

### Appendix 3.39.3

#### Decision making references for the following S32 evaluations;

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

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
Unitary Plan Political Working Party Meeting on the Built Environment <sup>1</sup>  28-10-2011	The Political Working Party accepted the following to enable the development of option papers:  <b>Transforming Brownfield business areas</b> <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> <b>Business Activities</b> <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> <b>Auckland Plan directives</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The difference between PC6 to the RPS and the centres hierarchy in the Auckland Plan.</li> </ul> <b>Intensification</b> <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> <b>Reverse Sensitivity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The need to protect business from reverse sensitivity.</li> </ul>
Business Advisory Panel <sup>2</sup>  21-11-2011	Identification of Issues relevant to business that the Unitary Plan will have to address: <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>1</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

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
<p>Political Working Party Meeting <sup>3</sup> 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 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.</li> <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>

<sup>2</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

<sup>3</sup> PWP Minutes 2012-07-27 - U:\CPO\RLP\AAA FC\LAND USE AND PLANNING LUP\UP 2011 - Business)\MEETINGS 0103\UP Political Working Party 0165\2012-07\Minutes and Agenda 0010

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<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> <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</p>

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>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>Political Working Party Meeting: Business package Overview of Business Provisions<sup>4</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> <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</p>

<sup>4</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>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 concentrating retail activity in the core area.</li> <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</li> </ul>

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>Political Working Party Meetings<sup>5</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>

<sup>5</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>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 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</p>

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p>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 Metropolitan and Town Centre zones and the interface between business and residential zones.</p>
<p>Political Working Party Meeting<sup>6</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 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>

---

<sup>6</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>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> <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</p>

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	we should wait for the RUB investigation.
<p>Political Working Party Meeting: Day 1<sup>7</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 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</p>

---

<sup>7</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>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>Auckland Plan Committee – Interim Decisions<sup>8</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> <li>• historic heritage; and</li> <li>• Existing design controls/guidelines previously developed for a centre through a precinct or</li> </ul>

<sup>8</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
	<p>master planning exercise.</p> <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 Viewshafts 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 - Corridors<sup>9</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 – Waterfront heights</p> <p>31-07-2013</p>	<p><b>Waterfront heights</b></p> <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</li> </ul>

<sup>9</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

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<p data-bbox="735 248 1134 275">Mt Eden in west suppresses height</p> <ul data-bbox="687 293 1331 353" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="687 293 1331 353">• Specific height strategies for individual precincts e.g. Britomart, Wynyard Viaduct Harbour.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="639 414 1305 441"><b>Draft Unitary Plan approach to height in the Waterfront</b></p> <ul data-bbox="687 459 1310 611" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="687 459 1310 519">• Height greatest in CBD core – lower Queen Street Valley and ridgelines</li> <li data-bbox="687 535 1310 562">• Height reduces from south to northern waters edge</li> <li data-bbox="687 577 1310 611">• Height reduces towards suburbs in east and west</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="639 672 815 698"><b>Precinct scale</b></p> <ul data-bbox="687 716 1353 801" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="687 716 1353 801">• Minor variations to height and built form allow for local distinctiveness along the waterfront – height strategies sit within the precinct.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="639 864 810 891">APC agreed to</p> <ul data-bbox="687 909 1350 1238" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="687 909 1350 969">• Retain north-south height transition across the city centre and east-west transition to fringe areas</li> <li data-bbox="687 985 1350 1137">• 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 data-bbox="687 1153 1350 1238">• Undertake a comprehensive review of the heights applying along the city centre waterfront during the Unitary Plan submission phase</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="639 1301 1066 1328"><b>Viaduct harbour precinct approach</b></p> <p data-bbox="639 1346 788 1373">APC agreed:</p> <ul data-bbox="687 1391 1353 1868" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="687 1391 1353 1507">• 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 data-bbox="687 1523 1353 1583">• To enable some additional height to the south of the precinct, as provided for in the draft UP</li> <li data-bbox="687 1599 1353 1684">• 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 data-bbox="687 1700 1353 1760">• To retain the ability to achieve an additional two storeys through a RDA consent for a framework plan</li> <li data-bbox="687 1776 1353 1868">• Any additional height could be addressed as part of a comprehensive review of City Centre waterfront heights during the UP submission phase.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="639 1928 1106 1955"><b>Down town West and Central Wharves</b></p> <p data-bbox="639 1973 1015 2000">For the notified UP, APC agrees:</p>

Significant Developments	Relevant recorded detail
	<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>