

AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN
INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

Te Paepae Kaiwawao Motuhake o te Mahere Kotahitanga o Tāmaki Makaurau

Report to Auckland Council
Hearing topics 010, 029, 030, 079
Special character and pre- 1944
July 2016

Report to Auckland Council- Hearing topics 010, 029, 030 and 079 Special character and pre- 1944

Contents

1.	Hearing topic overview	3
1.1.	Topic description	3
1.2.	Summary of the Panel’s recommended changes to the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan.....	4
1.3.	Overview	5
1.3.1.	Special Character Areas Overlay	5
1.3.2.	Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay	6
1.3.3.	Areas added as special character areas	6
1.3.4.	Other matters.....	7
1.4.	Scope.....	7
1.5.	Documents relied on	7
2.	Special character or historic character.....	8
2.1.	Statement of issue.....	8
2.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons	8
3.	Special character statements	10
3.1.	Statement of issue.....	10
3.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons	10
4.	Howick	11
4.1.	Statement of issue.....	11
4.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons	11
5.	Pukehana Avenue, Epsom	12
5.1.	Statement of issue.....	12
5.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons	12
6.	Hill Park, Manurewa	12
6.1.	Statement of issue.....	12
6.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons	12
7.	Onehunga Mall.....	13
7.1.	Statement of issue.....	13

7.2. Panel recommendation and reasons	13
8. Otahuhu Town Centre	14
8.1. Statement of issue.....	14
8.2. Panel recommendation and reasons	14
9. 532, 534 and 536 Parnell Road.....	15
9.1. Statement of issue.....	15
9.2. Panel recommendation and reasons	15
10. Plan provisions	16
10.1. Statement of issue.....	16
10.2. Panel recommendation and reasons	16
11. The Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay.....	16
11.1. Statement of Issue	16
11.2. Panel recommendation and reasons	16
12. Consequential changes	20
12.1. Changes to other parts of the plan	20
12.2. Changes to provisions in this topic	20
13. Reference documents	20
13.1. General topic documents.....	20
13.2. Specific evidence	24

1. Hearing topic overview

1.1. Topic description

Topics 010, 029 and 030 and 079 address the regional policy statement and the district plan provisions of the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan relating to special character and the pre-1944 building demolition controls.

Topic	Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan	Independent Hearings Panel reference
Special Character	<p>Chapter B - Regional Policy Statement - 4</p> <p>Protecting our historic heritage, special character and natural heritage - Te tiaki taonga tuku iho</p> <p>4.2 - Special Character -</p> <p>Chapter E: Overlay objectives and policies</p> <p>3 Special Character</p> <p>3.1 Business and residential special character areas</p> <p>Chapter J - Overlay Rules - 3 Special Character</p> <p>3.1 Special Character Business</p> <p>3.2 Special Character Residential Helensville</p> <p>3.3 Special Character Residential Isthmus A, B and C</p> <p>3.4 Special Character Residential North Shore</p> <p>3.5 Special Character General Plan Maps</p>	<p>B5 - Regional policy statement</p> <p>D18 Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential and Business</p> <p>Planning maps on the GIS Viewer</p>
Pre-1944	<p>Chapter B - Regional Policy Statement - 4</p> <p>Protecting our historic heritage, special character and natural heritage - Te tiaki taonga tuku iho</p> <p>4.2 Special character including</p>	<p>All the pre-1944 provisions have been deleted.</p>

	<p>Objective 3</p> <p>Chapter E: Overlay objectives and policies</p> <p>3 – Special Character</p> <p>3.1 Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control</p> <p>Chapter J - Overlay Rules - 3 Special Character (3.6 Pre 1944 Building Demolition Controls</p> <p>Plan Maps</p>	
--	--	--

Under the Local Government (Auckland Transitional Provisions) Act 2010, section 144 (8) (c) requires the Panel to set out:

the reasons for accepting or rejecting submissions and, for this purpose, may address the submissions by grouping them according to—

- (i) the provisions of the proposed plan to which they relate; or
- (ii) the matters to which they relate.

This report covers all of the submissions in the Submission Points Pathways report (SPP) for this topic. The Panel has grouped all of the submissions in terms of (c) (i) and (ii) and, while individual submissions and points may not be expressly referred to, all points have nevertheless been taken into account when making the Panel's recommendations.

1.2. Summary of the Panel's recommended changes to the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan

- i. The following areas have been added to D18 Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential and Business:
 - a. Pukehana Avenue, Epsom;
 - b. Hill Park, Manurewa; and
 - c. the Otahuhu and Onehunga Mall Business Areas that were Historic Heritage Areas (now Special Character).
- ii. The sites at 532, 534 and 536 Parnell Road (I and M Rosser), and surrounding sites have been removed from the Special Character (Newmarket) Business Overlay.
- iii. A number of the character statements provided for the each of the character areas have been redrafted to better assist in setting out the particular character values of the area.
- iv. The policies have been amended to address infrastructure in the Special Character Areas Overlay areas, and the rules are in E26 Infrastructure (consolidated set of infrastructure rules).

- v. The rules, bulk and location standards, matters of discretion and the assessment criteria have been simplified and clarified, and the assessment criteria amended to following the Panel's approach to how assessment criteria are drafted.
- vi. The Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay and all of the provisions relating to it have been deleted in their entirety.

1.3. Overview

1.3.1. Special Character Areas Overlay

The Panel supports the Special Character Areas Overlay - Residential and Business with a set of provisions seeking to ensure that the character and amenity values of these areas are maintained and enhanced.

The Panel is not convinced by the arguments put forward by the Council and some submitters in topic 010 RPS heritage and special character and topic 029 Special character that special character (or historic character as the Council is seeking to call it) is 'historic heritage' requiring protection as a matter of national importance.

The Special Character Overlay has been retained as special character, and has not changed to historic character as proposed by the Council. The reasons for this are set out in more detail below. This means the special character provisions remain as streetscape character and amenity issues (in terms of section 7 of the Resource Management Act 1991) rather than historic heritage (in terms of section (6 (f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 - with its focus on protection).

The Panel considers that if the Council wishes to change the basis for controls on the use and development of a number of residential and business areas from special character to historic character then it should proceed by a plan change. This would require a robust section 32 analysis of the relative benefits and costs of such a change and enable public participation through the schedule 1 Resource Management Act 1991 process.

Special character area statements have been prepared to support all the special character areas (other than Howick). These statements identify the key special character values of the area. Assessment of proposals for activities, development and modifications to buildings within special character areas will be considered against the special character area statements and the special character values that are identified in those statements. These values set out and identify the notable and distinctive aesthetic, physical and visual qualities of the areas and community associations.

The Special Character Area Overlay over the Howick business area has been retained as in the notified Plan. The Council did not support Howick having such an overlay, and due to this no character statement has been prepared. A special character area statement should be undertaken by the Council, in conjunction with the Howick community including the Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association represented by Ms G Mackereth who appeared a number of times at the hearings.

These matters are addressed in more detail below.

1.3.2. Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay

The Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay and all of the provisions relating to it have been deleted in their entirety.

The Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay was applied to extensive residential and business areas of urban Auckland. In many areas, this overlay covered buildings not otherwise identified as subject to the Special Character Overlay, so that the two overlays together cover entire suburbs.

The Panel found the notified pre-1944 controls confusing as well as lacking a strong evidential or section 32 basis. The mapped overlay was a Historic Heritage Overlay intended to recognise and provide for the protection of historic heritage in terms of section 6(f) of the Resource Management Act 1991. However the provisions in the regional policy statement were part of special character which as notified intended to largely have regard to character and amenity values; a section 7 matter.

Moreover the basis for the overlay was stated to be a 'precautionary' one, where the Council in legal submissions admitted that it had not undertaken sufficient investigations to ascertain the nature and extent of historic heritage in the mapped areas, but said that the potential to find historic heritage was sufficient to warrant a building demolition control. At the plan hearings the Council described the approach as 'cautionary' as opposed to 'precautionary', significantly reduced the area to which the overlay applied (as the Council had undertaken the work to determine if all of the areas in the overlay warranted that overlay), and sought to introduce a three-year sunset clause after which the provisions would have no legal effect.

Notwithstanding the Council's evidence, in section 32 terms the Panel was not convinced the potential historic heritage or character values were under such threat that warrants the imposition of a consenting regime as proposed by the Pre-1944 Demolition Control Overlay provisions. It is the Panel's view that the Pre-1944 Demolition Control Overlay is placing unnecessary constraints and burdens on landowners seeking to develop their properties in seeking to protect buildings with unidentified significant historic heritage value.

With respect to protecting unidentified significant buildings, places, areas, features and landscapes, the Panel has made its position on this matter clear in other reports, including its Report to Auckland Council –Hearing topic 010 Historic heritage July 2016. The Panel's recommendation is that the Unitary Plan protects those items, places and areas that have been scheduled after being identified and evaluated and satisfy the evaluation factors.

This matter is addressed in more detail below.

1.3.3. Areas added as special character areas

As set out in the summary of changes, the following areas have been added to the Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential and Business:

- i. Pukehana Avenue, Epsom;
- ii. Hill Park, Manurewa; and
- iii. The Otahuhu and Onehunga Mall Business Areas that were historic heritage areas (now special character).

1.3.4. Other matters

The policies have been amended to address infrastructure in the special character overlay areas, and the rules are in E26 Infrastructure (consolidated set of infrastructure rules).

The rules, bulk and location standards, matters of discretion and the assessment criteria have been simplified and clarified, and the assessment criteria amended to following the Panel's approach to how assessment criteria are drafted.

1.4. Scope

The Panel considers that the recommendations in 1.2 above and the changes made to the provisions relating to this topic (see 1.1 above) are within scope of submissions.

For an explanation of the Panel's approach to scope see the Panel's report to Auckland Council – Overview of recommendations July 2016.

1.5. Documents relied on

Documents relied on by the Panel in making its recommendations are listed below in section 13 Reference documents.

2. Special character or historic character

2.1. Statement of issue

Whether special character should be historic character.

2.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

The Council proposed to change the Special Character Overlay to the Historic Character Overlay. This matter became the major focus of this topic at the regional policy statement and plan hearings. There were extensive legal submissions and evidence from the Council and submitters on this topic at the regional policy statement and plan hearings, setting out why from a legal and planning perspective it was appropriate or not to change from special character as notified to historic character.

The Council's reasoning for this change was that it was needed to protect and manage the historic heritage values of collective areas of historic character. The implication of the change would be a focus on historic heritage in terms of section 6(f) Resource Management Act 1991 rather than special character as notified, which was intended to have regard to character and amenity values - a section 7 matter.

The Council's position was supported by a number of submitters including: Devonport Heritage (3263-3), Remuera Heritage Incorporated (5347-12), Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (Heritage New Zealand) (371-25) and Civic Trust (6444-27 and 28). In general terms these submitters sought the term 'special character' be replaced with 'historic character'. While the Panel acknowledges the relief sought by and the evidence presented by these submitters, it is not clear from reading those submissions that the magnitude of the shift from special to historic character as envisaged by the Council was contemplated by these submissions.

A number of submitters including the University of Auckland, Samson Corporation and Sterling Nominees and, the New Zealand Institute of Architects (Auckland Branch) and Housing New Zealand opposed the changes proposed. Their concerns were set out in legal submissions and expert evidence at both the regional policy statement and Plan hearings.. In not recommending the shift from special to historic character, the Panel generally agrees with these submitters.

The Council in setting out its reasoning for seeking the change, stated in the closing statement for the regional policy statement (and echoed at the plan hearings) that Part 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991 needs to be considered as a whole in relation to the management of historic heritage. Council stated at paragraph 2.9 that:

To this extent, the debate in the evidence about whether historic heritage character is a matter under section 6 or section 7 is academic.

At paragraphs 2.12, 2.13 and 2.19 the Council went on to provide its rationale for why the change was appropriate:

The March 2013 draft version of the Unitary Plan included Regional Policy Statement provisions relating to both Historic Heritage and Historic Character.

Following the Environment Court decision on Plan Change 163 (Residential 1) (PC 163), the Council decided in a short timeframe (a week) to make a number of changes to the draft Unitary Plan to reflect the text changes to PC 163, as suggested by the Environment Court.

With the benefit of more time and the opportunity to make a fully informed policy decision, I submit that at the RPS level the Council may have ended up where we are now with a clear articulation of what it wishes to protect as historic heritage and what might be managed via alternative mechanisms in response to the particular values represented. Based on the above, it is my submission that the shift to "historic" is not a paradigm shift but a clarification of what was always intended. In any event, as submitted above, the debate is moot given there is clearly jurisdiction to make the changes sought by the Council.

In the context of the notified plan, the Panel does not accept whether historic heritage character is a matter under section 6 or section 7 is academic. As already addressed above the management approach to special as opposed to historic character is considerably different. The draft version of the Unitary Plan had no statutory weight but it appears, due to the Environment Court's decision on Plan Change 163, that the Council made a deliberate policy shift from historic character to special character.

This position is evident in the provisions of the notified regional policy statement. Chapter E - Overlay Objectives and Policies (and again echoed in the plan provisions) begins with an overlay description making it clear that the purpose of the overlay is to "retain and manage identified special character values of specific residential and business areas". Reference is made to the special character statements identifying key attributes or qualities of the area for maintenance retention and enhancement. These are section 7, amenity value issues. The objectives and policies (regional policy statement and plan) which apply to all special character areas continue the section 7 theme by referring to values and qualities (emphasis added).

The Panel also does not support the statement from paragraph 2.19 above that "it is my submission that the shift to 'historic' is not a paradigm shift but a clarification of what was always intended". This is not supported by the plan provisions as notified and if the Plan intended something else, it is the Panel's view that in this case as the shift is significant, the Council should undertake a plan change, and not seek to rely on the submissions as a basis for making these changes.

The Panel also notes that the Council's expert planner for the regional policy statement (Ms Rowe), in response to a question from the Panel, acknowledged that the change from special character to historic character would be a major policy shift. The proposed policy shift would have significant implication for how special character areas would be managed if they were changed to historic character areas: i.e. a move from maintaining and enhancing amenity values to one more akin to protection. The Panel agrees with Ms Rowe, whose views reinforce the Panel position that if the Council wishes to change from special to historic character as it proposed, it should do so through a plan change after a robust section 32 analysis has been completed.

Given the significance of this issue, and that of the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Overlay (addressed below) the Panel issued Interim Guidance for Topics 029 and 030 Special Character and Pre-1944 dated 15 July 2015. The purpose of the guidance was to inform all parties of the Panel's interim position and to guide their preparations for topic 079 Special character and pre-1944 mapping. This guidance was prepared as a result of having read the submissions and having heard evidence and legal submissions from submitters (including Auckland Council) at the hearings on Topics 010, 029 and 030. Having heard that evidence and all the legal submissions and evidence at 079, the Panel's position on the change from special to historic character has not changed. The reasons are as set out in the guidance and in this report.

In summary the Panel is not persuaded by the Council's arguments to change the Special Character Overlay to be a Historic Character Overlay; the change being much more than just a change of name. The implication of the change is that there would be a focus on historic heritage in terms of section 6(f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 rather than special character intended to have regard to character and amenity values which is a section 7 matter. In section 32 and section 32AA terms it is more appropriate that those identified special character areas remain as special character, where there is a focus on streetscape character amenity values rather than the protection of historic heritage.

The Panel considers that if the Council wishes to change the basis for controls on the use and development of a number of residential areas from special character to historic character (i.e. a change in the policy basis from section 7(c) and (f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 to section 6(f)) then it should proceed by a plan change with a robust section 32 analysis of the relative benefits and costs of such a change and enable public participation through the schedule 1 Resource Management Act 1991 process.

3. Special character statements

3.1. Statement of issue

The Panel strongly supports special character statements.

3.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

Each special character area, other than the Howick business area, is supported by a special character area statement identifying the key special character values of the area. The Council did not support Howick as a special character area, despite the notified Plan showing Howick as a special character area. Howick is addressed in more detail below.

Assessment of proposals for demolition, removal, additions and alteration and new buildings within special character areas will be considered against the relevant policies as well as the special character area statements. The special character statements identify the overall notable or distinctive aesthetic, physical and visual qualities of the area and community associations in those statements. This will greatly assist the assessment of consent applications.

4. Howick

4.1. Statement of issue

Whether the Howick business area should retain the special character overlay

4.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

The Council sought to remove Howick from the Special Character Business Overlay and this was opposed by a number of Howick submitters. The Council acknowledged there were no submissions to do this. The Panel's interim guidance on this matter (as referenced above) stated at paragraph 22:

The Council sought to remove Howick from the Special Character Business Overlay and this was opposed by a number of Howick submitters. The Council acknowledged there were no submissions to do this. On the basis of this guidance, the Panel considers that Howick should remain a special character area. If the Council wishes to provide something different for Howick it would need to pursue this via a plan change to enable potential submitters in Howick to address such a proposal directly.

Having heard and considered the evidence since the guidance was issued; the Panel does not support the Council's position but supports the submitters, such as the Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association.

As the Council did not support Howick having the overlay, it had not prepared a character statement. In the time available to it the Panel has not been able to advance a special character statement, and certainly no time to engage (through a hearings process) with the Council and community over what may be appropriate.

While there is no character statement, in the main street the business character height is lower than elsewhere to ensure redevelopment is compatible with the surrounding area and to retain the views to the north. Submitters felt very strongly about the views along the main street towards the founding church and the sea.

The height of Howick Town Centre was addressed by the Council's expert planner Mr Sadlier (paragraph 8.367 of his evidence in chief) for Topics 051-054, where he responded to a submission seeking unlimited height in the centre. Mr Sadlier identified the historic importance of the area and did not support an increase in height from that which was notified. The Panel notes that the Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association were strongly in support of retaining the notified heights. The Panel has retained the variable heights that were in the notified Plan.

Howick's planning provisions have a long history and the Panel considers that the Council needs to review both the residential and business areas in light of the area's historical importance.

Given the reasons above the Panel does not agree with the Council's out of scope recommendation to delete the Special Character Overlay. The Panel does however recommend that a special character area statement be prepared by the Council, in conjunction with the Howick community including the Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association.

5. Pukehana Avenue, Epsom

5.1. Statement of issue

Whether Pukehana Avenue, Epsom should be included as a special character area.

5.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

Ms A Borich on behalf of the Pukehana Residents group supported the Council's inclusion and identification of Pukehana Avenue, Epsom in the mapping of the pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay. She also supported that the street be included as a special character area as she considered it met the special character assessment criteria in the notified Plan (following the analysis and report by Mr Matthews, heritage architect for the Council, as submitted by the Pukehana Avenue Residents Group). The Panel acknowledges the substantial amount of work undertaken by the Pukehana Avenue Residents Group and Ms Borich in particular.

The Council supported the inclusion of Pukehana Avenue as a special character area. The Panel agrees and supports its inclusion based on the evidence of both the Council and submitters.

For the reasons set out in this report, the Panel has recommended the deletion of the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay.

6. Hill Park, Manurewa

6.1. Statement of issue

Whether Hill Park, Manurewa should be included as a special character area.

6.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

The Hill Park Residents Association, Mr G Frost and a number of other submitters supported that Hill Park be included in a Special Character Overlay. The Hill Park Residents Association and Mr G Frost presented extensive evidence (evidence in chief and in rebuttal to the Council's expert evidence of Mr Mathews, heritage architect), Ms Mein (planner and urban designer) and Ms Fogel (heritage advisor) on the history and development of Hill Park, the character that has developed (mainly mid-20th century houses).

Ms Fogel at paragraph 20.7 of her evidence in chief stated:

The submission seeking that the Pre-1944 overlay is extended to include all significant properties in Hill Park has not been met. Hill Park was outside the notified extent of the Pre-1944 overlay because this is a post-war subdivision, with most buildings constructed in the 1950s and 1960s. Because of the age of the buildings, I do not consider that it would be appropriate to extend the Pre-1944 overlay over Hill Park. Hill Park was managed in the Auckland Council District Plan - Operative Manukau Section 2002 as a Residential (Traditional Suburban) Heritage Zone known as RH8.

From the submissions and evidence it does not appear that the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay was in fact sought as outlined by Ms Fogel. The submitters' evidence clearly focussed on Hill Park's special character. However, with respect to Ms Fogel's evidence, the Panel agrees that Hill Park is not pre-1944. Notwithstanding this, the Panel has recommended the entire deletion of the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay. The reasons for this are set out elsewhere in this report.

Ms Mein at 8.19 of her evidence in chief stated:

As I stated in paragraph 8.5 of my evidence above, the emphasis of the Council through this process has been to focus on the provisions relating to those areas included within the overlay as notified; principally Auckland's early suburbs and town centres and their patterns of development. Hill Park represents mid-20th century suburban development and therefore would not meet the criteria for historic character at this time and through the PAUP process. However, it has distinct characteristics that may merit recognition as a character area at some future date.

Ms Mein did not support the inclusion of this area, or others, through the submissions process.

At paragraph 7.4 and 7.5 of her evidence in rebuttal Ms Mein stated:

Notwithstanding the above, I concur with Mr Frost that Hill Park's development patterns and characteristics are such that it may merit recognition as a historic character area, subject to a detailed assessment by a heritage expert.

As stated in my evidence in chief, in my opinion, additional sites and areas worthy of inclusion in the overlay should be the subject of future plan changes.

The Panel, having considered all of the evidence from submitters and the Council accepts that Hill Park has a special character (as set out and explained by Mr Frost) that warrants a Special Character Overlay. A special character statement has been drafted; being adapted from that provided by Mr Frost. Accordingly the Panel recommends the Special Character Overlay for Hill Park as shown on the planning maps.

7. Onehunga Mall

7.1. Statement of issue

Whether Onehunga Mall should be a historic heritage area or special character area.

7.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

The Onehunga Mall Historic Heritage Area includes sites on Onehunga Mall in and around the Onehunga Town Centre. The Onehunga Mall Historic Heritage Area was introduced as a new historic heritage area in the notified Plan. Also part of the Onehunga Mall Historic Heritage Area was subject to a series of controls in the Onehunga Centre Plan in the Auckland Council District Plan – Operative Auckland City - Isthmus section.

The Onehunga Mall Historic Heritage Area was included in the notified Plan as a result of the Onehunga historic heritage survey, as described in Ms Sorrell's evidence in chief. Mr

Bollard, heritage architect, was engaged by the Council to review and respond to submissions received in relation to the Onehunga Mall Historic Heritage Area.

A number of submissions sought changes to the historic heritage area, and these included whether the area was in fact historic heritage and seeking to remove or change the spatial extent of the area identified, to the removal of some buildings from the historic heritage area. A detailed analysis of the submissions was set out in Ms Rowe's planning evidence in chief.

Mr Bollard in his evidence in chief set out that he did not consider that the Onehunga Mall Historic Heritage Area met the factors and thresholds warranting its inclusion in the schedule. Mr Bollard undertook a historic character assessment of the area and he considered that a reduced extent of the Onehunga Mall Historic Heritage Area should be included in the plan as a special character area (business) area. Mr Bollard proposed the extent of the special character area (business) area, showing the proposed character defining and character supporting sites. He also proposed special character statement as part of his evidence in chief.

It is noted that Mr McKenzie of Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga addressed the Council's proposed amendments. Mr McKenzie outlined a range of reasons why Onehunga Mall had high historical and heritage significance, based on advice provided to him by Mr Jones - Heritage Advisor Registration for Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga. The Panel notes that Mr Jones did not provide evidence on this matter. Moreover Mr McKenzie acknowledged that Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga may not have had scope to address this matter.

While the Panel acknowledges the significance of Onehunga as set out in Mr McKenzie's evidence, the Council has relied on the evidence of Mr Bollard. The Panel agrees with the Council for the reasons set in Ms Rowe's and Mr Bollard's evidence.

8. Otahuhu Town Centre

8.1. Statement of issue

Whether Otahuhu Town Centre should be an historic heritage area or a special character area.

8.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

The Otahuhu Town Centre Historic Heritage Area includes sites in the Onehunga Town Centre, focussed on Great South Road and was introduced as a new historic heritage area in the Plan.

Matthews and Matthews Architects Limited undertook an evaluation of the historic heritage values of the Otahuhu Town Centre Historic Heritage Area for the Council. The details of this are summarised in Ms Matthews' evidence in chief. At the conclusion of Ms Matthews' evaluation was that the Otahuhu Town Centre should be included as a special character area in the Unitary Plan. However, as notified it was included as a historic heritage area in the Plan.

Auckland Council and other submitters sought to remove the Otahuhu Town Centre from the Historic Heritage Overlay and instead include it in the Plan as a special character area. Some submitters sought to include the Otahuhu Town Centre as a special character area, while others sought specific properties be removed from the Otahuhu Town Centre Historic Heritage Area.

For the reasons set out in her evidence, Ms Matthews considered that the Otahuhu Town Centre should be included in the Unitary Plan as a special character area. She addressed heritage-related matters raised by submitters in relation to sites within the Otahuhu Town Centre and set out which buildings should be variously character-supporting, character-defining, or as non-character places within the special character area.

Ms Rowe in her evidence in chief considered it appropriate that the Otahuhu Town Centre Historic Heritage Area be removed from the schedule. This was because the Otahuhu Town Centre did not meet the factors and thresholds for management as a historic heritage area. She considered that the inclusion of Otahuhu Town Centre as an area of special character was a more appropriate method to manage the special heritage values of the area. The Panel agrees with the Council for the reasons set in Ms Rowe's and Ms Matthew's evidence.

9. 532, 534 and 536 Parnell Road

9.1. Statement of issue

Whether 532, 534 and 536 Parnell Road (I and M Rosser) and the surrounding sites should be removed from the special character area.

9.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

I and M Rosser considered that their properties at 532, 534 and 536 Parnell Road should be removed from the Special Character Overlay on the basis that the buildings on the sites were not identified as character defining or character supporting themselves. The Rossers consider that their properties are:

an island of residential historic character being protected in a HCA designed to protect the historic character of the Newmarket business area (paragraph 2.8 of the legal submissions on behalf of the submitters)

The submitters also set out that these buildings were separate from the main Newmarket Historic Character Area that is centred on Broadway/Khyber Pass.

The Panel has considered the Council's evidence on this matter and in relation to the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay and that of a number of submitters regarding the appropriate zoning and overlays for this area. Auckland Council, in its evidence for topic 079 recommended deleting a significant amount of the overlay from Newmarket (as part of the review of the pre-1944 and special character overlays). As already set out the Panel has recommended the deletion of the entire Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay.

However the Council sought to retain the Special Character Overlay (called Historic Character Overlay by the Council) over the submitters on other adjoining properties, but recommended it be deleting from the surrounding area: i.e. it left an 'island' of approximately

20 properties. The Panel does not agree with the Council that the Special Character Overlay should remain over this 'island' for the reasons advanced in Ms Goodyer's submissions and the Rosser's evidence.

10. Plan provisions

10.1. Statement of issue

Whether the rules, bulk and location standards, matters of discretion and the assessment criteria need to be simplified and clarified, and the assessment criteria amended to follow the Panel's approach to how assessment criteria are drafted.

How infrastructure is treated in the Special Character Overlay areas.

10.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

The Panel has responded to a wide range of submissions seeking that the plan provisions (rules, bulk and location standards, matters of discretion and the assessment criteria) be simplified and clarified, and that the assessment criteria be written as assessment matters rather than criteria are drafted

The rules, bulk and location standards, matters of discretion and the assessment criteria have been simplified and clarified, and the assessment criteria amended to following the Panel's approach to how assessment criteria are drafted. The residential (in particular) rules, matters of discretion and assessment criteria were separately provided for the various geographic areas (e.g. Isthmus, North Shore, Helensville). However when more closely examined, many of the provisions, especially for demolition and removal, and new buildings, were very similar. The Panel has consolidated those into a set where they were sufficiently similar to enable greater consistency of any assessment. Where they are different, such as Isthmus B, and the focus is more on the individual building rather than streetscape, the provisions have remained separate.

The Panel has also amended the residential and business policies to address infrastructure, which was missing for the notified Plan and requested by Auckland Utility Operator Group and Infrastructure providers. It is noted that while D18 Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential and Business contains the objectives and policies relating to special character and infrastructure, the rules are chapter E26 (consolidated set of infrastructure rules).

11. The Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay

11.1. Statement of Issue

Whether the provisions relating to the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay should be retained or deleted.

11.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

The Panel has recommended deleting all of the provisions relating to the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay. In coming to his recommendation the Panel has considered the

submissions and the extensive legal submissions and evidence for the Council and submitters produced at the regional policy statement and Plan hearings.

The Council's position was clear that it was appropriate to protect unidentified pre-1944 historic heritage buildings and (initially) special character areas in the regional policy statement. In doing so it stated it was taking a precautionary approach, as these areas had a high potential for historic character values and/or significant historic heritage values. The Panel questioned the Council's use of the precautionary approach for the pre-1944 buildings, and if the precautionary approach could be used in this context, where the outcome was in fact known: i.e. if there was no protection some buildings may be fully or partially demolished.

With respect to the precautionary approach, both Mr Brabant, legal counsel for a number of submitters (University of Auckland, Samson Corporation/Sterling Nominees and New Zealand Institute of Architects (Auckland Branch), and Dr Kirman for Housing New Zealand, challenged the basis on which the Council had used the precautionary approach. Both referenced case law relating to the precautionary approach and its generally accepted use in terms of scientific or technical uncertainty. Both legal counsel submitted that it was not appropriate to use the precautionary approach as the Council had done. The Panel agrees, and does not find that a Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay as proposed in the notified Plan can be predicated on the precautionary approach. The outcome could be known - that is, the loss of some pre-1944 buildings.

However, when questioned by the Panel, about how many consent applications had been made, and how many had been granted or refused (given the demolition rule had been given immediate legal effect pursuant to section 86b of the Resource Management Act 1991, despite the provisions being part of the special character provisions), the Council witnesses were unclear. They thought there may have been up to 200 consent applications (full or partial demolition), none of which had been declined. The Panel's findings at the regional policy statement hearing was that there was a lack of evidence about the level of risk of loss of heritage or special character buildings including an unspecified number of pre-1944 buildings and a lack of evidence as to the risk of loss of heritage or special character buildings if the overlay was not in place. No appropriate section 32 cost-benefit analysis had been undertaken to understand how many sites were subject to the overlay, the actual number of applications made, and how many involved removal or demolition of the entire building or parts of the building.

At the hearings on Topics 029, 030 and 079 the Council continued to support the pre-1944 overlay. It was also supported by a number of submitters including the Character Coalition, Grey Lynn Residents' Association and the Point Chevalier Residents against THABs. The Grey Lynn Residents' Association said that there were considerable areas of Grey Lynn not covered by the Special Character Overlay, and therefore the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay was needed to protect the character of Grey Lynn from inappropriate development. Mr Rendell for the Point Chevalier Residents against THABs considered the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay offered the only measure of management to an area he considered to be of high potential for historic character.

A number of submitters remained opposed to the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay. These included Samson Corporation Limited, Urban Design Forum and New Zealand Institute of Architects and Mr Lack. They questioned whether the Pre-1944 Building

Demolition Control Overlay was appropriate as it was, in their view, based on insufficient information and an inadequate assessment of the risk of acting or not acting.

The spatial extent of the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay and the provisions applying to it were further addressed at the hearing for Topic 79. In that hearing, and in the Council's closing statement, it considered there was a clear risk of not acting in terms of the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay, because of the "potential significant historic heritage places, and buildings within potential historic character areas will be at a greater risk of loss through demolition or removal" (paragraph 5.1 of the Council's closing statement). For these reasons and those set out at the 029 and 030 hearings the Council supported the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay.

The purpose and direction of the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay was modified over the course of the hearing process. The Council no longer considered the issue to be one of precaution but a 'cautious.' approach. Also, while the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay policies in the regional policy statement were part of special character, this changed at the plan hearings where a much greater focus was on historic heritage rather than special character. This is reinforced in the Council's closing statement version of the Plan provisions - Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay (description) which states:

This overlay applies to areas in Auckland identified as having been settled ~~pre-~~ prior to 1944 which are considered to have a high potential for historic character values and/or significant historic heritage values.

The overlay proposes a ~~precautionary approach to demolishing~~ provides a transitional approach to controlling the total or substantial demolition or removal of ~~residential and non-residential~~ buildings constructed prior to 1944 within the overlay. This is to ~~address concerns that~~ avoid the loss of unscheduled significant historic heritage buildings and places, or groups of ~~special character~~ buildings that contribute to the historic ~~streetscape or~~ character of a neighbourhood, ~~will be lost~~ before an evaluation of those values is done.

Moreover, the rules were limited to controlling the demolition of buildings, while retaining the criteria used to assess a demolition application to those for identifying and evaluating historic heritage buildings. The notified plan requirement to seek consent for new buildings or relocated buildings at the rear of any existing pre-1944 building was deleted (noting that consent was not required for a 'replacement building' if a building was to be demolished as is the case for special character areas). The clear focus appears to be on individual buildings notwithstanding the references to area of special (historic) character.

The Plan as notified states that the provisions would have no legal effect three years following the date that the relevant provisions of the overlays for historic heritage, historic character and pre-1944 are made operative. This period was determined to be necessary to enable the necessary work to be undertaken to identify particular buildings. The overlay is an interim one, to enable the Council to 'protect' all of the pre-1944 buildings while it undertook the work necessary to identify those buildings worthy of scheduling or their identification with areas of 'historic character'.

Following the 010 and 029/030 hearings the Panel issued interim guidance. The purpose of this guidance was to inform all parties of the Panel's interim position and to guide their

preparations for Topic 079 Special character and pre-1944 mapping. Having now heard and deliberated on all of the Plan provisions, including topic 079, the Panel maintains the position set out in the interim guidance. That guidance, and the other reasons set out in this report, form the Panel's reasons for its recommendation to delete the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay in its entirety.

It is the Panel's view, having considered all of the evidence, the pre-1944 buildings are not deserving of historic heritage scheduling or inclusion in a special character area. There is little evidence showing that the pre-1944 buildings are at any significant risk of demolition or relocation or that the areas where there are pre-1944 buildings are at risk of losing their character (as distinct from losing some buildings).

Having reviewed the Council's final marked up version of the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay provisions, the Panel regards this as creating an additional method to protect buildings almost as though they were scheduled, but without any comparable analysis. In this respect the provisions seek to protect unidentified significant historic heritage buildings.

With respect to protecting unidentified significant buildings, places, areas, features and landscapes, the Panel has made its position clear in other reports, including its report on Topic 010 Historic heritage as referenced above. The Panel's recommendation is that the Plan protects those items, places and areas that have been scheduled after being identified and evaluated and satisfy the evaluation factors. As set out in the report on 010 Historic heritage, the notified Plan took a broad view of historic heritage. The Plan identified and scheduled historic heritage places for protection in the conventional way. However it also included policies in the regional policy statement, as well as at Plan level dealing with historic heritage that has not been identified or evaluated. The Panel has not supported this all-inclusive approach to unscheduled historic heritage, and this applies to what the Council has called unidentified buildings with high potential for historic character values and/or significant historic heritage values; including the buildings in the Pre-1944 Building Demolition Control Overlay.

In light of the above, it is the Panel's view that the Pre-1944 Demolition Control Overlay is placing unnecessary constraints and burdens on landowners seeking to develop their properties. The Panel is not convinced that there is a need to impose a consenting regime as proposed by the Pre-1944 Demolition Control Overlay provisions. If the Council wishes to pursue the Pre-1944 Demolition Control Overlay this should be done through a plan change process. Such a plan change should include the necessary mapping and provision/text work and a robust section 32 analysis to justify the change. In doing so, a plan change would also need to include a review of the implications of such a protection mechanism for the Plan's urban growth provisions, and the basis on which any such control is founded in terms of sections 6 and 7 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

For all of the above reasons, in terms of section 32 and section 32AA, the Panel finds that the provisions, even with the extent of the Pre-1944 Demolition Control Overlay being reduced by approximately 85 per cent from that notified, is not the most appropriate method to give effect to the Resource Management Act 1991. The Panel has considered the risk of not acting, i.e. deleting the provisions. As set out earlier the Panel does not find that pre-1944 buildings are at any significant risk of demolition or relocation such that areas are at risk of losing their character, as distinct from losing some buildings. Accordingly the Panel

does not agree that imposing the overlay to provide for a transitional management approach as recommended by the Council is necessary in section 32 terms. It is more appropriate to delete those provisions for the reasons set out above.

12. Consequential changes

12.1. Changes to other parts of the plan

There are no consequential changes to other parts of the Plan as a result of the Panel's recommendations on this topic.

12.2. Changes to provisions in this topic

There are no changes to provisions in this topic as a result of the Panel's recommendations on other hearing topics.

13. Reference documents

The documents listed below, as well as the submissions and evidence presented to the Panel on this topic, have been relied upon by the Panel in making its recommendations.

The documents can be located on the aupihp website (www.aupihp.govt.nz) on the hearings page under the relevant hearing topic number and name.

You can use the links provided below to locate the documents, or you can go to the website and search for the document by name or date loaded.

(The date in brackets after the document link refers to the date the document was loaded onto the aupihp website. Note this may not be the same as the date of the document referred to in the report.)

13.1. General topic documents

Panel documents

The Submission Points Pathway report.

Topic 010

[010-Submission Point Pathway Report - Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area - 22 Sept 2014](#) (17 October 2014)

[010-Submission Point Pathway Report - Trees and Vegetation - 15 Oct 2014](#) (17 October 2014)

[010-Submission Point Pathway Report - Special Character - 22 Sept 2014](#) (17 October 2014)

[010-Submission Point Pathway Report - Natural Heritage - 22 Sept 2014](#) (17 October 2014)

[010-Submission Point Pathway Report - Natural Character of the Coastal Environment - 22 Sept 2014](#) (17 October 2014)

[010-Submission Point Pathway Report - Landscape and Natural Features - 20 March 2015](#)
(20 March 2014)

[010-Submission Point Pathway Report - Historic Heritage - 15 Oct 2014](#) (15 October 2014)

[010-Submission Point Pathway Report - Historic Heritage - \(Amended for subs 5277-103 and 5280-101\) - 22 October 2014](#) (2 December 2014)

[010-Submission Point Pathway Report - Biodiversity - 15 Oct 2014](#) (20 October 2014)

Topics 029 & 030

[029 - Submission Point Pathway - 9 March 2015](#) (3 April 2015)

[030 - Submission Point Pathway - 3 March 2015](#) (4 March 2015)

Topic 079

[079-Submission Point Pathway Report - 25 January 2016](#) (25 January 2016)

The Parties and Issues Report

Topic 010

[010-Parties and Issues Report - Natural Heritage, Natural Character, Landscapes and Features - 11 Nov 2014](#) (11 November 2014)

[010-Parties and Issues Report - Biodiversity - 11 Nov 2014](#) (11 November 2014)

[010-Parties and Issues Report - Historic Heritage - 11 Nov 2014](#) (11 November 2014)

[010-Parties and Issues Report - Special Character - 15 Oct 2014](#) (20 October 2014)

[010-Parties and Issues Report - Trees and Vegetation - 11 Nov 2014](#) (11 November 2014)

[010-Parties and Issues Report - Waitakere Ranges - 16 Oct 2014 - Amended date for Auckland Council Track-Change Text](#) (20 October 2014)

Topics 029 & 030

[029 - Parties and Issues Report - 31 March 2015](#) (3 April 2015)

[030 - Parties and Issues Report - 21 April 2015](#) (22 April 2015)

Topic 079

[079- Parties and Issues Report - 25 January 2016](#) (25 January 2016)

Mediation Statements

Topic 029 & 030

[029 - MJS - Second session 13, 14 April 2015](#) (21 April 2015)

[029 - MJS - Second session 13, 14 April 2015 - Attachment 2 - tracked changes](#) (21 April 2015)

[029 - Auckland Council - MEDIATION - Balmoral Tram Suburb Historic Character Statement - 7 April 2015](#) (9 April 2015)

[029 - Auckland Council - MEDIATION - Historic Character Statement Framework - 7 April 2015](#) (9 April 2015)

029 - Auckland Council - MEDIATION - Kingsland Business Historic Character Statement - 7 April 2015 (9 April 2015)

029 - Mediation Joint Statement - Objectives and Policies, Rules, and Appendix 10 (11 March 2015)

029 - Mediation Joint Statement - Objectives and Policies, Rules, and Appendix 10 - Attachment 2 (11 March 2015)

029 - Mediation Joint Statement - Objectives and Policies, Rules, and Appendix 10 - Attachment 3 (11 March 2015)

029 - Mediation Joint Statement - Objectives and Policies, Rules, and Appendix 10 - Attachment 4 (11 November 2015)

029 - Mediation Joint Statement - Objectives and Policies, Rules, and Appendix 10 - Attachment 5 (11 November 2015)

029 - Mediation Joint Statement - Objectives and Policies, Rules, and Appendix 10 - Attachment 6 (11 March 2015)

029 - Mediation Joint Statement - Objectives and Policies, Rules, and Appendix 10 - Attachment 7 (11 March 2015)

029 - Mediation Joint Statement - Objectives and Policies, Rules, and Appendix 10 - Attachment 8 (11 March 2015)

030 - Mediation Joint Statement - Objectives and Policies, Rules and Assessment Criteria - 26 and 27 February 2015

030 - Mediation Joint Statement - Objectives, Policies, Rules, Notification and Assessment Criteria - 20 April 2015 (21 April 2015)

Expert Conference Statements

Topic 010

010-Expert Conference Joint Statement - B4.3.2 Landscape and natural features (11 November 2014)

010-Attachment 1 - marked -up text for B4.3.2 Landscape and natural features (11 November 2014)

010-Joint Witness Statement - Landscape (11 November 2014)

010-Expert Conference Joint Statement - B4.3 Natural heritage and B4.31 Natural character (11 November 2014)

010-Attachment 1 - marked-up text for B.3 Natural heritage and B.3.1 Natural character (11 November 2014)

010-Expert Conference Joint Statement - B4.3.3 Trees and vegetation (11 November 2014)

010-Attachment 1 - marked-up text for B.4.3.3 Trees and vegetation (11 November 2014)

010-Expert Conference Joint Statement B4.3.4 Biodiversity (11 November 2014)

010-Attachment 1 - marked-up text for B4.3.4 Biodiversity (11 November 2014)

010-Expert Conference Joint Statement - B4.1 Historic heritage (11 November 2014)

[010-Attachment 1A - marked-up text for B4.1 Historic heritage \(9 June 2016\)](#)

[010-Attachment 1B - marked-up text for B4.1 Historic heritage \(11 November 2014\)](#)

Auckland Council marked up version

Topic 010

[Combined Track Changes \(2 December 2014\)](#)

[Combined Track Changes - Amended \(B4.3.2\) 031214 \(4 December 2014\)](#)

[Proposed track change Biodiversity \(30 October 2014\)](#)

[Proposed track change Historic Heritage \(30 October 2014\)](#)

[Proposed track change Landscape and natural features \(30 October 2014\)](#)

[Proposed track change Natural heritage and natural character of the coastal environment \(30 October 2014\)](#)

[Proposed track change Trees and vegetation \(30 October 2014\)](#)

[Proposed track change Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area \(3 November 2014\)](#)

Topic 029

[029 - Auckland Council - Introduction Business Historic Character Statements - Further Mediation - 7 April 2015 \(13 April 2015\)](#)

[029 - Auckland Council - Introduction Residential Historic Character Statements - Further Mediation - 7 April 2015 \(13 April 2015\)](#)

[029 - Auckland Council - MARKED UP - J.3.5 Residential General Rules - Further Mediation - 7 April 2015 \(13 April 2015\)](#)

[029 - Auckland Council - MARKED UP - Special Character Rules - Further Mediation - 7 April 2015 \(9 April 2015\)](#)

[029 - Auckland Council - MARKED UP- E.3.1 Special Character Further Mediation - 7 April 2015 \(13 April 2015\)](#)

[029 - Auckland Council - MARKED UP version \(Appendix 10\) \(20 February 2015\)](#)

[029 - Auckland Council - MARKED UP version \(Special Character Business - Rules J.3.1\) \(20 February 2015\)](#)

[029 - Auckland Council - MARKED UP version \(Special Character General - Rules J.3.5\) \(20 February 2015\)](#)

[029 - Auckland Council - MARKED UP version \(Special Character Objectives and Policies E.3.1\) \(20 February 2015\)](#)

[029 - Auckland Council - MARKED UP version \(Special Character Provisions - New E.4.7 and J.4.7 Howick Town Centre\) \(20 February 2015\)](#)

[029 - Auckland Council - MARKED UP version \(Special Character Residential - Rules - Helensville J.3.2\) \(20 February 2015\)](#)

[029 - Auckland Council - MARKED UP version \(Special Character Residential Isthmus A, B and C J.3.3\) \(20 February 2015\)](#)

[029 - Auckland Council - MARKED UP version \(Special Character Residential North Shore - Rules J.3.4\) \(20 February 2015\)](#)

Topic 030

[030 - Auckland Council - MARKED UP version \(Pre-1944 Rules, Assessment Criteria & Notification E.3.2\) \(20 February 2015\)](#)

[030 - Auckland Council - MARKED UP version \(Pre-1944 Rules, Assessment Criteria and Notification J.3.6\) \(20 February 2015\)](#)

[030 - Auckland Council - MARKED Up version E.3.2 Overlay objectives and policies Further Mediation 7 April 2015 \(8 April 2015\)](#)

[Auckland Council Track Changes – H.1.1 Infrastructure – to be discussed in Session 9A \(24 February 2015\)](#)

Topic 079

[079 Ak Cncl - Supplementary Evidence – Marked Up Version - Consequential amendments - Updated 29 Mar 2016 \(29 March 2016\)](#)

Auckland Council closing statement

Topic 010

[Hearing Evidence - Closing Statement \(B4.1 and B4.2\) \(19 December 2014\)](#)

[Hearing Evidence – Closing Statement - Tracked changes Attachment A \(B4.3, B4.3.1 and B4.3.2\) \(23 December 2014\)](#)

[Hearing Evidence - Closing Statement - Tracked changes Attachment B \(B4.3.3, B4.3.4 and B4.3.5\) \(23 December 2014\)](#)

[Hearing Evidence –Closing Statement \(B4.3.1, B4.3.2, B4.3.3, B4.3.4 and B4.3.5\) \(13 January 2015\)](#)

Topics 029 and 030

[029 and 030 - Hrg - Auckland Council - Post hearing closing remarks \(1 July 2015\)](#)

Topic 079

[079 Ak Cncl - CLOSING REMARKS \(26 February 2016\)](#)

Panel Interim Guidance

[029 and 030 Special Character and Pre-1944 \(PDF 75KB\) \(15 July 2016\)](#)

13.2. Specific evidence

Topic 010

Hill Park Residents Association

[Hearing Evidence - submission point 5646-11 \(28 November 2014\)](#)

[Hearing Evidence - submission point 5646-6 \(28 November 2014\)](#)

[Hearing Evidence - submission point 5646-7 \(28 November 2014\)](#)

Housing New Zealand Corporation

[Hearing Evidence - Legal submissions](#) (5 December 2014)

[Hearing Evidence- Shannon Bray](#) (13 November 2014)

[Hearing Evidence- David Pearson](#) (13 November 2014)

Howick Ratepayers and Residents Associations Incorporated

[Hearing Evidence](#) (24 November 2014)

The University of Auckland

[Hearing Evidence - Karl Cook](#) (13 November 2014)

The New Zealand Institute of Architects et al

[Hearing evidence - Legal submission](#) (3 December 2014)

[Hearing Evidence - Adam Wild](#) (13 November 2014)

Topic 29 and 30

Housing New Zealand Corporation

[029 and 030 - Hrg - Housing New Zealand Corporation - Legal submissions](#) (16 June 2015)

[029 and 030 - Hrg - Housing New Zealand support of memorandum of Samson Corporation et al](#) (3 March 2015)

[029 and 030 - Hrg - Housing New Zealand \(Amelia Linzey\) - Planning](#) (25 May 2015)

Howick Ratepayers and Residents Associations Incorporated

[029 and 030 - Hrg - Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association](#) (25 May 2015)

Point Chevalier Residents against THABs Incorporated

[030 - Hrg - Point Chevalier Residents against THABs](#) (19 May 2015)

The New Zealand Institute of Architects et al

[029 and 030 - Hrg - Samson Corporation Ltd and Sterling Nominees Ltd - Legal Submissions](#) (11 June 2015)

[029 and 030 - Hrg - The Urban Design Forum and NZ Institute of Architects and Samson Corp and Sterling Nominees \(Adam Wild\) 2 June 2015](#) (11 June 2015)

[029 and 030 - Hrg - Samson Corporation and Sterling Nominees \(Adam Wild\)](#) (19 May 2015)

Topic 079

Hill Park Residents Association

[079 Glen Frost and Hill Park Residents Association – JOINT STATEMENT – REBUTTAL – to L Mein](#) (21 January 2016)

[079 Glen Frost and Hill Park Residents Association – JOINT STATEMENT – REBUTTAL – to R Fogel](#) (21 January 2016)

[079 Glen Frost and Hill Park Residents Association– JOINT STATEMENT – REBUTTAL – to A Matthews](#) (21 January 2016)

Housing New Zealand Corporation

[079 Housing New Zealand - LEGAL SUBMISSIONS](#) (11 February 2016)

[079 Housing New Zealand \(A Linzey\) - Planning - Corrected](#) (4 February 2016)

[079 Housing New Zealand \(D Pearson\) - Architecture](#) (23 December 2015)

Howick Ratepayers and Residents Associations Incorporated

[079 Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association Inc \(G Mackereth\)](#) (20 December 2015)

Pukehana Avenue Residents Group

[079 Pukehana Avenue Residents Group with 56 signatures - \(Angela Borich\) - Planning](#) (18 December 2015)

Irene and Michael J Rosser

[079 Irene and Michael J Rosser - LEGAL SUBMISSIONS](#) (10 February 2016)

Point Chevalier Residents against THABs Incorporated

[079 Point Chevalier Residents Against THABs Incorporated et al – JOINT STATEMENT](#) (16 December 2015)

The University of Auckland

[079 The University of Auckland - LEGAL SUBMISSIONS](#) (3 February 2016)

[079 The University of Auckland \(A Wild\) - Heritage](#) (20 December 2015)