> <li>• Enable out-of-centre commercial activity in certain areas (along corridors and close to centres) where greater intensification is desirable</li> <li>• Out-of-centre commercial activity could occur in other areas subject to satisfying certain criteria, including effects on – centres, efficient use of land and infrastructure, scarce industrial land, social and community wellbeing and accessibility, net economic benefit.</li> </ul>
<p>Property Council Meeting – Business<sup>13</sup></p> <p>12-09-2012</p>	<p><b>Role of Centres and out-of centre commercial activity</b>  The presentation covered the following matters. There was some discussion afterwards, particularly about the amount of ancillary office that should be permitted in the industrial zones.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While trying to ensure as much commercial development occurs in the centres as possible, the centres based strategy needs to recognise that this is not always possible / appropriate due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- fragmentation of site ownership and small size of site; and</li> <li>- stores that sell bulky good need large sites which are not always suitable for centres as the use up too much land which could be better used by more intensive activities</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>13</sup> Prop council presentation 2012-09-12 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\UP 2011 - Business\CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT 0040\Presentations 0011

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p><b>Out-of-centre commercial activity policy guidance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UP to follow the negotiated RPS PC 6 approach</li> <li>• Encourage commercial activities in centres</li> <li>• Enable out-of-centre commercial activity in certain areas (along corridors and close to centres) where greater intensification is desirable</li> <li>• Out-of-centre commercial activity could occur in other areas subject to satisfying certain criteria including effects on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- centres</li> <li>- efficient use of land and infrastructure</li> <li>- scarce industrial land</li> <li>- social and community wellbeing and accessibility</li> <li>- new economic benefit</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Activity statuses in industrial zones</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessory housing and small retail (cafes, pie shops) are provided for to implement the RPS policy. This will be supported by policy that make it clear where commercial activities are expected to be located (subject to RPS PC 6)</li> <li>• Prohibit non-ancillary residential, large format retail and non-ancillary offices in HIZ and non complying in LIZ.</li> </ul>
<p>Business Advisory Panel <sup>14</sup></p> <p>20-09-2012</p>	<p><b>Centres based approach</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BAP supports in principle the centres based approach to the UP provided it is strongly linked to integrated public transport nodes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Activities in the HIZ</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BAP supports in principle the prohibition of residential, large format retail and non-ancillary office activities in heavy industry zones.</li> <li>• Some members subsequently expressed concerns with the proposed rule that prohibits non-ancillary office activities in HIZ area. Concerns over the definition of non-ancillary, and the prohibited status being seen as too inflexible.</li> </ul> <p><b>Activities in the LIZ</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BAP expressed issues with non ancillary residential, LFR and office activities being non complying in light industrial areas.</li> </ul>
<p>Retail Group <sup>15</sup></p> <p>24-09-2012</p>	<p><b>Terms and Definitions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'High density centres' are not in the August draft. But are likely to be put into future drafts. This is still likely to comprise the city centre, metropolitan centres and</li> </ul>

<sup>14</sup> Business advisory panel 2012-09-20 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\((UP 2011 - Business)\CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT 0040\Presentations 0011

<sup>15</sup> Retail stakeholders 2012-09-24 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\((Unitary Plan - 2011)\CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT 0040\Sector engagement workshops\20121024 Business Provisions

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>town centres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Intensive Corridors' will be identified but under a different name</li> <li>• 'Compact mixed use environments' are not proposed to be used in the UP</li> </ul> <p><b>Design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusion of NSCC PPC 30 urban Design Criteria – provides a balance between design and function</li> </ul> <p><b>Transport and Parking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently there is no traffic generating rule applying to retail within centres</li> <li>• Out-of-centre traffic will be assessed as part of resource consent process.</li> <li>• Proposed parking rates for LFR still to come</li> </ul>
<p>Political Working Party Meeting: Business package Overview of Business Provisions<sup>16</sup></p> <p>12-10-2012</p>	<p><b>Business Provisions</b></p> <p>Officers provided an overview of the proposed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zones</li> <li>• Activities with zones</li> <li>• Built form within zones</li> <li>• Street frontage overlay</li> </ul> <p>Significant changes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building heights to increase in many town and local centres;</li> <li>• Implement the Auckland Plan direction to locate new retail and office activities in centres;</li> <li>• New buildings in most business zones will require a resource consent to enable the building design to be assessed;</li> <li>• Maximum car parking rates (and no minimums) proposed for centres on the frequent public transport network.</li> </ul> <p>Controls include consents for new buildings; height limits, bulk and form controls, height in relation to boundary, provision of yards, other development controls.</p> <p>Looking further at height limits in metro centres and if this allows sufficiently generous floor to ceiling ratios. Some push back on proposed height in town centres from discussion with Local boards and communities.</p> <p>Building frontage typology to maximise streetscape and pedestrian amenity.</p>

<sup>16</sup> PWP Minutes 2012-10-12 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\((Unitary Plan - 2011)\MEETINGS 0103\UP Political Working Party 0165\2012-10\Minutes and Agenda 0010

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>Parking controls distinguish between centres on frequent transport network, centres with less frequent PT and all other areas. Parking maximum only for centres on frequent transport network is a major change and has been much debated at local board workshops.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>Reservations about 8 storeys, the impact on liveability and the practical application. The approach should build up to rather than impose 8 storeys. There was concern at going out with this in March, and it would be important to see visual representation of how this would look e.g. examples and 3D modelling.</p> <p>The centres the Auckland Plan identified that could take 8 stories are the ones with more depth so the height can be achieved in the middle. We are hoping to use 3D modelling to show see what the full package of controls would deliver in each local board area.</p> <p>We need active edges on green space in centres such as Takapuna (this has been addressed in the rules rather than as a map).</p> <p>Concern that the rules (e.g. glazing, verandas, childcare) do not allow for local needs or allow local flavour to come through.</p> <p>Need to refine definitions to ensure that people who make things (e.g. tailors, jewellers) are not prohibited.</p> <p>More thought required on the interface with urban design criteria. Many examples of this type of building presenting unsafe and unfriendly face to the street.</p> <p>The approach doesn't recognise the dynamic nature of changing public transport. Will plan changes be required to apply changes to parking controls as the transport network extends?</p> <p><b>Direction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add active edges for green space in centres.</li> <li>• Change terminology - pedestrian cover instead of veranda.</li> </ul> <p>Need narrative around how 8 metres will work and some practical examples.</p> <p><b>Business Package: City centre zone</b></p> <p>Rachel Morgan outlined the detailed provisions proposed for the City Centre. These reflect the Auckland Plan directions and City Centre Masterplan aspirations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wide range of permitted activities is proposed, while</li> </ul>

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>concentrating retail activity in the core area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building height managed through general height controls and special height controls to protect sunlight admission to public places and views to the volcanic cones.</li> <li>• The floor area ratios and height controls will manage the overall density of development.</li> <li>• Floor area ratio bonuses will incentivise positive design features and public benefits.</li> <li>• New requirements will ensure a variety of housing types.</li> <li>• Development controls will improve the pedestrian experience.</li> <li>• Parking provisions will support the Auckland Plan and City Centre Masterplan objectives for transport.</li> <li>• Areas of distinctiveness and character will be managed by the use of precincts.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>Suggested additions to bonus features – visual amenity/sculptural form of buildings and provision of cycle parks/facilities. Confirmed that cycle parks/facilities will be proposed to be a requirement and not a bonus.</p> <p>Requiring daylight in apartment bedrooms forces more creative design if we want to encourage 3 bedroom apartments.</p> <p>Suggestions included support for pedestrianising of space, shared parking spaces for shared vehicles, provision for aging population, provision of childcare, bonus for energy efficient buildings.</p> <p>Balconies were a concern to avoid “tack ons” and the importance of not restricting or pre-empting innovative use of outdoor space.</p> <p><b>Direction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for the proposed direction.</li> </ul>
<p>External Advisory Panel – Business Package Review <sup>17</sup></p> <p>18-10-2012</p>	<p><b>Parking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be no minimums for Industry in Parking Overlay Area B as this would require too great an area particularly with land extensive activities</li> <li>• Overlay Area B is excessive at 1:40sq.m and should be something more like 1:100sq.m to enable more efficient use of land resource and encourage redevelopment.</li> <li>• An exemption might be made with sites that have no practical vehicle access to the rear of the site e.g. metro and town centres. If the rules constrain the ability to establish a new vehicle crossing then the</li> </ul>

<sup>17</sup> Business EAP minutes 2012-10-18 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\(\Unitary Plan - 2011)\MEETINGS 0103\External Advisory Panel E004\2011-10\Minutes and Agenda 0010



Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>affected properties should not need to provide on site parking.</p> <p><b>Industrial parking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking at the front of a site may be safest and most appropriate. Need provisions to be set back, with landscaping to the front of the carpark (minimum number of trees per frontage length) and signage controlled.</li> </ul> <p><b>Industry vs. business parks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distinguishing factor is that the business park zone is anticipated for greater public use by visitors, workers and customers.</li> </ul> <p><b>Activities in the industrial zones</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Childcare RDA in LIZ (to consider traffic effects) and Prohibited in HIZ</li> <li>• Churches to be RDA to assess carparking effects. Need to consider amenity and health and safety effects in HIZ.</li> </ul> <p><b>HIZ / LIZ</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessory offices are currently too small – need to reconsider 200sq.m and 20% - it should be 20% only.</li> <li>• Consider reducing setbacks from 50m to 30m (where height reduces from 20m to 10m)</li> <li>• Heights too low, are they needed? If so 15m height within 20m of a sensitive zone, and 20m high beyond.</li> <li>• Clarify activity status for infringing HIZ/LIZ development control should be RDA or DA</li> </ul> <p><b>Development controls</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FAR is a poor control and not outcome focused. Height is better if that is the outcome you want to control.</li> <li>• Site coverage – 50% desirable to ensure the tower can be moved around on the podium, and efficiently use the site / construction constraints.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mixed Use Zone</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Controls preventing residential at ground floor should be revised.</li> <li>• No yard approach for 3-4 storeys</li> <li>• MUB office threshold should be increased to 500sq.m</li> </ul> <p><b>Business Parks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business Workstream to consider office and retail thresholds in the MU and BP zones.</li> <li>• Limit the range of activities able to locate in the BP to avoid de facto centres arising in the BP locations.</li> <li>• Need to provide for complementary business services in this zone. Review the limit from 100sq.m to 200sq.m, or make it RDA to infringe control rather than NC.</li> <li>• All land around Central Park and Bishops Estate in Tamaki should be considered for BP also.</li> <li>• Height limit should be 6 storeys</li> <li>• 60% building coverage seems too low is its about</li> </ul>

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>landscaping have a landscape rule, and a building separation rule to manage development intensity and provide relief when viewed from adjoining sites.</p> <p><b>GFA Thresholds</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BP 500sq.m threshold needs to be revised</li> <li>• LFR should be encouraged in MUB zone</li> </ul>
<p>Fast Food meeting – Restaurant Brands and McDonalds <sup>18</sup></p> <p>23-10-2012</p>	<p><b>Objectives and Policies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need criteria specifically targeting drive throughs. Objectives and policies do not currently do this.</li> <li>• Integration team is adding assessment criteria for drive throughs and their conflicting design controls</li> <li>• Use either policies or assessment criteria – not both.</li> </ul> <p><b>Definitions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some zones don't provide for drive throughs specifically – this creates ambiguity. Confusion with nesting table how drive throughs can fall under retail or food and beverage dependant on the zone.</li> <li>• The definition for drive through sent by the group has been accepted and will be used in the UP.</li> </ul> <p><b>Activity Status</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council advised that a 30m buffer no longer applies in the Town and Local centres, as virtually all sites would be affected. They are now RD across the board because the UP aims to be outcome focused and to have certainty. RDA would be non-notified.</li> <li>• Policies should reference for when something different is expected (e.g. drive through. They can't just be about standard retail – as a drive through proposal would immediately fail to meet the criteria.</li> </ul> <p><b>Operating Hours</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider controlling activities at night through noise standards, not operation times</li> </ul> <p><b>Height</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban Design Panel always asks whether an activity can go above. May need more words to clarify that this should not apply to Drive Throughs / Service Stations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Signs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group feels that the sign threshold of 12sq.m is too small.</li> <li>• 6m high is too short. Environment Court increased the height of signs for traffic safety.</li> <li>• Take to PWP to compare proposed signs controls with what drive through group wants.</li> </ul> <p><b>Traffic and Parking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sequential test for drive throughs will no longer apply.</li> </ul>

<sup>18</sup> Drive through minutes 23-10-2012 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\((Unitary Plan - 2011)\CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT 0040\Sector engagement workshops\Minutes and Agenda 0010\October 2012 workshops

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The removal of caps on traffic generation in centre will need to be approved by Auckland Transport first. Might still be required on the corridors as RDA criteria.</li> <li>• Minimums and maximums will only apply to centres that are on frequent transport links i.e. 800m from bus stop / 1km from rail</li> <li>• Food based retail applies to the parking overlay 1:1.25 maximum on ground floor. Need to only look at the area used by the public. This ratio doesn't work for 24hour operations.</li> </ul>
<p>Political Working Party Meetings<sup>19</sup></p> <p>21-11-2012</p>	<p><b>Business design provisions</b></p> <p>Preferred approach is a form-based code – this gives more certainty, reduces complexity and may encourage greater development intensity. Note that FAR (Floor area ratio) is still used in the CBD.</p> <p>Changes since the August draft include: slight increase in building heights; allowance for roof profile; improve floor to floor heights to improve amenity outcomes; variation in heights for large and small town centres. These changes need to be modelled by BEU and the economic impact analysed.</p> <p>Street frontage rules are unchanged.</p> <p>Interface with residential zones. The team is seeking views on the proposed height in relation to boundary for sites adjacent to residential zones. The recession plane has been extended further (compared to August) for single house and mixed housing zones in metro centres. The measurement height for the recession plane has been increased for the terraced housing/apartment zone in metro centres.</p> <p>Yards were included in the August provisions but the team is now seeking views on whether this is necessary in the business zones or whether the height in relation to boundary (HIRB) controls would be enough to protect amenity in adjacent residential zones.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>Discussion on the need for a bonus system to apply in metro centres.</p> <p>The rationale for the original rules was to ensure daylight in the street and setback from other buildings. The maximum tower dimension has been introduced to avoid the 'canyon' effect. This is similar to the provisions applying to tall buildings in the CBD. Have also introduced tower separation control and building set back rules.</p> <p>Six storeys has traditionally been seen as a good scale for metropolitan centres and is accepted worldwide. Height in</p>

<sup>19</sup> PWP draft Minutes 2012-11-21 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\ (Unitary Plan - 2011)\MEETINGS 0103\UP Political Working Party 0165\2012-11\Minutes and Agenda 0010

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>specific Centres will be further discussed at the December workshop.</p> <p>The relationship between master planning/precinct planning and the UP was explained. The UP establishes the baseline for future development. This baseline can be varied by overlays with precincts incorporated in the overlays. Some of these are already included in the UP and more will be created by plan changes in future as the area plan programme expands and detailed precinct planning occurs.</p> <p>Discussion of how far specific location controls can be addressed in the March draft. It will not be possible to complete all the work for March but where they are being investigated this will be indicated with a dotted line. The team is reviewing whether some precincts are still required given the new zone roles.</p> <p>How big an issue is the 30m limit proposed with the HIRB with adjoining residential zones. How much of an economic impact on Newmarket and Takapuna could this have in terms of limiting development?</p> <p>Every house needs some sort of sunlight so this is not an appropriate trade off. Need a transition area between residential and business zones and there are clear differences between the southern or northern side. The team will look at how the height in relation to boundary controls could be better managed given that sites to the south of Metropolitan and Town Centres will be significantly affected compared with those sites on the north.</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to the width of yards and what they can be used for, for example access. If the yard is not retained, there will need to be different approach to interface in character areas.</p> <p>Concerns were expressed at the impact of business zones abutting character areas and how the transition between zones should be addressed when character assessments will not be completed for years. Some members strongly support a staged approach to intensification and argue that council has never made the decision to upzone all at once.</p> <p>The opposing view is that development cannot be put on hold while character assessments are completed. The community has signalled it does not like what is happening under the current district plans and wants something better in place. The Auckland Plan indicates staged release of Greenfield land but is silent on the subject of Brownfield development.</p> <p><b>Direction</b></p> <p>Endorsed the general approach to metro centres and town centres, subject to further work on application of yards and HIRB, in particular to character areas, and consideration of bonus system in metro centres.</p> <p>Investigate a different approach to the southern side of</p>

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
<p>Plan Change 6 / Retail Sector Meeting<sup>20</sup></p> <p>24-10-2012</p>	<p>Metropolitan and Town Centre zones and the interface between business and residential zones.</p> <p><b>Plan Change 6</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AP has moved away from corridors and put stronger emphasis on the centres based approach - However it is sensible to follow PC6 criteria to consider out of centre / corridor development</li> </ul> <p><b>Wording / Terminology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes made to PC 6 terminology and provisions – need evidence to support this change</li> <li>• Group requests that Matt Bonis be used by Council going forward given his understand / experience of PC6</li> <li>• RPS principles regarding the corridor provisions need to be fine tuned.</li> <li>• The notified version of the UP may define intensive corridors but under a different name. Specific formula / criteria be used alongside ground truthing of the relationship with PT network and locations most appropriate for out of centre commercial activity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Retail locations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group would like the UP to enable them to locate out-of-centre where appropriate.</li> <li>• UP has direction to incentivise in-centre development by not requiring an ITA, providing greater development rights within centre, and reducing the differing planning approaches from around the region.</li> <li>• Group considered the expansion of centres should be enabled. Current policies state that recognition must be made to the character of adjoining areas. If the adjoining areas are assigned to residential then this is potentially problematic.</li> <li>• UP encourages residential intensification at the expense of retail. Need to work together – if you double residential, need to double retail.</li> </ul> <p><b>Plan Structure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group has Concerns that the policies are written like rules. Staff advised that they have been drafted in a directive way to be outcome focused.</li> <li>• Explanations and reasons will be provided when provisions are definite.</li> <li>• Group agrees the UP shouldn't use both policies and assessment criteria to address the same issues. Rely on Assessment criteria only to provide more clarity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Urban Design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group support the retention of NSCC PC 30. It should be used as a starting point for the UP's urban design provisions.</li> <li>• Group suggested that LIZ design criteria be carefully considered and that the continuum of retail activities</li> </ul>

<sup>20</sup> Retail stakeholders minutes 2012-10-24 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\((Unitary Plan - 2011)\CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT 0040\Sector engagement workshops\Minutes and Agenda 0010\October 2012 workshops

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>and appropriate built form responses are recognised</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group suggested limiting RDA criteria for new buildings – if the list is too long then activity may as well be Discretionary.</li> </ul> <p><b>Transport Network / Parking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group expressed issues with the maximum carparking overlay relates to PT network in 2022 but are in force from when the plan becomes operative – which is likely to be prior to 2022. Group would like some flexibility to meet demand.</li> <li>Issue with removing minimums as neighbouring uses will rely on other commercial operators. Matt Bonis suggested an RDA trigger for contextual analysis. Not all of the group felt this was an adequate response.</li> <li>Group supported no ITA requirement in centres</li> </ul> <p><b>Activity Status</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group disagrees that controlled activities be replaced with RDA status.</li> <li>The activity status of in-centre and corridors should be an incentive to locate there.</li> </ul>
<p>Business Park Stakeholders Meeting <sup>21</sup></p> <p>30-10-2012</p>	<p><b>Principles / Objectives and Policies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Business Park is a generic zone and new areas of business parks can be introduced via a plan change. Smales and Central Park will also have precincts to reflect the recent planning work and to ensure provisions such as floorspace and parking controls will still apply.</li> <li>Existing provisions for Highbrook Master Plan will roll over and continue to apply.</li> </ul> <p><b>Activity Status of Land Use and Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ancillary retail cap of 100sq.m is too blunt and needs to be refined. Food and Beverage GFA needs to be greater.</li> <li>Childcare in Business Parks don't have the same effects as in other locations, and are therefore appropriate in this zone.</li> <li>If an onerous consent process is being taken, objectives and policies need support this.</li> <li>Small office tenancies also need to be provided for in Business Parks. Currently office under 500sq.m is non complying – various floor plate sizes make the development feasible.</li> <li>More assessment criteria to be introduced rather than rules. Initially the policies were meant to provide the assessment</li> </ul> <p><b>Residential in Business Parks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group agree it's beneficial to have provision allowing for some residential but it should strictly be ancillary and not the dominant activity on site.</li> </ul>

<sup>21</sup> Business park minutes 30-10-2012 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\((Unitary Plan - 2011)\CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT 0040\Sector engagement workshops\Minutes and Agenda 0010\October 2012 workshops

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A directive approach is important to provide certainty.</li> </ul> <p><b>Carparking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group would like to be able to apply for dispensations during the consent process if all has been done to encourage public transport. Parking should not be non complying; if you want a bigger shortfall then you should be able to apply.</li> </ul> <p><b>Height</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group feels height limits are too low. Could go up to 8 storeys as Office Parks are decentralised / island developments.</li> <li>• Smales provisions will need to be carried over in precinct –the rolling height method will disadvantage Smales as height is currently taken from the street frontage.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mapping</b> East of Sylvia Park zoning (mixed use) is bold as land is LIZ at the moment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fred Thomas Drive is LIZ but has substantial office – the local board has recommended this be changed.</li> <li>• Central park is not as big as what is defined on the viewer</li> <li>• Site zoned Business Park, north of Central Park – would like the lower boundary extended to be Business Park also.</li> </ul>
<p>Political Working Party Meeting<sup>22</sup></p> <p>03-12-2012</p>	<p><b>Centres</b></p> <p>Town centres required to be areas of significant change by the Auckland Plan. Height is the main focus of feedback.</p> <p>Recent plan changes or area plans – these take precedence over proposal in the draft UP.</p> <p>Large town centres and small town centres are differentiated.</p> <p>Need to resolve if the PWP wants to promote generic heights throughout the zones, or varying heights applied to different centres reflecting community feedback on the heights.</p> <p>Where there is no feedback from a board on the height, we are taking it as support for the proposed height. In some cases the heights proposed by the feedback are lower than the district plan provisions so would mean downzoning from the existing height.</p> <p>Cr Raffills –complicated because looking out 20 Years. Boards need to trade up and down to ensure that overall the capacity is there. Talk to boards individually in a structured way.</p> <p>Shale Chambers – concern that boards that have had area</p>

<sup>22</sup> PWP workshop notes final 2012-12-03 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\(\Unitary Plan - 2011)\MEETINGS 0103\UP Political Working Party 0165\2012-12\PWP December workshop 2012-12\Agenda and workshop notes

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>planning have a different answer. Individual approach penalises the boards who have tried to embrace change. Needs to be a rationale for change, not just because of lack of buy in or opposition to intensification.</p> <p>Cr Morrison –decrease in height may make development uneconomic.</p> <p>Lindsay Waugh – local boards not party to the discussion on which town centres designated as large and which are small. (Jane confirmed this was discussed at the September workshops.)</p> <p>Cr Hartley – consider 6 as a maximum. There are not many examples of 8 storeys.</p> <p>Property Council feedback is for 8 storeys because of development economics.</p> <p>Roger Blakeley – if you reduce the height it reduces capacity for intensification.</p> <p>Cr Walker – one size fits all won't work. Different economic models – if the model changes and it is worth going up then that change will happen.</p> <p>Shale Chambers – minimum height should reflect the topography so that provides a logical basis for variation. Proposed a 3 tier approach where options of 4, 6, 8 storey town centres provided.</p> <p>Michael Williams– the test should be if the board area meets the directions of the Auckland Plan overall. As long as capacity is not being undermined we should accept the recommendations of the boards as this is based on the views sought from their communities.</p> <p>Concern that if areas like Orewa are pulled back to 4 we will be challenged on going higher in other areas.</p> <p>Howick – 2 storeys until master planning completed. Then would lodge a plan change to enable further development.</p> <p>Michael Williams. Manurewa, based on study by Patrick Fontein want to reduce height to four stories. Analysis shows this doesn't reduce capacity across the area. Provide the PWP with the analysis behind the proposed height limits.</p> <p>Cr Webster – this area is part of the southern initiative so a key area where investment and development being encouraged.</p> <p>Proposals form Orakei would be downzoning. Parts of the board area have a character overlay, which would take precedence and reduce the height in parts of the area. Need more clarity about the Ellerslie area. Need reassurance that not proposing a height that doesn't work with the context.</p> <p>Otara – smallest of the large town centres so four storeys appropriate and reclassify as a small town centre.</p> <p>Papatoetoe – Need more information on historic character and should wait until area plan completed. Cr Coney supports four storeys not six.</p> <p><i>Local centres</i></p>



Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>Proposed approach is four storeys but where the area plan has gone for a lower height that has to stand.</p> <p>Concern at impact of 3 vs. 4 and need to revisit Hibiscus Bays area plan.</p> <p>Cr Morrison – the RUB investigation in the south has confirmed local centres need to be four storeys. For the north and west we should wait for the RUB investigation.</p>
<p>Political Working Party Meeting: Day 1<sup>23</sup></p> <p>11-12-2012</p>	<p><b>Height in centres</b></p> <p>At the workshop on 3 December the working party sought further clarification of the appropriate heights in the Manurewa town centre and the maximum building height in the Ellerslie town centre.</p> <p>The Manurewa Local Board sought a height of 4 storeys or lower for the Manurewa town centre (rather than the recommended 8 storeys) and the working party requested officers review the report by Patrick Fontein. This report concluded there was minimal market viability for such development in the town centre.</p> <p>The Orakei Local Board sought a maximum height of three storeys and the working party questioned the appropriate height given the character elements in the centre.</p> <p>Officers recommend retaining a maximum height of 8 storeys for Manurewa, which will reduce height from what previously applied, and 4 storeys for Ellerslie which is consistent with other town centres subject to a historic character overlay.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>Concerns were raised about consistency of approach and the trend so far for area plans to reduce height. Penny Pirrit will arrange a further meeting on the area plans with the Hibiscus and Bays and Mangere Otahuhu local boards on the height issue.</p> <p>The maximum height is about providing opportunity and does not dictate that development must happen to this height. The need for some local variation was acknowledged, but how much needs to be determined.</p> <p>The rules are to enable development going forward. It is important to explain the height in relation to boundary transition rules, and make clear that town centres are commercial rather than residential. The working party requested an opportunity to review the rules before they are released in March. It is important to be clear about these rules before they go to</p>

<sup>23</sup> PWP Minutes 2012-12-11 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\(\Unitary Plan - 2011)\MEETINGS 0103\UP Political Working Party 0165\2012-12\Other december meetings\Agendas and Minutes 0010

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>councillors and boards and be sure the approach is defensible.</p> <p>Cr Walker noted the issues with height for Orewa that have been through the Environment Court and reminded the working party of its previous agreement to follow Environment Court rulings and area plans. The same concerns would apply to other beach locations.</p> <p>Glen Tupuhi commented that Three Kings does not meet the criteria for a town centre and raised concerns about the implications for Housing NZ plans and the need to ensure a better process of consultation than the Tamaki transformation. Penny Pirrit agreed to pass on these concerns to Megan Tyler who is looking at a precinct plan for this area.</p> <p>The Milford height limit was further discussed. Penny advised waiting until the decision on the private plan change process becomes available.</p> <p>Jeremy reminded members that the decision at the workshop was not to change a height limit if there was no specific feedback from the board.</p> <p><b>Direction</b></p> <p>Confirmed that the discussion with the boards on their area plans needs to happen.</p> <p>Rules on height in relation to boundary transition and underlying principles to be brought back to PWP in new year. Briefing next week on this for interested working party members.</p> <p>PWP members to email Penny Pirrit if interested.</p> <p>Confirmed an 8 storey height limit for Manurewa.</p> <p>Confirmed a 4 storey height limit for Ellerslie.</p> <p>Agreed to leave the Milford height limit at 8 storeys for now, noting Cr Hartley's concerns.</p>
<p>Revised Business provisions with PC 6 / Commercial Appellants Group<sup>24</sup></p> <p>20-12-2012</p>	<p>Identification of issues by the group were:</p> <p><b>Over emphasis of residential development to business activity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council staff acknowledged the need for greater balance reflected through the objectives – suggested an equivalent objective 3 &amp; 4 as seen in the residential objectives to apply to the business objectives.</li> <li>• There is a need for a linkage between residential growth and growing market demand for commercial capacity in centres.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recognition of the need for modes of transport other than PT</b></p>

<sup>24</sup> Retail stakeholders minutes 2012-12-20 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\((Unitary Plan - 2011)\CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT 0040\Sector engagement workshops\Minutes and Agenda 0010\October 2012 workshops

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group have concerns that the policies related to transportation (2.2.5.2) do not adequately recognise private car travel</li> <li>• Group observed the need, at the RPS level of UP - that for some uses passenger transport isn't always an option – suggestion to reflect provisions of PC6 (this was largely done through explanation and context reasons to provide context).</li> <li>• Group recommended that a qualifier or enabling provision is incorporated to allow for all modes.</li> <li>• Policy 2.2.4.2 “urban activities” is too broad – retail, office and industry needs to be qualified and more targeted.</li> </ul> <p><b>Urban Design Provisions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are concerns that the Design Manual is being prepared out of sequence with the UP, and how the group doesn't have the ability to participate in its preparation</li> <li>• Council do not want urban design requirements to be so high as to discourage in-centre development.</li> <li>• Council is considering the use of explanations to ensure the context of different types of retail development can be recognised and ADM given appropriate weight.</li> <li>• Group would like the operational requirements of retail recognised, so that they are considered in balance with urban design matters.</li> <li>• Issues associated with mall design won't be recognised in the ADM but this format of development is popular and should be provided for.</li> </ul> <p><b>Centres based approach</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 2.2.2.12 has potential to constrain commercial expansion</li> <li>• High density policy (2.2.2.11) should include a focus on activity and mix anticipated.</li> <li>• Centre Expansion (2.2.2.12.d) – “compatibility” is not necessarily the correct phrase/ Perhaps better to be described as managing the interface and effects of commercial activity – as it is more about avoiding nuisance than protecting character.</li> <li>• “Provide or encourage (2.2.2.12) –The group is ok with ‘encourage’ subject to any heritage considerations that need to be taken account of for adjacent development.</li> <li>• 2.2.2.17 “Non-industrial” should be added to make sense of the provision. E.g. prevent or avoid non-industrial activities locating on industrial land which could...”</li> <li>• Concerns that no commercial development would pass the test of 14(g) of the sequential test as it is currently framed. Group expressed that they would go to court on this provision alone.</li> <li>• Council to reconsider that provision.</li> </ul>
Ports of Auckland Meeting <sup>25</sup>	<b>General</b>

<sup>25</sup> POAL meeting minutes 0 2013-04-11 (AC Amendments) - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\UP 2011 - City Centre)\MEETINGS 0103

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
11-04-2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POAL is generally disappointed with the draft provisions – the operative RCP and Central Area provisions have been developed over many years of consultation and work well for POAL. POAL would like to see these provisions rolled over.</li> </ul> <p><b>Draft RPS – Economic Strategy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POAL concerned at the lack of recognition in the draft RPS of the national and regional significance of POAL’s port infrastructure, particularly given the Auckland Plans directive 13.7 and recognition of ports in the NZCPS</li> <li>• There is also no recognition given to POAL’s significant contribution to the economy</li> <li>• Council responded that the RPS is a focused document and that there is specific recognition of the significant of POALS operation in the Auckland Plan, to which the RPS refers to.</li> <li>• There is now a proposed definition of ‘significant infrastructure’ which will include POAL’s infrastructure. The Council prefers to rely on this approach rather than specifying infrastructure providers or type within the objectives and policies.</li> <li>• POAL did not support this as the Auckland Plan does not have statutory weight under the RMA like the RPS. POAL seeks specific recognition of Port in the RPS.</li> </ul> <p><b>Waitemata Navigation Chanel</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognition of the Navigation Channel is found in the regional provisions e.g. dredging policy in the coastal zones.</li> <li>• The Navigation Channel has not been mapped as Council would prefer to provide policy-level recognition only</li> </ul> <p><b>Air Discharges from vessels</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POAL supports the regulation of “Mobile-Source” discharge; including sulphur emissions from ships at a national level by the Marine Pollution Regulations. Council considers this a valid Resource Management issues as NEW air quality standards unable to be met for the Central Area. This is why, in the absence of the ability to regulate, it has chosen to ‘advocate’ for controls on ship emissions. Council will consider deleing this policy or re-drafting it so that Ports of Auckland is not specifically identified.</li> <li>• POAL does not support applying more stringent controls than other authorities – as ships that operate in an international market will simply move their ships to other New Zealand ports. Regulation should be at a national level. Council will consider changing language so that it is not specific to POAL, given the message it sends to international customers.</li> <li>• POAL does not think it is appropriate to ‘advocate’ for reform to the Marine Pollution Regulations in an RPS. Council will consider "advocating" for reform directly with the Ministry, rather than flagging this specifically in the RPS.</li> <li>• POAL recognises there is a concern re ship sulphur</li> </ul>

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>emissions among some at the Council, and has been proactively engaging with the Ministry for appropriate national-level reform.</p> <p><b>Use of the coastal environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POAL is concerned that long-standing objectives and policies in the operative RPS that enable the use and development of the coastal environment for port purposes, and other water-related industrial and commercial activities, do not appear in the RPS. The operative RPS provisions work well, and should be rolled over into the Unitary Plan.</li> <li>• Council explained that one of the aims of the Unitary Plan is to reduce duplication - a simpler Plan.</li> <li>• The Council has decided to deal with the Port specifically at a lower policy than in the RPS, but concedes that some changes could potentially be made here prior to notification so that there is specific recognition of the Port and other commercial or infrastructure uses of the CMA in the RPS.</li> </ul> <p><b>Public access to the coastal environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RPS should be drafted so that public access is restricted to all Port areas because of operational, safety, customs and bio-security requirements, with the lower-level provisions providing opportunities for greater public access to the CMA in appropriate circumstance.</li> <li>• Council responded that the draft RPS adopts the approach that opportunities for public access should be provided to all of the CMA, unless that is not appropriate, rather than specifically restricting public access to certain areas, as suggested by POAL.</li> </ul> <p><b>Dredging and disposal activities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POAL seeks that dredging and disposal activities within the coastal environment continue to be provided for, as it is in the operative RPS</li> <li>• Council explained that dredging and disposal or dredged material are very specific activities, which means it is appropriate to move them out of the RPS and into the new regional coastal provisions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Structure of the UP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POAL prefers a stand alone "Port Precinct" for POAL containing all land and coastal zone level objectives, policies and rules. The Port of Auckland would still be subject to the RPS, Auckland-wide and City Centre zone objectives and policies, any overlays and the general procedural matters. There will be no cross-referencing to the City Centre rules or General Coastal Marine zones.</li> <li>• Council agrees that the structure of the Unitary Plan, as it applies to the Port, is an issue because of the interface between the coastal and land provisions. The draft Unitary Plan seeks to resolve this by integrating the land and coastal provisions within the Port precinct.</li> <li>• Council will consider a Port Precinct that excludes the underlying City Centre zone rules from applying, but is less certain that a Port Precinct which also</li> </ul>

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>includes ITA provisions and excludes the General Coastal</p> <p><b>Extent of Port Precinct</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POAL raised an issue as to how Captain Cook and Queen's wharves are treated in the Unitary Plan. Captain Cook still forms part of the operational area of the port, and POAL has responsibility for maintaining Queens wharf. POAL is considering whether these wharves should be included within the Port Precinct.</li> <li>• The Council considers that there are no issues with Captain Cook and Queen's wharves being in the Viaduct and Central Wharves Precinct, as port and marine activities are fully enabled in this area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Restrictions on vessel anchorage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council confirmed that the 28 day restriction is directed at house boats, not POAL's customers. The Harbour Master's resource consents should enable the long term-anchorage of commercial vessels in the authorised areas.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discharge of sewerage from vessels</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POAL's customers do not discharge sewerage in the CMA</li> </ul> <p><b>Stormwater discharges and ITA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan structural issue - POAL provided a specific set of ITA and discharge provisions, based on its existing resource consents and reflecting POAL's unique situation and operational requirements, to Council for inclusion in the Port Precinct; however, these have not been included in the draft Plan.'</li> <li>• The Unitary Plan (or at least the "second generation" Unitary Plan) will outlive POAL's consents, so it is appropriate that the Plan's provisions reflect POAL's existing consents to provide certainty moving forward.</li> <li>• The Unitary Plan should also reflect the provisions of POAL's existing consents, in order to provide certainty moving forward for any applications for additional reclamations (and associated activities) that may be made during the life of the Plan. The ALWP provisions have basically been rolled straight over into the draft Plan.</li> <li>• Council's technical experts do not agree that the Port is so unique that it deserves separate controls, however, the complications associated with new ITA consent requirements for new reclaimed land is accepted as requiring further consideration.</li> </ul> <p><b>Underwater Noise</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POAL notes that there is an exemption for commercial vessels in these rules, but is concerned that there has been a complete lack of consultation with POAL on this issue</li> <li>• POAL is also concerned that these rules, even with the exemption, are the "thin end of the wedge" and the exemption for commercial vessels may disappear from the next generation of the Unitary Plan.</li> </ul>

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council explained that these rules have come from a concern to protect whales and dolphins from the effects of dredging and blasting - not directed at ships.</li> </ul> <p><b>City Centre noise control and Port Precinct noise</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POAL expressed how critical it is that the noise control boundaries are placed as a "line" in the maps, rather than stated in the controls as going to the nearest residential zone boundary, as zonings can change.</li> <li>• Council understands POAL's concern regarding firm noise control boundaries being provided in the maps and will consider for inclusion in notified Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Maintenance and capital works dredging</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POAL provided a detailed set of provisions for these activities to Council for inclusion in the Port Precinct; however, they have not been included.</li> <li>• Council does not want to provide all capital dredging in the Port Precinct with an RDA status - it must be linked to a per annum volume (currently 15,000 cumecs per annum).</li> <li>• Council has attempted to resolve POAL's concern that other persons will use up the annual RDA volume - 15,000 cumecs per annum control now specific to the Port Precinct.</li> <li>• Council wants feedback as to whether it has the volume right.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sediment quality guidelines</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POAL's concern is that these guidelines will apply to dredging - it is not clear in the draft Plan.</li> <li>• Council explained that guidelines referred to in discharges policy (3.2.5.1.10 policy 10.b) not intended to apply to dredging. Council will look to clarify this in notified Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Electricity transmission corridor provisions.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This may be an issue for POAL's facilities at Pikes Point and the Port of Onehunga, which are subject to this overlay.</li> <li>• <input type="checkbox"/> POAL will review overlay and provide feedback on its effects on</li> <li>• POAL's operations at these sites.</li> </ul> <p><b>Heritage – Rainbow Warrior</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POAL questioned why Marsden Wharf has been scheduled. Understood that this issue has been settled through the lengthy RCP appeals process.</li> <li>• Council explained that the Heritage team consider the wharf to be part of the heritage site, notwithstanding previous litigation.</li> <li>• Coastal team understands POAL's position and will be having ongoing discussions with Heritage team</li> </ul>

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>prior to notification - any assistance POAL could provide as to the litigation history would be helpful.</p> <p><b>Port of Onehunga</b> Council explained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The "Historic Character Area Subject to Investigation" has been placed as a notification over the Port of Onehunga as all of the Onehunga area is being reviewed for historic heritage values.</li> <li>• The Onehunga Study may result in heritage rules/scheduling of sites being added to the notified Plan.</li> <li>• The Heritage team will be in contact with POAL to discuss the outcome of the Onehunga Study</li> </ul> <p><b>Pre 1944 blanked demolition control</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council explained that there is a Mapping error - the pre-1994 demolition control is not intended to apply to the Port Precinct. This will be corrected in the notified Plan</li> </ul> <p><b>Infrastructure and ITA provisions – Minor reclamations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council is still working through how to define "minor reclamations"- not sure if the Plan should adopt a threshold control or a description of the activity.</li> <li>• In any event, minor reclamations will require a level of control to enable the effects of the activity to be assessed – potentially as a restricted discretionary activity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Minor Ports Zones</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POAL is more comfortable with the Council's proposed structure for this zone; however, coastal provisions should still be included.</li> </ul>
<p>Business Advisory Panel<sup>26</sup> 15-04-2013</p>	<p><b>Where we work</b> Simplifying the existing 44 business zones into 8 standard business zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aim to locate most new retail and office activities into centres</li> <li>• Focus on design – new buildings in most commercial zones require a resource consent; but not in industrial zones</li> <li>• Propose maximum parking ratios (and no minimums) in centres well served by public transport.</li> </ul> <p><b>Parking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum rates (no minimums) to apply in Metropolitan, Town and Local Centres, and the Mixed Use zone</li> <li>• The following standards are proposed:</li> <li>• Office = 1 per 30sq.m GFA</li> </ul>

<sup>26</sup> 2013-04-15 BAP presentation - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\UP 2011 - Business)\CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT 0040\Presentations 0011\march 2013



Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food and Beverage (excl taverns) =1 per 10sq.m GFA and outdoor seating</li> <li>• All other retail 1 per 20sq.m</li> </ul> <p><b>Language and approach of the plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plain English</li> <li>• Clear and certain activity tables</li> <li>• Outcome focused provisions – where possible, provide a stronger policy approach rather than just avoidance of effects e.g. change an intensification is encouraged in centres.</li> </ul> <p><b>Flexibility and certainty</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guaranteed non-notification for most restricted discretionary activities</li> <li>• Greater use of restricted discretionary activities to narrow the focus to relevant matters only</li> <li>• Restricted discretionary assessment criteria vs. development control infringement criteria – reduce double jeopardy</li> <li>• </li> </ul> <p><b>Nature of provisions</b></p> <p>Centres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased heights in most centres</li> <li>• Reduced carparking requirements</li> <li>• No integrated transport assessments required</li> </ul> <p>Industrial zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple and functional industrial zone provisions</li> </ul>
<p>Ports of Auckland Meeting <sup>27</sup></p> <p>07-05-2013</p>	<p><b>Port Noise overlay</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed that the noise contours associated with the overlay need to be more clearly represented on the GIS Viewer or otherwise included as a diagram in the overlay. <b>Action:</b> the Unitary Plan team will follow up with the GIS team to resolve.</li> <li>• POAL queried the maximum internal noise level of 35dBA and considered that 30dBA would be a more appropriate internal noise level, in line with international standards. The council will wait to review the feedback received on this and consider the matter further.</li> <li>• Agreed to amend the title of the overlay from City Centre Port Noise to Port Noise given the overlay applies to land beyond the City Centre zone.</li> </ul> <p><b>Port Precinct noise controls</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed in principle that the “nearest residential zone” outside of the City Centre referenced in the text of rule 14.8.8 of the operative District Plan should be mapped to provide certainty. However, further work required to</li> </ul>

<sup>27</sup> POAL meeting minutes – 2013-05-07 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\(\UP 2011 - City Centre)\MEETINGS 0103

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>determine the location of the noise boundary (refer below).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Terrace Housing and Apartment Building zone has been applied to sites at the corner of the Strand and Gladstone Road. The council queried whether the existing residential buildings within this zone have been acoustically insulated based on the projected noise generated by the port at that location. <b>Action:</b> POAL to investigate</li> <li>• Discussion on the 60 dBA noise level being applied on the southern side of Quay Street only; however, it was agreed that the community may be more accepting of an outer noise boundary within the neighbouring residential zones.</li> <li>• Question whether 60dBA line should be extended along Tamaki Drive</li> <li>• POAL agreed to review the port noise overlay contours and the “nearest residential zone” boundary line as the two are not consistent in their application, i.e. noise sensitive activities need to insulate based on a higher noise being generated than what is specified in the port precinct rules. These however will remain as separate maps/diagrams. <b>Action:</b> POAL to review the contours and include findings in their Unitary Plan feedback. <b>Action:</b> POAL to review the contours and include findings in their Unitary Plan feedback.</li> </ul> <p><b>Underwater noise controls</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POAL – the Unitary Plan needs to make it clear that the underwater noise controls apply to construction activities and not general port activities. <b>Action:</b> the Unitary Plan team will follow this up with the coastal team.</li> </ul>
<p>Auckland Plan Committee – Interim Decisions<sup>28</sup></p> <p>19-06-2013</p>	<p><b><u>Principles For Building Heights In Centre Zones</u></b></p> <p>a) Height controls should take into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the status of the centre in the Auckland Plan hierarchy;</li> <li>• public transport/transport projects (e.g. AMETI);</li> <li>• the size and depth of the centre;</li> <li>• the interface between zones;</li> <li>• current building heights;</li> <li>• topography;</li> <li>• landscape features;</li> </ul>

<sup>28</sup> List of interim directions for UP 2013-07-04 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\{Unitary Plan - 2011}\MEETINGS 0103\APC workshops\Interim Directions

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• historic heritage; and</li> <li>• Existing design controls/guidelines previously developed for a centre through a precinct or master planning exercise.</li> </ul> <p>(b) Centres with similar characteristics should have similar controls (rules).</p> <p>(c) Heights should decrease from centres out to surrounding residential areas.</p> <p>(d) Heights should enable flexibility to achieve good design outcomes</p> <p>(e) Heights should enable buildings to adapt to different uses over time (e.g. generous floor to ceiling heights at ground floor level).</p> <p>(f) Apply a more refined approach to larger town centres, (i.e. heights may vary within the centre). [This was revised to include all town centres not just larger ones].</p> <p>(g) Heights in centres should not be reduced from existing operative plan heights except where a centre has an unlimited height control.</p> <p><b><u>Principles For Volcanic Veiwshafts And Blanket Height Sensitive Areas</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The volcanic viewshaft heights should clearly override zone heights.</li> <li>• Work on a more fine grained analysis of height within BHSA areas was requested for the following centres: Panmure, Devonport, Mangere Bridge, Stonefields/Mt Wellington, Mt Eden, and Market Road.</li> </ul>
<p>Auckland Plan Committee Workshop – Signs <sup>29</sup></p> <p>03-07-2013</p>	<p><b>Signs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue the approach in the draft UP for billboards outside the road reserve.</li> <li>• APC requests a more restrictive approach to new billboards in light industry as against heavy industry.</li> <li>• Manage buildings in the road reserve as restricted discretionary activities where they are place on street furniture (bus shelters, phone booths etc)</li> <li>• Manage other billboards in the road reserve according to the activity status of the adjacent zone</li> <li>• APC request to ensure “Strategic Transport Corridor” is included in these provisions – concern about</li> </ul>

<sup>29</sup> APC Signs\_FINAL - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\(\Unitary Plan - 2011)\MEETINGS 0103\APC workshops\Ppresentations\Ppresentations with Workshop annotations

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>billboards within these highway and railway routes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review provisions for ‘welcome to x village” type-signs to make them more permissible</li> <li>• Need to work with NZTA and AT through the future.</li> </ul>
<p>Auckland Plan Committee Workshop - Corridors<sup>30</sup></p> <p>03-07-2013</p>	<p><b>Corridors</b></p> <p>Committee agreed to implement the Identified Growth Corridors (IGCs) concept for commercial activities along corridors.</p> <p>Committee agreed the need to examine segments of some corridors to see if they are appropriate to be IGCs and discuss any proposed segments at the mapping workshops.</p>
<p>Auckland Plan Committee Workshop - Air Quality Buffers<sup>31</sup></p> <p>31-07-2013</p>	<p><b>Air Quality Buffers</b></p> <p>1. The Auckland Plan Committee endorsed the hybrid approach where there is a zone within 500m of the HIZ :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That contains intensive sensitive uses (e.g. Town centre, Terraced Housing) or</li> <li>• The UP proposes intensification for a zone</li> </ul> <p>- Then place the air quality buffer within the HIZ</p> <p>2. Where an existing zone is within 500m of the HIZ that is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• single house zone (or a lower intensity zone e.g. Country side living</li> <li>• the zone has few sensitive uses (e.g. industrial, general business)</li> </ul> <p>-Then place an air quality overlay surrounding the heavy industry zone to a distance of 500m (could be called the air quality – sensitive activity restriction’ overlay (AQSAR))</p> <p>3. Where the air quality overlay surrounds the heavy industry zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• permitted activities for new sensitive activities within the overlay will be permitted as normal</li> <li>• sensitive activities within the overlay that require resource consent will be strongly discouraged by the overlay objectives and policies</li> <li>• existing low intensity zones within the overlay that contain sensitive activities (e.g. single house residential, large lot residential, countryside living) shall not be subject to intensification</li> </ul> <p>4. In Greenfield heavy industry areas, no sensitive zones should be located within 500m</p>
<p>Auckland Plan Committee Workshop – Waterfront heights</p>	<p><b>Waterfront heights</b></p>

<sup>30</sup> APC Corridors FINAL 2013-07-03 annotated from wksp - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\((Unitary Plan - 2011)\MEETINGS 0103\APC workshops\Ppresentations\Ppresentations with Workshop annotations

<sup>31</sup> APC Air Quality FINAL with notes - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\((Unitary Plan - 2011)\MEETINGS 0103\APC workshops\Ppresentations\Ppresentations with Workshop annotations

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
31-07-2013	<p><b>Draft Unitary Plan approach to height in the city centre</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greatest building heights are concentrated in core CBD</li> <li>• Transition to lower heights towards the waterfront and fringe areas- view protection to Museum in east and Mt Eden in west suppresses height</li> <li>• Specific height strategies for individual precincts e.g. Britomart, Wynyard Viaduct Harbour.</li> </ul> <p><b>Draft Unitary Plan approach to height in the Waterfront</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Height greatest in CBD core – lower Queen Street Valley and ridgelines</li> <li>• Height reduces from south to northern waters edge</li> <li>• Height reduces towards suburbs in east and west</li> </ul> <p><b>Precinct scale</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minor variations to height and built form allow for local distinctiveness along the waterfront – height strategies sit within the precinct.</li> </ul> <p>APC agreed to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain north-south height transition across the city centre and east-west transition to fringe areas</li> <li>• Retain specific precinct height strategies to maintain distinctive built form across parts of the waterfront and provide opportunities for taller buildings where they are appropriate for local character, topography, views, sunlight and heritage</li> <li>• Undertake a comprehensive review of the heights applying along the city centre waterfront during the Unitary Plan submission phase</li> </ul> <p><b>Viaduct harbour precinct approach</b></p> <p>APC agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To retain existing heights along the Viaduct waterfront to ensure buildings achieve a human scale, maximise sunlight access and enable views through the city to the harbour</li> <li>• To enable some additional height to the south of the precinct, as provided for in the draft UP</li> <li>• To retain existing height for 204 Quay Street given its heritage status and to ensure consistency of height for buildings directly adjoining the waters edge.</li> <li>• To retain the ability to achieve an additional two storeys through a RDA consent for a framework plan</li> <li>• Any additional height could be addressed as part of a</li> </ul>

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>comprehensive review of City Centre waterfront heights during the UP submission phase.</p> <p><b>Down town West and Central Wharves</b></p> <p>For the notified UP, APC agrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To apply a precinct to enable the introduction of tailored provisions to guide future development that is consistent with the general approach to height along the waterfront (although Cr Coney expressed a concern)</li> <li>• To retain the Quay Street harbour edge height control to ensure building height transitions to the waterfront</li> <li>• Continue working with landowners on a development strategy for the area – the outcome of which could be incorporated into the UP through or in response to a submission</li> </ul> <p><b>Britomart precinct approach</b></p> <p>APC agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To retain the heights in the draft UP until a decision on PC41 is released</li> </ul> <p><b>Quay Park Precinct approach</b></p> <p>APC agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the notified version : to enable an additional 5-10m height in the eastern part of the precinct through an RDA consent for a framework plan to achieve the integrated development of land. However this additional height must not impact on the Dilworth of Museum Veiwshafts</li> <li>• That the framework plan would assess ‘big picture’ issues such as the proposed street / block layout and the location of public open space / connections</li> <li>• Work with landowners to investigate opportunities for additional height and the relocation of the Dilworth viewshaft.</li> <li>• Continue working with landowners on a development strategy for the area – the outcome of which could be incorporated into the UP through or in response to a submission.</li> </ul>
<p>Auckland Plan Committee Recommendations<sup>32</sup></p> <p>28-08-2013</p>	<p><u>Business</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Endorses the interim directions in relation to business issues outlined in Attachment 1 to the agenda report that were given at the Auckland Plan Committee, Unitary Plan workshops held in June, July and August</li> </ul>

<sup>32</sup> 28-30 Recommendations\_ FINAL - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\((Unitary Plan - 2011)\MEETINGS 0103\APC Workshops

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p data-bbox="735 248 802 275">2013.</p> <ul data-bbox="687 293 1342 506" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="687 293 1342 353">• Acknowledges the local board feedback in relation to business issues in the draft Auckland Unitary Plan.</li> <li data-bbox="687 371 1342 432">• Endorses discretionary activity status for large format retail in the Mixed Use zone.</li> <li data-bbox="687 450 1342 506">• Endorses the application of an Identified Growth Corridor along Lincoln Road.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="639 566 770 593"><u>City Centre</u></p> <ul data-bbox="639 611 1342 1032" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="639 611 1342 730">• Endorses the interim directions in relation to City Centre issues outlined in Attachment 1 to the agenda report that were given at the Auckland Plan Committee, Unitary Plan workshops held in June, July and August 2013.</li> <li data-bbox="639 748 1342 808">• Acknowledges the local board resolutions in relation to City Centre issues in the draft Auckland Unitary Plan.</li> <li data-bbox="639 826 1342 887">• Endorses the retention of the current height controls in the operative district plan for the Wynyard Precinct.</li> <li data-bbox="639 904 1342 965">• Endorses non-complying activity status for any further reclamation within the Port precinct.</li> <li data-bbox="639 983 1342 1032">• Endorses a review of the Port precinct provisions at the conclusion of the pending stage 2 Port study.</li> </ul>