

PC 78

Section 32

City Centre Precincts

Table of Contents

I201 Britomart Precinct	1
I202 Central Wharves Precinct	6
I205 Downtown West Precinct	12
I206 Karangahape Road Precinct	15
I207 Learning Precinct	18
I208 Port Precinct Analysis	22
I209 Quay Park Precinct	25
I210 Queen Street Valley Precinct	44
I211 Viaduct Harbour Precinct	47
I212 Victoria Park Market Precinct	65
I214 Wynyard Precinct	67

Proposed Plan Change 78 (PC78) to the Unitary Plan Operative in part: I201 Britomart Precinct

I201 Britomart Precinct Analysis

Purpose: The purpose of the precinct is to act as a regional transport centre, provide for comprehensive development and provide a link between the core central business district and the harbour edge, while preserving identified special character and historic heritage values and enabling adaptive reuse of those buildings.

Zoning: City Centre Zone

Changes to the precinct required by MDRS: Not a relevant residential zone

Changes to the precinct required by NPS-UD: Policy 3 (a) changes (as much development capacity as possible).

Precinct provisions affected by MDRS or Policy 3	Outcome	Area subject to provision
I201.4.1.(A2)	Retain (see below)	Whole Precinct
I201.4.1.(A5)	Retain (see below)	Viewshaft area and Whole of Precinct
I201.4.2.(A14)	Retain (see below)	Open Space areas only
I201.4.2.(A17)	Retain (see below)	Open Space areas only
I201.6.2. Building height	Retain (see below)	Whole Precinct, as shown on I201.10.1 Britomart Precinct: Precinct plan 1 - Building height
I201.6.5. View shaft	Retain (see below)	Viewshaft area only, as shown on I201.10.3 Britomart Precinct: Precinct plan 3 - Paving and viewshafts
I201.6.6. Site intensity	Amend (see below)	Whole Precinct, as shown on I201.10.2 Britomart Precinct: Precinct plan 2 - Site intensity

EVALUATION REPORT

This report is prepared as part of the evaluation required by Section 32 and Sections 77P, 77Q and 77R of the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act') for proposed Plan Change 78 (PC 78) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP).

The background to and objectives of PC 78 are discussed in the overview report, as is the purpose and required content of section 32 and 77P, 77Q and 77R evaluations. Sections 77O, 77P, 77Q, 77R relate to evaluation steps for urban non-residential zones.

This report discusses the implications of applying qualifying matters within the I201 Britomart Precinct to the implementation of policy 3 of the NPS-UD. It does not discuss MDRS as the City Centre Zone is not a relevant residential zone.

An existing qualifying matter is a qualifying matter referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) that is operative in the relevant district plan when the IPI is notified. There may also be “other” qualifying matters, in terms of sec 77O(j) (for non-residential zones) that are not covered by the qualifying matters listed in 77O (a) to (i).

The Council may make the MDRS and the relevant building height or density requirements under policy 3 less enabling of development in relation to an area within a relevant residential zone or urban non-residential zone only to the extent necessary to accommodate 1 or more of the qualifying matters listed in 77I or 77O.

Integrated evaluation for (a) to (i) qualifying matters

For the purposes of PC 78, the evaluation of qualifying matters referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32 and 77K / 77Q requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be large due to the number of identified historic heritage building and special character buildings, open spaces and general streetscape which contribute to the precinct’s character, enclosure, and sense of human scale.

This evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

Qualifying matters in section 77O(a) to (i)	77O (f) Open Space	77 (a) Historic Heritage (s6(f))
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	I201.4.2.(A14) I201.4.2.(A17) I201.6.2. Building height I201.6.5. View shaft I201.6.6. Site intensity	I201.4.1.(A2) I201.4.1.(A5) I201.6.2. Building height I201.6.5. View shaft I201.6.6. Site intensity
Effects managed	Protect open space amenity	Protect Historic heritage and its context
Applies to residential / non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3 and / or MDRS	N/A – Business - City Centre Zone	N/A – Business - City Centre Zone
How qualifying matter changes level of development enabled by Policy 3 and / or MDRS	Reduced height and density of floor area due to open space areas requiring DA consent for buildings.	Reduced height and density of floor area. Reduced availability of development land due to historic heritage and non-scheduled buildings subject to conservation plans.

Conclusion	Retain and Amend	Retain and Amend
-------------------	------------------	------------------

Integrated evaluation for 'other' qualifying matters

For the purposes of PC 78, the evaluation of 'other' qualifying matters has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32, 77J / 77P and 77L / 77R requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be large as the qualifying matters will affect all sites covered by the precinct.

This evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

'Other' qualifying matters sections 77I/O(j)	77O(j) Local Views	77O(j) Connection with the Waitemata Harbour	77O(j) Special character	77O(j) General streetscape, character, sense of enclosure and human scale
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	I201.4.1.(A2) I201.4.1.(A5) I201.6.2. Building height I201.6.5. View shaft I201.6.6. Site intensity	I201.4.1.(A2) I201.4.1.(A5) I201.6.2. Building height I201.6.5. View shaft I201.6.6. Site intensity	I201.4.1.(A2) I201.4.1.(A5) I201.6.2. Building height I201.6.5. View shaft I201.6.6. Site intensity	I201.4.1.(A2) I201.4.1.(A5) I201.6.2. Building height I201.6.5. View shaft I201.6.6. Site intensity
Sites to which the qualifying matter relates	Whole Precinct	Whole Precinct	Whole Precinct	Whole Precinct
Effects managed	Protection of local views which contribute to the Precincts character including connection to the harbour.	Protection of the Precincts connection with the Waitematā Harbour.	Protection of the identified Special Character buildings (on Precinct Plan I201.10.2) and their context	Protect the character of the Precinct and its human scale.
Applies to residential / non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3	N/A – Business - City Centre Zone	N/A – Business - City Centre Zone	N/A – Business - City Centre Zone	N/A – Business - City Centre Zone
Specific characteristics that makes level of development provided by Policy 3 inappropriate	The precinct is designed to provide historically significant and local views along the identified viewshaft, to promote connectedness and legibility within the precinct.	The precinct is also in a critical location for providing a better link between the city centre and the harbour and also Viaduct Harbour to the west and the Quay Park precinct (the site of Auckland's former rail station and shunting yards) and the arena site to the east. Provision for an attractive and safe pedestrian network and public squares, with good quality connections to the harbour edge and the city core, is vital.	The identified historic heritage and special character buildings and how these relate to the general streetscape contribute to its character, enclosure, and sense of human scale.	The Precinct's suppression of high and bulk and location of built form contribute to its streetscape, character, enclosure, and sense of human scale.
Why inappropriate with level of development provided in light national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD	Increased height would adversely affect the identified viewshaft Increased development intensity may adversely affect gaps between built form which link the Precinct and the Harbour	Increased development height and intensity may adversely affect the connection between the Precinct and the harbour through dominance of built form over harbour edges and reducing in gaps between built form allowing visual connections to the sea.	Increased height and bulk of building may adversely affect the special character buildings such that their prominence in the precinct is lost thereby reducing the character of the precinct overall.	Increasing built form bulk and height and the inappropriate location of built form may adversely affect the carefully planned and curated character and streetscape of the precinct which achieves its purpose.
Range of options to achieve the greatest heights and densities as provided for by Policy 3	Retain, remove or amend the provisions	Retain, remove or amend the provisions	Retain, remove or amend the provisions	Retain, remove or amend the provisions

while managing specific characteristics				
Costs of applying QM	Reduced height and density of floor area. Reduced availability of development land due to viewshaft (NC consent for buildings in viewshaft).	Reduced height and density of floor area. Reduced availability of development land due to viewshaft (NC consent for buildings in viewshaft).	Reduced height and density of floor area. Reduced availability of development land due to viewshaft (NC consent for buildings in viewshaft).	Reduced height and density of floor area. Reduced availability of development land due to viewshaft (NC consent for buildings in viewshaft).
Benefits	Protection of historically significant and local views which contribute to the Precincts character including connection to the harbour.	Protection of the Precincts connection with the Waitemata Harbour	Protection of the identified Special Character buildings (on Precinct Plan I201.10.2) and their context	Protect the character of the Precinct and its human scale.
Conclusion	Retain and Amend	Retain and Amend	Retain and Amend	Retain and Amend

**Proposed Plan Change 78 (PC78) to the Unitary Plan Operative in part
I202 Central Wharves Precinct
I202 Central Wharves Precinct Analysis**

Purpose: To provide for a scale of development and a range of uses which reflect and complement the Viaduct Harbour as a special place of character within the city centre.

Zoning: Business - City Centre, Coastal – General Coastal Marine, Open Space – Community zone

Changes to the precinct required by MDRS: Not applicable – not a relevant residential zone (as per s2 of the Act)

Changes to the precinct required by NPS-UD: Policy 3(a) - building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification.

Precinct provisions affected by MDRS or Policy 3	Outcome	Area subject to provision
Rule I202.4.1 (A38) Development that does not comply with Standard I202.6.1.8 – NC activity status	Retained	Whole precinct

Table I202.6.1.1.1 Activities on Princess Wharf		Retained	Princess Wharf
Activity	Maximum gross floor area allowed as a proportion of the overall gross floor area of buildings on Princes Wharf allowed in I202.6.1.8 Site intensity below		
Visitor accommodation	30 per cent		
Retail	5 per cent		
Offices (except the Ports of Auckland building or offices that are accessory to marine and port activities)	10 per cent		
Parking buildings and areas	35 per cent		
I202.6.1.7 Building height		Retained	Whole precinct as identified by I202.10.1 Central Wharves: Precinct plan 1 - Building heights
I202.6.1.8 Site Intensity		Retained	Princess Wharf
I202.6.1.10 Viewshafts		Retained	Areas identified in I202.10.2 Central Wharves: Precinct plan 2 - Viewshafts

section 32 and sec77K / sec 77Q alternative process for existing qualifying matters / Section 32 and section 77J / 77L “other” qualifying matter

EVALUATION REPORT

This report is prepared as part of the evaluation required by Section 32 and Sections 77K / 77Q and Sections 77J and 77L of the Resource Management Act 1991 (‘the Act’) for proposed Plan Change X (PPCX) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP).

The background to and objectives of PCX are discussed in the overview report, as is the purpose and required content of section 32 and 77I / 77Q and 77J / L and 77P/R evaluations:

- Sec 77I / 77J/L relates to evaluation steps for relevant residential zones
- Sec 77O / 77P/R relates to evaluation steps for urban non-residential zones.

This report discusses the implications of applying qualifying matters within the I202 Central Wharves Precinct to the implementation of policy 3 of the NPS-UD.

An existing qualifying matter is a qualifying matter referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) that is operative in the relevant district plan when the IPI is notified. There may also be “other” qualifying matter, in terms of sec 77I(j) that are not covered by the qualifying matters listed in 77I (a) to (i) (or 77O for non-residential zones).]

The Council may make the MDRS and the relevant building height or density requirements under policy 3 less enabling of development in relation to an area within a relevant residential zone or urban non-residential zone only to the extent necessary to accommodate 1 or more of the qualifying matters listed in 77I or 77O.

Section 80E(1) sets out the scope of the IPI as a change to a district plan. Therefore, regional plan matters addressing the coastal marine area is not considered to be in scope. This is relevant as the majority of the I202 Central Wharves Precinct is located within the coastal marine area. Evaluation of qualifying matters is referred to in section 77O (a) to (i) has still been undertaken where parts of the precinct zoned Business – City Centre or where a control applies to both land and the coastal marine area.

Integrated evaluation for (a) to (i) qualifying matters

For the purposes of PPCX, the evaluation of qualifying matters referred to in section 77I or 77O (a) to (i) has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32 and 77K / 77Q requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be small due to most of the precinct sitting within the coastal marine area.

This section 32/77K/Q evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

Qualifying matters in section 77I/O(a) to (i)	77O(a) (s6(d) - the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes, and rivers)	77O(a) (s6(f) - the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development)	77O(f) open space provided for public use
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rule I202.4.1 (A38) Development that does not comply with Standard I202.6.1.8 Table I202.6.1.1.1 Activities on Princess Wharf I202.6.1.7 Building height I202.6.1.8 Site Intensity I202.6.1.10 Viewshafts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I202.6.1.7 Building height I202.6.1.10 Viewshafts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rule I202.4.1 (A38) Development that does not comply with Standard I202.6.1.8 Table I202.6.1.1.1 Activities on Princess Wharf I202.6.1.7 Building height I202.6.1.8 Site Intensity I202.6.1.10 Viewshafts
Effects managed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public access to the coastal marine area. Amenity values of the publicly accessible parts coastal marine area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Values of identified historic heritage sites (Ferry Building - Categories A place) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amenity values and useability of public open spaces Amenity values of the publicly accessible parts of the coastal marine area (Te Wananga and Princes Wharf)
Applies to residential / non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3 and / or MDRS	Business – City Centre zone; Open Space – Community zone	Business – City Centre zone; Open Space – Community zone	Business – City Centre zone; Open Space – Community zone
How qualifying matter changes level of development enabled by Policy 3 and / or MDRS	Controls limit development capacity by limiting the intensity of development, and height and location of buildings. Controls on Princes Wharf are out of scope as it is in the coastal marine area.	Building height and viewshaft controls limit development capacity in terms of amount of new floor space and location of new buildings. No effect on development enabled by Policy 3 due to existing protection enabled by historic heritage place (Ferry Building identified) as a s6 matter.	Combination of building bulk controls, site intensity, and viewshaft controls limits potential development capacity.
Conclusion	See table above (multiple provisions retained)	See table above (multiple provisions retained)	See table above (multiple provisions retained)

Integrated evaluation for section 77J and 77L ‘other’ qualifying matters

For the purposes of PPCX, the evaluation of ‘other’ qualifying matters has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32 and 77J / 77L requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be small due to most of the precinct sitting within the coastal marine area.

This section 32/ 77J and L evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

'Other' qualifying matters sections 77O(j) and sites affected	77O(j) any other matter – City centre built form: Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour	77O(j) any other matter – City centre built form: Protecting amenity and retaining the “human scale” of streets
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule I202.4.1 (A38) Development that does not comply with Standard I202.6.1.8 • Table I202.6.1.1.1 Activities on Princess Wharf • I202.6.1.7 Building height • I202.6.1.8 Site Intensity • I202.6.1.10 Viewshafts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule I202.4.1 (A38) Development that does not comply with Standard I202.6.1.8 • Table I202.6.1.1.1 Activities on Princess Wharf • I202.6.1.7 Building height • I202.6.1.8 Site Intensity • I202.6.1.10 Viewshafts
Effects managed	<p>Effects of building bulk and form on the city centre’s relationship with the Waitemata Harbour. Particularly by;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognising that Quay St is the northern interface between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour – and aligning heights with the Harbour Edge Height Control plane of 40m + 40 degree - Requiring transition of form and heights sympathetic to the landform and hydrology of this part of the waterfront in relation to the wider city centre - Enhancing the amenity and the importance of this part of Quay St as a key pedestrian public space with access and connections to the coastal marine area 	<p>Effects of building bulk and form on the amenity values of adjoining streets and public open spaces. Particularly, to minimise bulk and visual dominance from affecting the sense of ‘human scale’ environment within and south of the precinct, along Quay St and Te Wanaga.</p>
Applies to residential / non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3 and / or MDRS	Business – City Centre zone; Open Space – Community zone	Business – City Centre zone; Open Space – Community zone
Specific characteristics that makes level of development provided by the MDRS or Policy 3 inappropriate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low-medium rise built form which creates an open waterfront environment for pedestrians/a sense of civic space; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low-medium rise built form which enhances the pedestrian environment

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Built form which enhances the amenity and accessibility of public spaces adjacent to the water's edge, Built form which recognises the importance of Quay St as the interface between the city and the water by providing mostly unobstructed views connecting pedestrians with the Waitemata Harbour 	
Why inappropriate with level of development provided in light national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD	<p>Increasing height and bulk will create potential adverse dominance effects which compromise the open nature of the precinct area and thereby its unique relationship as a key public space connecting people with the Waitemata Harbour.</p> <p>Increasing building bulk and removal of access controls will adversely affect the physical access to the coastal marine area as well as the sense of connection provided by a high-quality public spaces adjacent to the water.</p>	Increasing height and bulk will create potential adverse dominance effects on adjoining streets and public spaces. Quay St and adjoining public spaces will be particularly sensitive to height as they are located south of the precinct.
Range of options to achieve the greatest heights and densities permitted by the MDRS or as provided for by Policy 3 while managing specific characteristics	Retain, remove or amend the provisions	
Costs of applying QM	<p>The qualifying matter's controls limit the potential additional capacity for residential and commercial development in the landward parts of the I202 Central Wharves precinct.</p> <p>Taken together, the controls will impact the competitive operation of land and development markets within this part of the city centre. Likewise, economic costs from unrealisable development potential in a desirable location.</p>	
Benefits	<p>Protect the city's relationship with the Waitemata Harbour. This includes within the precinct as well as the wider city centre – particularly as the precinct plays a key role in the interface between the two.</p> <p>A high-quality water-front environment will have broader social, cultural and economic benefits. This includes tourism</p>	<p>Protect the amenity of streets and public spaces within the precinct.</p> <p>Contributing to the social wellbeing of residents and users of streets and public spaces within the precinct by creating a human scale urban environment.</p>

	opportunities, providing for cultural and social uses and activities, and waterfront recreational spaces for all Aucklanders.	
Conclusion	See table above (multiple provisions retained)	See table above (multiple provisions retained)

Proposed Plan Change 78 (PC 78) to the Unitary Plan Operative in part: I205 Downtown West Precinct

I205 Downtown West Precinct Analysis

Purpose: To enable development and pedestrian connectivity that is integrated with the core central business district and the waterfront, whilst supporting the transport interchange facilities within and around the precinct.

Zoning: Business – City Centre Zone

Changes to the precinct required by MDRS: Not a relevant residential zone

Changes to the precinct required by NPS-UD: Policy 3 (a) changes (as much development capacity as possible)

Precinct provisions affected by MDRS or Policy 3	Outcome	Area subject to provision
I205.4.1(A2)	Retain (see below)	Blocks within the precinct described in Standard I205.6.2.
I205.4.2(A7)	Retain (see below)	Blocks within the precinct described in Standard I205.6.2.
I205.6.2. Pedestrian connections	Retain (see below)	Blocks within the precinct described in Standard I205.6.2.

EVALUATION REPORT

This report is prepared as part of the evaluation required by Section 32 and Sections 77P, 77Q and 77R of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“the Act”) for proposed Plan Change 78 (PC 78) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP).

The background to and objectives of PC 78 are discussed in the overview report, as is the purpose and required content of section 32 and 77P, 77Q and 77R evaluations. Sections 77O, 77P, 77Q, 77R relate to evaluation steps for urban non-residential zones.

This report discusses the implications of applying qualifying matters within the I205 Downtown West Precinct to the implementation of policy 3 of the NPS-UD. It does not discuss MDRS as the City Centre Zone is not a relevant residential zone.

An existing qualifying matter is a qualifying matter referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) that is operative in the relevant district plan when the IPI is notified. There may also be “other” qualifying matters, in terms of sec 77O(j) (for non-residential zones) that are not covered by the qualifying matters listed in 77O (a) to (i).

The Council may make the relevant building height or density requirements under policy 3 less enabling of development in relation to an area within a relevant urban non-residential zone only to the extent necessary to accommodate 1 or more of the qualifying matters listed in 77O.

Integrated evaluation for (a) to (i) qualifying matters

For the purposes of PC 78, the evaluation of qualifying matters referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32 and 77K / 77Q requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be less than minor as no (a) to (i) matters apply.

This evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

Qualifying matters in section 77O(a) to (i)	None
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	N/A
Effects managed	N/A
Applies to residential / non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3 and / or MDRS	N/A
How qualifying matter changes level of development enabled by Policy 3 and / or MDRS	N/A
Conclusion	N/A

Integrated evaluation for 'other' qualifying matters

For the purposes of PC 78, the evaluation of 'other' qualifying matters has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32, 77J / 77P and 77L / 77R requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be medium as the qualifying matter only affects the development capacity of developments in the area identified in Standard I205.6.2.

This evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

'Other' qualifying matters sections 77I/O(j)	77O(j) Connection with the Waitematā Harbour	77O(j) General streetscape, character, sense of enclosure and human scale
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	I205.4.1(A2) I205.4.1(A7) I205.6.2. Pedestrian connections	I205.4.1(A2) I205.4.1(A7) I205.6.2. Pedestrian connections
Sites to which the qualifying matter relates	Blocks within the precinct described in Standard I205.6.2.	Blocks within the precinct described in Standard I205.6.2.
Effects managed	Protect the Precinct's connection with the Waitematā Harbour.	Protect the character of the Precinct and its human scale.
Applies to residential / non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3	N/A - Business – City Centre Zone	N/A - Business – City Centre Zone
Specific characteristics that makes level of development provided by Policy 3 inappropriate	Protection of the precinct's pedestrian connections and accessibility to the Waitematā Harbour.	Protection of pedestrian amenity and accessibility through the precinct. The precinct's provisions also provides pedestrian linkages from the downtown transport interchanges to the city centre.
Why inappropriate with level of development provided in light national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD	Inappropriate built forms at ground level may result in the potential loss of pedestrian amenity and linkages from the core city centre to the waterfront.	Inappropriate built forms at ground level may result in reduce pedestrian accessibility and legibility within the precinct to the wider streetscape and nearby transport interchanges.
Range of options to achieve the greatest heights and densities as provided for by Policy 3 while managing specific characteristics	Retain, remove or amend the provisions	Retain, remove or amend the provisions
Costs of applying QM	Reduced density of floor area at ground level, due to requirements to provide pedestrian connections.	Reduced density of floor area at ground level, due to requirements to provide pedestrian connections.
Benefits	Protection of the pedestrian connections throughout the precinct between the city centre and the Waitematā Harbour.	Contributes towards precinct's anticipated integrated streetscape network and supports the transport interchange function of the area.
Conclusion	Retain	Retain

Proposed Plan Change 78 (PC 78) to the Unitary Plan Operative in part: I206 Karangahape Road Precinct

I206 Karangahape Road Precinct Analysis

Purpose: The purpose of the precinct is to maintain and enhance the area’s distinctive built form and streetscape character.

Zoning: City Centre Zone

Changes to the precinct required by MDRS: Not a relevant residential zone

Changes to the precinct required by NPS-UD: Policy 3 (a) changes (as much development capacity as possible)

Precinct provisions affected by MDRS or Policy 3	Outcome	Area subject to provision
I206.4. (A2) New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for	Retain (see below)	Whole precinct
I206.4. (A3) Development that does not comply with Standard I206.6.1 Frontage height and setback	Retain (see below)	Sites shown in I206.10.1 Karangahape Road: Precinct plan 1 - Frontage height and setback
I206.6.1. Frontage height and setback	Retain (see below)	Sites shown in I206.10.1 Karangahape Road: Precinct plan 1 - Frontage height and setback

EVALUATION REPORT

This report is prepared as part of the evaluation required by Section 32 and Sections 77P, 77Q and 77R of the Resource Management Act 1991 (‘the Act’) for proposed Plan Change 78 (PC 78) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP).

The background to and objectives of PC 78 are discussed in the overview report, as is the purpose and required content of section 32 and 77P, 77Q and 77R evaluations. Sections 77O, 77P, 77Q, 77R relate to evaluation steps for urban non-residential zones.

This report discusses the implications of applying qualifying matters within the [I205 Downtown West] Precinct to the implementation of policy 3 of the NPS-UD. It does not discuss MDRS as the City Centre Zone is not a relevant residential zone.

An existing qualifying matter is a qualifying matter referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) that is operative in the relevant district plan when the IPI is notified. There may also be “other” qualifying matters, in terms of sec 77O(j) (for non-residential zones) that are not covered by the qualifying matters listed in 77O (a) to (i).

The Council may make the relevant building height or density requirements under policy 3 less enabling of development in relation to an area within a relevant urban non-residential

zone only to the extent necessary to accommodate 1 or more of the qualifying matters listed in 77O.

Integrated evaluation for (a) to (i) qualifying matters

For the purposes of PC 78, the evaluation of qualifying matters referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32 and 77K / 77Q requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be large.

This evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

Qualifying matters in section 77O(a) to (i)	77 (a) Historic Heritage (s6(f))
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	I206.4. (A2) I206.4. (A3) I206.6.1. Frontage height and setback
Effects managed	Building form and scale, dominance, frontages, design. In order to respect the form, scale and architecture of scheduled historic heritage places in the Karangahape Road Precinct, and provide high-quality design which enhances the precinct's built form and streetscape character.
Applies to residential / non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3 and / or MDRS	City Centre Zone
How qualifying matter changes level of development enabled by Policy 3 and / or MDRS	Restricts frontage height and requires a building setback.
Conclusion	Retain

Integrated evaluation for 'other' qualifying matters

For the purposes of PC 78, the evaluation of 'other' qualifying matters has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32, 77J / 77P and 77L / 77R requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be large.

This evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

'Other' qualifying matters sections 77I/O(j) and sites affected	77O(j) Special character	77O(j) Streetscape, character, sense of enclosure, human scale
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	I206.4. (A2) I206.4. (A3) I206.6.1. Frontage height and setback	I206.4. (A2) I206.4. (A3) I206.6.1. Frontage height and setback
Sites to which the qualifying matter relates	Whole Precinct	Whole Precinct
Effects managed	Require building design to respect the form, scale and architecture of special character buildings in the Karangahape Road Precinct. Maintain the precinct's character and architectural style by requiring new buildings to be compatible in style, including scale, material, colour and detailing. Require proposals for new buildings or additions to existing buildings adjoining or adjacent to special character buildings to be sympathetic and provide contemporary and high-quality design which enhances the precinct's built form and streetscape character.	Building form and scale in the precinct is controlled to maintain the spatial integrity of the street and the quality of street-level amenity. This includes avoiding adverse dominance effects, enhancing the street environment for pedestrians, reducing adverse wind effects, maintaining sunlight and daylight.
Applies to non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3	City Centre Zone	City Centre Zone
Specific characteristics that makes level of development provided by Policy 3 inappropriate	The identified historic heritage building and special character buildings and general streetscape contribute to its character, enclosure, and sense of human scale.	The Precinct's suppression of height and bulk and location of built form contribute to its streetscape, character, enclosure, and sense of human scale.
Why inappropriate with level of development provided in light national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD	Increased height and bulk of building may adversely affect the special character buildings such that their prominence in the precinct is lost thereby reducing the character of the precinct overall.	Increasing built form bulk and height and the inappropriate location of built form may adversely affect the carefully planned and curated character and streetscape of the precinct which achieves its purpose
Range of options to achieve the greatest heights and densities provided for by Policy 3 while managing specific characteristics	Retain, remove or amend the provisions	Retain, remove or amend the provisions
Costs of applying QM	Reduced building envelope due to maximum frontage height and setback requirements.	Reduced building envelope due to maximum frontage height and setback requirements.
Benefits	Protection of Special Character buildings and their context. Protection of the distinctive character of the Precinct by protecting the key elements it is derived from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ridge top location, orientation and aspect; • concentration of historic heritage and special character buildings and features; and • diverse and multicultural mix of activities 	Protect the character of the Precinct and its human scale. Protection of the distinctive character of the Precinct by protecting the key elements it is derived from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ridge top location, orientation and aspect; • concentration of historic heritage and special character buildings and features; and • diverse and multicultural mix of activities
Conclusion	Retain	Retain

Proposed Plan Change 78 (PC 78) to the Unitary Plan Operative in part: I207 Learning Precinct

I207 Learning Precinct Analysis

Purpose: The purpose of the Learning Precinct is to ensure the stimulation of education, research, business and cultural experiences by identifying key actions to enhance economic and social benefits to the city, add value and vitality to the central business district and raise awareness of opportunities for learning in the precinct. The physical characteristics of the precinct include historic heritage places, and parks and gardens around the campuses. The purpose of sub-precinct B is to ensure that the Old Government House grounds remain predominantly an open space for passive recreation.

Zoning: Business – City Centre Zone, Open Space - Conservation Zone

Changes to the precinct required by MDRS: Not a relevant residential zone

Changes to the precinct required by NPS-UD: Policy 3 (a) changes (as much development capacity as possible)

Precinct provisions affected by MDRS or Policy 3	Outcome	Area subject to provision
I207.4.(A23)	Retain (see below)	As shown on I207.10.1 Learning: Precinct plan 1 - Building height controls.
I207.4.(A24)	Retain (see below)	As shown on I207.10.1 Learning: Precinct plan 1 - Building height controls.
I207.4.(A26) New buildings, relocation of buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for.	Retain (see below)	Whole precinct
I207.6.3. Building height	Retain (see below)	As shown on I207.10.1 Learning: Precinct plan 1 - Building height controls
I207.6.4. Frontage Height and Setback	Retain (see below)	As shown on I207.10.4 Learning: Precinct plan 4 - Frontage types
I207.6.5. Wynyard Street Coverage and Pedestrian Link	Retain (see below)	As shown on I207.10.1 Learning: Precinct plan 1 - Building height controls
I207.6.6. Sub-precinct B: Old Government House	Retain (see below)	Sub-precinct B. As shown on I207.10.5 Learning: Precinct plan 5 - Sub-precinct B Old Government House.

EVALUATION REPORT

This report is prepared as part of the evaluation required by Section 32 and Sections 77P, 77Q and 77R of the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act') for proposed Plan Change 78 (PC 78) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP).

The background to and objectives of PC 78 are discussed in the overview report, as is the purpose and required content of section 32 and 77P, 77Q and 77R evaluations. Sections 77O, 77P, 77Q, 77R relate to evaluation steps for urban non-residential zones.

This report discusses the implications of applying qualifying matters within the [I205 Downtown West] Precinct to the implementation of policy 3 of the NPS-UD. It does not discuss MDRS as the City Centre Zone is not a relevant residential zone.

An existing qualifying matter is a qualifying matter referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) that is operative in the relevant district plan when the IPI is notified. There may also be "other" qualifying matters, in terms of sec 77O(j) (for non-residential zones) that are not covered by the qualifying matters listed in 77O (a) to (i).

The Council may make the relevant building height or density requirements under policy 3 less enabling of development in relation to an area within a relevant urban non-residential zone only to the extent necessary to accommodate 1 or more of the qualifying matters listed in 77O.

Integrated evaluation for (a) to (i) qualifying matters

For the purposes of PC 78, the evaluation of qualifying matters referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32 and 77K / 77Q requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be large.

This evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

Qualifying matters in section 77O(a) to (i)	77 (a) Historic Heritage s6(f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	77O (f): open space provided for public use, but only in relation to land that is open space.
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	I207.4.(A23) I207.4.(A24) I207.4.(A26) New buildings, relocation of buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for. I207.6.5. Wynyard Street Coverage and Pedestrian Link	I207.4.(A23) I207.4.(A24) I207.4.(A26) New buildings, relocation of buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for.

Effects managed	Effects of buildings on historic heritage places and the historical street network. Including design, scale; materials and orientation of buildings.	Effects of buildings and structures and the network of linkages and open spaces. Including building scale and dominance, design of buildings and structures, whether high quality open space is supported, whether adequate public open space for visual amenity and recreations is maintained.
Applies to non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3	Business – City Centre Zone	Business – City Centre Zone Open Space - Conservation Zone
How qualifying matter changes level of development enabled by Policy 3.	Height is restricted in the precinct. Maximum frontage heights, with setbacks required above those.	Height is restricted in sub-precinct B (which is zoned Open Space), building location and is restricted in the rest of the precinct (zoned City Centre).
Conclusion	Retain	Retain

Integrated evaluation for ‘other’ qualifying matters

For the purposes of PC 78, the evaluation of ‘other’ qualifying matters has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32, 77J / 77P and 77L / 77R requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be large.

This evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

‘Other’ qualifying matters sections 77I/O(j) and sites affected	77O(j) Streetscape, pedestrian-oriented character, amenity.
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	I207.4.(A26) New buildings, relocation of buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for. I207.6.3. Building height I207.6.4. Frontage Height and Setback I207.6.5. Wynyard Street Coverage and Pedestrian Link
Sites to which the qualifying matter relates	Whole Precinct Sites as shown on I207.10.1 Learning: Precinct plan 1 - Building height controls

	Sites as shown on I207.10.4 Learning: Precinct plan 4 - Frontage types
Effects managed	Building form, scale and design is controlled to protect the character and amenity of the precinct and provide for open spaces and pedestrian connections. This includes avoiding adverse dominance effects, maintaining and enhancing pedestrian amenity, ensuring that building height is appropriate to its location.
Applies to non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3	City Centre Zone
Specific characteristics that makes level of development provided by Policy 3 inappropriate	The Precinct's suppression of height and bulk and location of built form contribute to its streetscape, character, pedestrian amenity, and sense of human scale.
Why inappropriate with level of development provided in light national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD	Increasing built form bulk and height and the inappropriate location of built form may adversely affect the carefully planned and curated character and streetscape of the precinct which achieves its purpose
Range of options to achieve the greatest heights and densities as provided for by Policy 3 while managing specific characteristics	Retain, remove or amend the provisions
Costs of applying QM	Restricted height and development capacity. Reduced building envelope due to maximum frontage height and setback requirements.
Benefits	Protect the character of the Precinct and its human scale. Protection of the distinctive character of the Precinct by protecting the key elements it is derived from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ridge top location, orientation and aspect; • concentration of historic heritage and special character buildings and features; and • diverse and multicultural mix of activities
Conclusion	Amend – increase 50m height limit to 72.5m to align with zone heights.

Proposed Plan Change 78 (PC78) to the Unitary Plan Operative in part: I208 Port Precinct

I208 Port Precinct Analysis

Purpose: The purpose of the precinct is to provide for a nationally and regionally significant component of Auckland and New Zealand’s transport infrastructure and trade network. The precinct primarily consists of land and coastal areas owned or controlled by Ports of Auckland Limited.

Zoning: Business – City Centre Zone, Coastal – General Coastal Marine Zone

Changes to the precinct required by MDRS: Not a relevant residential zone

Changes to the precinct required by NPS-UD: Policy 3 (a) changes (as much development capacity as possible).

Precinct provisions affected by MDRS or Policy 3	Outcome	Area subject to provision
I208.4.1(A28): New buildings and alterations and additions to buildings on land or on coastal marine area structures outside of Area A shown on Precinct plan 2 (P)	Retain	Area outside of Area A, as per I208.10.2 Precinct Plan 2
I208.4.1(A31): New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for within Area A shown on Precinct Plan 2 (RD)	Retain	Area within Area A, as per I208.10.2 Precinct Plan 2
I208.4.1(A32): Alterations and additions to existing coastal marine area structures or buildings not otherwise provided for (P)	Retain	Whole precinct
I208.4.1(A39): Buildings not listed as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity (D)	Retain	Whole precinct
I208.6.1.8. Building height Precinct Plan 1 C1.9(2) Infringement of standards	Retain	Whole precinct, as per I208.10.1 Precinct Plan 1

EVALUATION REPORT

This report is prepared as part of the evaluation required by Section 32 and Sections 77P, 77Q and 77R of the Resource Management Act 1991 (‘the Act’) for proposed Plan Change 78 (PC 78) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP).

The background to and objectives of PC 78 are discussed in the overview report, as is the purpose and required content of section 32 and 77P, 77Q and 77R evaluations.

- Sections 77O, 77P, 77Q, 77R relate to evaluation steps for urban non-residential zones.

This report discusses the implications of applying qualifying matters within the I201 Britomart Precinct to the implementation of policy 3 of the NPS-UD. It does not discuss MDRS as the City Centre Zone is not a relevant residential zone.

An existing qualifying matter is a qualifying matter referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) that is operative in the relevant district plan when the IPI is notified. There may also be “other” qualifying matters, in terms of sec 77O(j) (for non-residential zones) that are not covered by the qualifying matters listed in 77O (a) to (i).

The Council may make the MDRS and the relevant building height or density requirements under policy 3 less enabling of development in relation to an area within a relevant residential zone or urban non-residential zone only to the extent necessary to accommodate 1 or more of the qualifying matters listed in 77I or 77O.

Section 80E(1) sets out the scope of the IPI as a change to a district plan. Therefore, regional plan matters addressing the coastal marine area are not considered to be in scope. This is relevant as parts of the Port Precinct are located within the coastal marine area. Evaluation of qualifying matters is referred to in section 77O (a) to (i) has still been undertaken where parts of the precinct zoned Business – City Centre or where a control applies to both land and the coastal marine area.

Integrated evaluation for (a) to (i) qualifying matters

For the purposes of PC 78, the evaluation of qualifying matters referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32 and 77K / 77Q requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be large due to the potential impacts on enabled development capacity while accommodating matters of national significance and ensuring the safe and efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure.

This evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

Qualifying matters in section 77O(a) to (i)	77O(a) matters of national importance: <i>(a) The preservation of natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development</i>	77O(a) matters of national importance: <i>(h) The management of significant risks from natural hazards</i>	77O(e) a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	I208.4.1(A28) I208.4.1(A31) I208.4.1(A32) I208.4.1(A39) I208.6.1.8. Building height	I208.4.1(A28) I208.4.1(A31) I208.4.1(A32) I208.4.1(A39) I208.6.1.8. Building height	I208.4.1(A28) I208.4.1(A31) I208.4.1(A32) I208.4.1(A39) I208.6.1.8. Building height
Effects managed	Further subdivision, use and/or development of this area which deviate away from the precinct's primary function is considered to be inappropriate due to the incompatible nature of the two activities (S6(a)).	Management of significant risks from natural hazards, including coastal inundation, coastal erosion, sea level rise and flooding.	Protection of a nationally and regionally significant component of Auckland and New Zealand's transport infrastructure and trade network.
Applies to residential / non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3 and / or MDRS	N/A - Business – City Centre zone	N/A - Business – City Centre zone	N/A - Business – City Centre zone
How qualifying matter changes level of development enabled by Policy 3 and / or MDRS	Controls limit development capacity by specifying where new buildings can locate within the precinct, and how high. RD requirement for buildings within 'Area A' of the precinct creates cost in terms of time and money by requiring resource consents for new development within the precinct.	Controls limit development capacity by specifying where new buildings can locate within the precinct, and how high. RD requirement for buildings within 'Area A' of the precinct creates cost in terms of time and money by requiring resource consents for new development within the precinct.	Controls within the precinct ensure that any development on the land adjoining the coastal marine area enables infrastructure to service the marine and port activities.
Conclusion	Retain	Retain	Retain

Integrated evaluation for 'other' qualifying matters

For the purposes of PC 78, the evaluation of 'other' qualifying matters has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32, 77J / 77P and 77L / 77R requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be minor as no 'other' qualifying matters affect the Precinct.

This evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

'Other' qualifying matters sections 77I/O(j)	None
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	N/A
Sites to which the qualifying matter relates	N/A

Effects managed	N/A
Applies to residential / non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3	N/A
Specific characteristics that makes level of development provided by Policy 3 inappropriate	N/A
Why inappropriate with level of development provided in light national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD	N/A
Range of options to achieve the greatest heights and densities as provided for by Policy 3 while managing specific characteristics	N/A
Costs of applying QM	N/A
Benefits	N/A
Conclusion	N/A

Proposed Plan Change 78 (PC 78) to the Unitary Plan Operative in part: I209 Quay Park Precinct

I209 Quay Park Precinct Analysis

Purpose: To enable redevelopment and a mix of activities within the eastern end of the city centre and along the waterfront.

Zoning: Business – City Centre Zone

Changes to the precinct required by MDRS: Not a relevant residential zone

Changes to the precinct required by NPS-UD: Policy 3 (a) changes (as much development capacity as possible)

Precinct provisions affected by MDRS or Policy 3	Outcome	Area subject to provision
I209.4.1.(A3) New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings (RD)	Retain (No QM)	Whole precinct.
I209.4.1.(A7) Development that does not comply with Standard I209.6.3 Site intensity (NC)	Remove	Whole precinct, as described in Standard I209.6.3.
I209.6.1. Building height	Amend (see below)	Whole precinct, as identified on Precinct Plan I209.10.2 and I209.10.3.
I209.6.2. Building frontage height	Amend (see below)	Sites identified on Precinct Plan I209.10.1.
I209.6.3. Site Intensity	Remove (see below)	Whole precinct, as described in Standard I209.6.3.

EVALUATION REPORT

This report is prepared as part of the evaluation required by Section 32 and Sections Sections 77P, 77Q and 77R of the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act') for proposed Plan Change 78 (PC 78) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP).

The background to and objectives of PC 78 are discussed in the overview report, as is the purpose and required content of section 32 and 77P, 77Q and 77R evaluations. Sections 77O, 77P, 77Q, 77R relate to evaluation steps for urban non-residential zones.

This report discusses the implications of applying qualifying matters within the I209 Quay Park Precinct to the implementation of policy 3 of the NPS-UD. It does not discuss MDRS as the City Centre Zone is not a relevant residential zone.

An existing qualifying matter is a qualifying matter referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) that is operative in the relevant district plan when the IPI is notified. There may also be “other” qualifying matters, in terms of sec 77O(j) (for non-residential zones) that are not covered by the qualifying matters listed in 77O (a) to (i).

The Council may make the relevant building height or density requirements under policy 3 less enabling of development in relation to an area within a relevant urban non-residential zone only to the extent necessary to accommodate 1 or more of the qualifying matters listed in 77O.

Integrated evaluation for (a) to (i) qualifying matters

For the purposes of PC 78, the evaluation of qualifying matters referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32 and 77K / 77Q requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be large as the qualifying matters will affect all sites covered by the precinct.

This evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

Qualifying matters in section 77O(a) to (i)	77O(a) protection of historic heritage (s6(f))	77O(f) open space provided for public use
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	I209.6.1. Building height	I209.6.1. Building height I209.6.2. Building frontage height
Effects managed	Protection of historic heritage values	Protection of amenity values associated with open spaces
Applies to residential / non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3 and / or MDRS	N/A - Business – City Centre Zone	N/A - Business – City Centre Zone
How qualifying matter changes level of development enabled by Policy 3 and / or MDRS	Reduced availability of development land within or directly adjacent to historic heritage extent of place.	Reduced height and density on sites surrounding open spaces.
Conclusion	Amend or Remove	Amend or Remove

Integrated evaluation for 'other' qualifying matters

For the purposes of PC 78, the evaluation of 'other' qualifying matters has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32, 77J / 77P and 77L / 77R requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be large as the qualifying matters will affect all sites covered by the precinct.

This evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

'Other' qualifying matters sections 77I/O(j)	77O(j) Amenity and human scale of streets	77O(j) Relationship to the harbour	77O(j) Protecting local and regionally significant views, in particular – the Auckland War Memorial Museum viewshaft and Railway Station and Gardens
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	I209.6.1. Building height I209.6.2. Building frontage height	I209.6.1. Building height	I209.6.1. Building height
Sites to which the qualifying matter relates	Whole precinct.	Whole precinct.	Eastern portion of the precinct (including whole of Quay Park Sub-precinct 1), as shown on the AUP GIS maps.
Effects managed	Bulk and visual dominance effects on the amenity values of streets and public spaces within the precinct.	Protection of the Precinct's connections with the Waitematā Harbour.	Protection of local and regionally significant views, notably – the Auckland War Memorial Museum and Railway Station and Gardens.
Applies to residential / non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3	N/A - Business – City Centre Zone.	N/A - Business – City Centre Zone.	N/A - Business – City Centre Zone.
Specific characteristics that makes level of development provided by Policy 3 inappropriate	Building form, height and design is controlled and appropriate to its location, to enhance the pedestrian environment through its streetscape amenity and sense of human scale.	The precinct is in a critical location for providing a better link to the harbour from the city's eastern areas, which include the site of Auckland's former rail station and shunting yards and the Spark Arena. The provision for an attractive and safe pedestrian network and public squares, with good quality connections to the harbour edge and the city core, is vital.	Protection of the visual and heritage qualities (landform, dominant building presence and setting) associated with views of the museum.
Why inappropriate with level of development provided in light national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD	Increased building height, bulk and scale may result in inappropriate built forms that adversely affect the existing and planned character of the precinct, and create adverse dominance effects on streets and public open spaces.	Inappropriate building height and intensity will adversely affect the relationship between the Precinct and the harbour, through the dominance of built form over harbour edges and reduction in gaps between built form that enable visual connections to the sea.	Loss of views of the museum and its significance as one of Auckland's most popular vantage points, due to inappropriate building heights within the viewshaft. Loss of historically significant view of the Railway Station and its site surrounds.
Range of options to achieve the greatest heights and densities as provided for by Policy 3 while managing specific characteristics	See attachment – Options analysis.	See attachment – Options analysis.	See attachment – Options analysis.
Costs of applying QM	Reduced height and density of floor area. Reduced availability of development land due to viewshaft (NC consent for buildings in viewshaft).	Reduced height and density of floor area. Reduced availability of development land within proximity to the Waitematā Harbour and due to viewshaft (NC consent for buildings in viewshaft).	Reduced height and density of floor area. Reduced availability of development land due to viewshaft (NC consent for buildings in viewshaft).

Benefits	Protection and enhancement of streetscape and pedestrian amenity within the Precinct and its human scale, as envisaged by the precinct.	Protection of the precinct's connection with the Waitematā Harbour.	Protection of views and aspect qualities associated with the Auckland War Memorial Museum and Railway Station and Gardens.
Conclusion	Amend or Remove. Matters of discretion and assessment criteria have also been amended, following changes to the amended provisions.	Amend or Remove	Amend or Remove

Appendix 1: I209 Quay Park Precinct – options analysis

1: Relevant objectives

The key objectives that apply to I209 Quay Park Precinct are:

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

(1) A quality compact urban form that enables all of the following:

- (a) a higher-quality urban environment;
- (b) greater productivity and economic growth;
- (c) better use of existing infrastructure and efficient provision of new infrastructure;
- (d) improved and more effective public transport;
- (e) greater social and cultural vitality;
- (f) better maintenance of rural character and rural productivity; and
- (g) reduced adverse environmental effects.

(3) Sufficient development capacity and land supply is provided to accommodate residential, commercial, industrial growth and social facilities to support growth.

H8. Business – City Centre Zone

H8.2. Objectives

(2) Development is of a form, scale and design quality so that centres are reinforced as focal points for the community.

(3) Development positively contributes towards planned future form and quality, creating a sense of place.

(8) Development in the city centre is managed to accommodate growth and the greatest intensity of development in Auckland and New Zealand while respecting its valley and ridgeline form and waterfront setting.

(9) The distinctive built form, identified special character and functions of particular areas within and adjoining the city centre are maintained and enhanced.

I209 Quay Park Precinct

I209.2. Objectives

(1) A mix of activities compatible with its location on the eastern edge of the city centre and its proximity to the port and transport network.

(2) The scale and form of development within the precinct:

- (a) acknowledges the importance of the precinct as the eastern gateway to the city centre;
- (b) provides a transition to surrounding neighbourhoods;
- (c) is sensitive to public open spaces, and the former railway station building;
- (d) enhances and defines street networks; and
- (e) provides a variation in building height and form.

2: Giving effect to Policy 3

NPS UD requires that:

In relation to tier 1 urban environments, regional policy statements and district plans enable:

- (a) in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification.

In the city centre this is being done primarily through enabling additional height and density of urban form in the City Centre Zone.

With regards to the precincts, each control has been reviewed individually to understand whether it limits intensification and to see where there are possibilities to increase height and/or density of urban form in city centre precincts (while still providing for qualifying matters).

2.1: Review of operative controls

Review parameters

- Review undertaken by assessing rules and standards against the Policy 3(a) requirement to enable “building heights and density of urban form”. This is assumed to refer to the building envelope, rather than to internal density. For this reason the following activities and standards have been assessed as **not** limiting NPS UD intensification:
 - “Use” activity controls
 - Controls which manage the internal arrangements of buildings, e.g. dwelling size, floor-to-floor height.
 - Activities with a Permitted or Controlled activity status
 - Use conversion controls
- Controls which do not limit NPS UD intensification were not further assessed, as they are out of scope of the IPI.
- Once controls (rules or standards) were identified as limiting intensification, further analysis was done holistically – also looking at the related objectives, policies, matters of discretion, assessment criteria, maps, appendices, etc.

Table 1: Assessment of rules in activity table (I209.4)

AUP provision	Activity status	Where does the control apply?	Does the control limit NPS UD intensification?	Does the control provide for a qualifying matter?	What effects is the control seeking to address/manage?	Related AUP provisions ¹
I209.4.1.(A1) Drive-through restaurants in Sub-precinct A	RD	Sub-precinct A, as shown on I209.10.3 Precinct Plan 3	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
I209.4.1.(A2) Minor cosmetic alterations and repairs to a building that does not change its external design and appearance	P	Whole precinct	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
I209.4.1.(A3) New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings	RD	Whole precinct	Possibly. Requires assessment of proposed development against matters which (depending on context and building design) may result in restrictions to development capacity.	No	Potential effects of buildings and/ or alterations and additions, including effects due to: (a) building design and external appearance; (b) form and design of buildings adjoining historic heritage places; (c) design of parking, access and servicing; (d) design and layout of dwellings, visitor accommodation and boarding houses; (e) functional requirements; and (f) how the development meets the needs of the overall development area.	Obs: I209.2.(1),(2), H8.2(3) Pols: I209.3.(1),(3),(4),(5),(6), H8.3.(3),(5),(15),(23),(24),(30),(34) Matters: I209.8.1.(1), H8.8.1.(1) Criteria: I209.8.2.(1), H8.8.2.(1)
I209.4.1.(A4) Transport network for roads, lanes, pedestrian connections	RD	Whole precinct	Possibly. Requires assessment of proposed transport network against matters which (depending on context and building design) may result in restrictions to development capacity.	No	Potential effects of establishing new roads, lanes and pedestrian connections, including effects due to: (a) the location, physical extent and design;	Obs: I209.2.(1),(2), H8.2(3),(11) Pols: I209.3.(1),(4), H8.3.(3),(13),(15),(23),(24)

¹ Some abbreviated terms used in this column. Obs: Objectives; Pols: Policies; Matters: Matters of discretion; Criteria: Assessment criteria.

AUP provision	Activity status	Where does the control apply?	Does the control limit NPS UD intensification?	Does the control provide for a qualifying matter?	What effects is the control seeking to address/manage?	Related AUP provisions ¹
					(b) the location and capacity of infrastructure to service the land for its intended use; (c) integration of development with neighbouring areas including the transport network; and (d) the location of the roads, lanes and pedestrian connections relative to the overall development.	Matters: I209.8.1.(3) Criteria: I209.8.2.(3)
I209.4.1.(A5) Public open space	RD	Whole precinct	Possibly. Requires assessment of proposed public open spaces against matters which (depending on context and building design) may result in restrictions to development capacity.	No	Potential effects of establishing new public open space networks, including effects due to: (a) the location, physical extent and design of open space; and (b) the location of the public open space relative to the overall development.	Obs: I209.2.(1),(2), H8.2(2) Pols: I209.3.(1),(4), H8.3.(3),(15),(23),(24) Matters: I209.8.1.(4) Criteria: I209.8.2.(4)
I209.4.1.(A6) Subdivision	RD	Whole precinct	Possibly. Requires assessment of proposed development against matters which (depending on context and building design) may result in restrictions to development capacity.	No	Potential effects associated with subdivision on the zone and precinct, including effects due to: (a) design and layout of sites; (b) effects of infrastructure provisions; (c) effects on historic heritage and cultural heritage items (d) effects on the surrounding transport network; and (e) effects on any natural hazards that apply on the site, e.g. floodplains or site instability.	Obs: I209.2.(1),(2), H8.2(3),(7),(8) Pols: I209.3.(1),(3),(4), H8.3.(3),(13),(16),(23),(24) Matters: I209.8.1.(2), E38.12.1. Criteria: I209.8.2.(2), E38.12.2.
I209.4.1.(A7) Development that does not comply with Standard I209.6.3 Site intensity	NC	Whole precinct	Yes. See assessment of Standard I209.6.3.	See assessment on Standard I209.6.3.	See assessment on Standard I209.6.3.	See assessment on Standard I209.6.3.

Table 2: Assessment of standards (I209.6)

AUP provision	Where does the control apply?	Does the control limit NPS UD intensification?	Does the control provide for a qualifying matter?	What effects is the control seeking to address/manage?	Related AUP operative provisions
I209.6.1. Building height	Whole precinct, as identified on I209.10.2 and I209.10.3 Precinct Plans 2 and 3.	Yes. Restricts building height by setting a maximum building height.	770(a): Matters of national importance – Historic Heritage (s6(f)). 770(f): open space provided for public use. 770(j): any other matter: City centre built form controls.	To manage the height of buildings to achieve Policies I209.3(5) and I209.4(6) of the Quay Park Precinct.	Obs: I209.2.(2), H8.2(3),(8),(9) Pols: I209.3.(4),(5),(6), H8.3.(3),(5),(23),(24), (30) Matters: I209.8.1.(6) Criteria: I209.8.2.(6) I209.10.2 Precinct plan 2 – Building height controls outside of sub-precinct A I209.10.3 Precinct plan 3 – Building height controls within sub-precinct A D19 Auckland War Memorial Museum Viewshaft Overlay H8.6.3. Admission of sunlight to public places H8.6.7. Railway station building and gardens view protection plane

AUP provision	Where does the control apply?	Does the control limit NPS UD intensification?	Does the control provide for a qualifying matter?	What effects is the control seeking to address/manage?	Related AUP operative provisions
I209.6.2. Building frontage height	Sites identified on I209.10.1 Precinct Plan 1.	Yes. Building height and development capacity at the front of buildings is limited due to frontage height and setback requirements.	770(f): open space provided for public use. 770(j): any other matter: City centre built form controls	To manage the frontage height of buildings to maintain pedestrian amenity and maintain low building heights around public open space.	Obs: I209.2.(2), H8.2(2),(9) Pols: I209.3.(1),(4) H8.3.(3),(11),(23),(24),(37) Matters: I209.8.1.(7) Criteria: I209.8.2.(7) I209 .10.1 Precinct plan 1 – Frontage height
I209.6.3. Site Intensity	Whole precinct	Yes. Restricts development capacity by setting a limit on gross floor area as a ratio to precinct.	No.	To manage the scale, form and intensity of development to maintain the character of the Quay Park Precinct.	Obs: I209.2.(2), H8.2(3),(8) Pols: I209.3.(1),(4), H8.3.(3),(5),(23),(24),(30)

2.2: Options analysis

Identify options

For each control we considered the following basic options:

- Retain the control as-is
- Remove the control in full.
- Amend the control
 - Some rules in the activity table were only assessed as retain or remove, as there was not a sensible amendment option to consider.
 - For some controls, multiple “amend” options were considered. This was especially important to address the different ways in which a control might impact the provision of development capacity. E.g. a height limit AND the spatial extent of that limit.

Development and Evaluation of Options

The options analysis is set out in Table 3 below.

Additionally, extensive modelling was undertaken of the options to understand the potential effects and whether they would enable intensification and a well-functioning urban environment.

Table 3: Options analysis of controls to implement Policy 3(a)

AUP provisions	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
I209.4.1.(A3) New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings	1	Retain	Low impact The intention is still to enable as much height and development capacity in the precinct as possible	Medium-High benefit In practical terms, although the intention of the NPS-UD is to enable as much development capacity as possible in the city centre, we consider that it is appropriate for the design and potential effects of new buildings and/ or alterations and additions to existing buildings to be the subject of assessment.		Retain (Option 1)
	2	Remove (change to P or C activity status)	Would not be limiting development capacity, building height, or density.	Low benefit / high cost		

AUP provisions	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
I209.4.1.(A7) Development that does not comply with Standard I209.6.3 Site intensity	1	Retain	Medium impact Does not directly restrict development capacity.	Low benefit Scale of development is managed through this control, but 2020 resource consent decision means that the use and benefit of the basic FAR standard has significantly decreased.	This control is directly related to I209.6.3. Site Intensity – outcome on whether it is retained or removed is a direct consequence to this standard.	Remove (Option 2) – consequence of I209.6.3. Site Intensity being removed.
	2	Remove	Would not be limiting development capacity, building height, or density. Would theoretically enable a significant increase in development capacity.	Medium benefit Would reduce some complexity and redundancy in the AUP, especially if Standard I209.6.3 was removed from the precinct and the bonus FAR controls were also removed from chapter H8.		
I209.6.1. Building height I209.10.2 and I209.10.3 Precinct plans 2 and 3	1	Retain building height standards as existing.	High impact Does not enable any additional height in the City Centre Zone.	Medium-High benefit. Retains controls which protect amenity and open spaces. There is sufficient plan enabled development capacity in the city centre to meet short-, medium- and long-term demands. Assessment against guiding principles: Protecting sunlight and daylight to open spaces: High. Protecting amenity and retaining the “human scale” of streets: High. Enabling tall slender towers with space between them to allow sunlight, daylight and views to permeate the city centre: Medium Protecting the outcomes achieved by the existing city centre precincts. Low. There is the potential for shading and dominance of most precincts by very tall buildings. Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitematā Harbour. Low. Significant additional height on the periphery of the city centre would undermine the relationship between the city centre and the harbour. Protecting historic heritage in the city centre. Low. Unrestricted height would have adverse impacts on a number of historical heritage areas within the city centre. Fewer, simpler, more targeted controls: Medium, would remove a control, but would need consequential controls to manage additional effects.	Council’s IHP evidence noted that building height, frontage height and site intensity are tied together to manage development. If removed, will need to look at what controls will be in place to manage adverse effects associated with additional building bulk/ form/ scale.	Amend building height standard (Option 3).
	2	Remove all height standards.	Would not be limiting development capacity, building height, or density. Would enable significant increase in height and development capacity.	Low benefits / high cost. The impacts on city centre amenity may mean that removing general building height limits does not enable the city centre to maximise the benefits of intensification. If building height controls are removed, consequential controls would need to be introduced to manage the consequential effects of increased building height, including building dominance, shading and amenity effects within the precinct, notably – on streets and public open spaces. Assessment against guiding principles: Protecting sunlight and daylight to open spaces: Low/ medium. Sites which are already protected by sunlight admission controls would retain that protection, but other open spaces may lose their sunlight and daylight. Protecting amenity and retaining the “human scale” of streets. Low. The amenity of streets would be greatly reduced in some parts of the city centre due to the dominance and shading of the increased height. Enabling tall slender towers with space between them to allow sunlight, daylight and views to permeate the city centre: Medium.	Without this standard, heights in the precinct would be managed by the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• D19 Auckland War Memorial Museum Viewshaft Overlay• H8.6.3. Admission of sunlight to public places• H8.6.7. Railway station building and gardens view protection plane• Appendix 11	

AUP provisions	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
				<p>Protecting local and regionally significant views: Low.</p> <p>Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour. High.</p> <p>Protecting historic heritage in the city centre. High.</p> <p>Promoting climate change resilience: Medium.</p> <p>Fewer, simpler, more targeted controls: Low. Would not simplify any controls.</p>		
	3	<p>Retain but amend existing height controls - amendments to heights in Precinct Plans 2 and 3.</p> <p>Increase building heights across the precinct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 72.5m for sites currently noted as 50m (Scene and Dockside blocks). Retention of existing heights – 18m and 30m (Spark Arena block, i.e. directly adjacent/ behind to Railway Station). Site with 20m height limit and in Sub-precinct A – removal of all height limits, with these being controlled by Special height controls (resulting in heights between 40-44m). 	<p>Medium/ High benefit.</p> <p>Significant increase in building height and development capacity. However, this would still be restricted around some parts of the precinct.</p>	<p>WFUE – Medium/ high benefit.</p> <p>This option enables greater heights and development to occur within the precinct, whilst limiting this around existing heritage and/or open space elements.</p> <p>As per Option 2, consequential controls would need to be introduced to manage the consequential effects of increased building height, including building dominance, shading and amenity effects within the precinct, notably – on streets and public open spaces.</p> <p>Assessment against guiding principles:</p> <p>Protecting sunlight and daylight to open spaces: Low/ medium. Sites which are already protected by sunlight admission controls would retain that protection, but other open spaces may lose their sunlight and daylight.</p> <p>Protecting amenity and retaining the “human scale” of streets. Low. The amenity of streets would be greatly reduced in some parts of the city centre due to the dominance and shading of the increased height.</p> <p>Enabling tall slender towers with space between them to allow sunlight, daylight and views to permeate the city centre: Medium.</p> <p>Protecting local and regionally significant views: Medium. Lower heights around existing scheduled buildings and within the viewshaft area are still proposed.</p> <p>Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour. Medium.</p> <p>Protecting historic heritage in the city centre. Medium. The existing building heights around the historic Railway Station are retained, to ensure that adverse impacts on its heritage values are minimised.</p> <p>Promoting climate change resilience: Medium</p> <p>Fewer, simpler, more targeted controls: Low. Would not simplify any controls.</p>	<p>I209.10.2 and I209.10.3 Precinct plans 2 and 3 will need to be updated due to this change.</p> <p>Additional assessment criteria under I209.8.2.(6) is also proposed, to manage additional heights, particularly in relation to the surrounding environment and any heritage/ open space items.</p> <p>In addition to the controls to manage height noted in Option 2, the following proposed controls within the City Centre Zone provisions help manage building bulk/ form/ scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard H8.6.24A Maximum east-west tower dimension Standard H8.6.25. Building frontage alignment and height Standard H8.6.25A Building setback from boundaries. 	
<p>I209.6.2 Building frontage height</p> <p>I209.10.1 Precinct plan 1</p>	1	Retain frontage height and setback controls as existing.	<p>Medium impact</p> <p>Limits building heights/ development capacity on sites along Mahuhu Crescent/ Tapora Street where this control currently applies.</p>	<p>Medium benefit.</p> <p>This standard seeks to maintain pedestrian amenity and minimise shading around the precinct’s existing open spaces, notably – around Mahuhu ki-te-Rangi Park.</p> <p>With the exception of H8.6.7. Railway station building and gardens view protection plane, there are no controls within the AUP’s operative provisions which limit building frontage and setbacks around any other public open spaces within the precinct or protect sunlight/ daylight to the precinct’s open spaces.</p>	<p>Frontages which this control applies are subject to a minimum frontage of 13m under H8.6.25 and Map H8.11.5.</p>	Amend frontage height controls (Option 3).

AUP provisions	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
				<p>Assessment against guiding principles:</p> <p>Protecting sunlight and daylight to open spaces: Medium. Sites which are already protected by this control or sunlight admission controls would retain that protection, but other open spaces may lose their sunlight and daylight.</p> <p>Protecting amenity and retaining the “human scale” of streets. Low. The amenity of streets would be greatly reduced in some parts of the city centre due to the dominance and shading of the increased height.</p> <p>Enabling tall slender towers with space between them to allow sunlight, daylight and views to permeate the city centre: Medium. Will be enabled as currently through zone provisions.</p> <p>Protecting local and regionally significant views: Medium.</p> <p>Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour. Medium.</p> <p>Protecting historic heritage in the city centre. Medium. Control does not currently apply around any historic heritage places.</p> <p>Promoting climate change resilience: Medium</p> <p>Fewer, simpler, more targeted controls: Low. Would not simplify any controls.</p>		
	2	Remove all frontage height and setback controls.	<p>Low impact</p> <p>Enables further heights and development capacity to occur around Mahuhu Crescent/ Tapora Street.</p>	<p>Low benefit.</p> <p>The removal of this control will result in reduced amenity within the precinct’s open spaces, including loss of sunlight/ daylight and additional shading; particularly if the height of buildings surrounding the open spaces within the precinct was increased. This will also impact on pedestrian amenity at street level.</p> <p>Assessment against guiding principles:</p> <p>Protecting sunlight and daylight to open spaces: Low/ medium. Sites which are already protected by the sunlight admission controls would retain that protection, but most open spaces in the precinct may lose their sunlight and daylight.</p> <p>Protecting amenity and retaining the “human scale” of streets. Low. The amenity of streets would be greatly reduced in some parts of the city centre due to the dominance and shading of the increased height.</p> <p>Enabling tall slender towers with space between them to allow sunlight, daylight and views to permeate the city centre: Medium. Will be enabled as currently through zone provisions.</p> <p>Protecting local and regionally significant views: Medium.</p> <p>Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour. Medium.</p> <p>Protecting historic heritage in the city centre. Medium. Control does not currently apply around any historic heritage places.</p> <p>Promoting climate change resilience: Medium.</p> <p>Fewer, simpler, more targeted controls: Medium, would remove a control, but would need consequential controls to manage additional effects.</p>		
	3	Retain frontage height controls/ Precinct Plan 1; and extend these to	<p>Medium/ High impact.</p> <p>Reduced development capacity on more sites within the precinct</p>	<p>High benefit.</p> <p>This option seeks to retain the outcomes sought by Option 1 in relation to public open spaces and pedestrian amenity. However, it also anticipates that building heights will be increased to</p>	Changes to this standard are consequential to the proposed increases in	

AUP provisions	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
		<p>sites directly adjacent to or opposite an identified open space.</p> <p>Standard header also updated to include references to 'setback'.</p>	<p>surrounding existing open spaces, due to frontage height and setback requirements.</p>	<p>enable more development capacity, and as a consequence, extends the existing frontage control to additional sites surrounding or immediately adjacent to open spaces.</p> <p>Assessment against guiding principles:</p> <p>Protecting sunlight and daylight to open spaces: High.</p> <p>Protecting amenity and retaining the "human scale" of streets: High. Controls introduced to provide 'human scale' to streets, to limit shading and dominance of streets.</p> <p>Enabling tall slender towers with space between them to allow sunlight, daylight and views to permeate the city centre: Medium. Will be enabled as currently through zone provisions.</p> <p>Protecting the outcomes achieved by the existing city centre precincts: High.</p> <p>Protecting local and regionally significant views: High.</p> <p>Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour. High.</p> <p>Protecting historic heritage in the city centre. Medium. Control does not currently apply around any historic heritage places.</p> <p>Promoting climate change resilience: Medium</p> <p>Fewer, simpler, more targeted controls: Low. Control would apply to additional sites.</p>	<p>height/ removal of FAR controls.</p> <p>I209.10.1.Precinct plan 1 will also need to be updated, as a consequence of this change.</p> <p>This control would work in conjunction with the other existing and proposed controls within the zone chapter which relate to sunlight admission, view protection, building setback and street frontage controls (see Option 3 of building height above).</p>	
I209.6.3. Site Intensity	1	<p>Retain site intensity as existing.</p>	<p>Medium impact.</p> <p>Does not enable additional intensity/ development capacity in the precinct.</p>	<p>Low/ medium benefit.</p> <p>Building bulk and scale is currently managed by the site intensity and Floor Area Ratio (FAR) provisions, through restrictions on total gross floor area in a development. The limits on achievable gross floor area has resulted in ensuring that tall buildings are relatively slender, and very few sites in the city centre where a building could take up the whole site area and also extend up to the height limit.</p> <p>However as per the approved resource consent decision BUN60341835 (74-80 Wellesley Street), the use and benefits associated with basic and bonus FAR provisions have significantly decreased. In addition, recent developments generally designed for the maximum total FAR rather than the basic FAR plus bonus FAR.</p> <p>Assessment against guiding principles:</p> <p>Protecting sunlight and daylight to open spaces: Medium.</p> <p>Protecting amenity and retaining the "human scale" of streets: Medium/ High. Building bulk/ scale around open spaces and streets are controlled through limits on floor area.</p> <p>Enabling tall slender towers with space between them to allow sunlight, daylight and views to permeate the city centre: High. Very few developments are able to achieve the site's maximum height, whilst complying with the FAR controls.</p> <p>Protecting local and regionally significant views: High</p> <p>Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour. High.</p> <p>Protecting historic heritage in the city centre. High.</p> <p>Promoting climate change resilience: Medium</p> <p>Fewer, simpler, more targeted controls: Low. Would not simplify any controls.</p>	<p>Relationship between building height, frontage height and site intensity controls, to encourage tall, slender buildings.</p>	<p>Remove all site intensity controls (Option 2).</p>

AUP provisions	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
	2	Remove all site intensity standards.	<p>Low impact.</p> <p>Enables significant development capacity/ intensity across the precinct.</p>	<p>Low/ medium benefit.</p> <p>Reduced complexity for developers, due to the removal of FAR controls and requirements.</p> <p>However, additional controls would need to be introduced to manage effects of scale and/ or unlimited capacity within the city centre.</p> <p>Assessment against guiding principles:</p> <p>Protecting sunlight and daylight to open spaces: Low/ medium. Sites which are already protected by sunlight admission controls would retain that protection, but other open spaces may lose their sunlight and daylight.</p> <p>Protecting amenity and retaining the “human scale” of streets: Low. The amenity of streets would be greatly reduced in some parts of the city centre due to the dominance and shading of the increased building bulk/ scale.</p> <p>Enabling tall slender towers with space between them to allow sunlight, daylight and views to permeate the city centre: Low/ medium. Will be enabled by current provisions as there will be an increase in building bulk.</p> <p>Protecting local and regionally significant views: Medium. Existing views currently provided for by existing controls/viewshafts will retain that protection. However, potential for loss of significant views at ground level due to increase in building intensity.</p> <p>Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour. Significant building bulk along the eastern area of the city centre could undermine the relationship between the city centre and the harbour.</p> <p>Protecting historic heritage in the city centre. Medium. Current control does not increase/ decrease site intensity around heritage buildings.</p> <p>Promoting climate change resilience: Medium.</p> <p>Fewer, simpler, more targeted controls: Medium, would remove a control, but would need consequential controls to manage additional effects.</p>	<p>This option reflects the proposed changes to the FAR provisions within the Business – City Centre Zone, where FAR provisions are proposed for removal.</p> <p>Additional controls within the precinct or zone would need to be introduced to manage building bulk or scale.</p>	
	3	<p>Amend existing site intensity standards.</p> <p>Removal of basic and bonus FAR provisions, but retain a maximum FAR.</p>	<p>Medium impact.</p> <p>Will enable some additional development capacity, however this would still be restricted due to limits on site intensity.</p>	<p>Medium benefit.</p> <p>Reduction in complexity and redundancy in the AUP, particularly if the bonus FAR controls under H8.6.11-H8.6.20 in the Business – City Centre Zone were removed.</p> <p>Easiest option to implement – however, this could result in adverse effects and negative built form outcomes if there are no controls in place to manage the effects of building bulk and form.</p> <p>Assessment against guiding principles:</p> <p>Protecting sunlight and daylight to open spaces: Low/ medium. Sites which are already protected by sunlight admission controls would retain that protection, but other open spaces may lose their sunlight and daylight.</p> <p>Protecting amenity and retaining the “human scale” of streets: Low/ Medium.</p> <p>Low. The amenity of streets would be greatly reduced in some parts of the city centre due to the dominance and shading of the increased building bulk/ scale.</p>	<p>See BUN60341835 (74-80 Wellesley Street) resource consent decision – notes that there is no RMA basis for requiring bonus FAR elements.</p> <p>Changes proposed would be consequential to the outcomes in this resource consent decision.</p>	

AUP provisions	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
				<p>Enabling tall slender towers with space between them to allow sunlight, daylight and views to permeate the city centre: Low/ medium. Will be enabled by current provisions, however, there will be an increase in building bulk.</p> <p>Protecting local and regionally significant views: Medium. Existing views currently provided for by existing controls/viewshafts will retain that protection. However, potential for loss of significant views at ground level due to increase in building intensity.</p> <p>Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour. Significant additional building bulk along the eastern area of the city centre could undermine the relationship between the city centre and the harbour.</p> <p>Protecting historic heritage in the city centre. Medium. Current control does not increase/ decrease site intensity around heritage buildings.</p> <p>Promoting climate change resilience: Medium.</p> <p>Fewer, simpler, more targeted controls: Medium, would remove a control, but would need consequential controls to manage additional effects.</p>		

Summary of table 3: key findings and conclusions

The findings noted that the retention of the building height, frontage height and site intensity controls as currently operative would fail to implement Policy 3(a) of the NPS UD. However, the removal of all 3 controls is likely to result in an unacceptable level of shading, building dominance and amenity on surrounding sites and streets; given that these controls work together to manage built form within the precinct. Should any of these controls be amended or removed to enable further development capacity within the precinct, consequential controls would be required to manage adverse effects.

As such, the following is recommended to implement Policy 3(a) within the Quay Park precinct:

Except for where qualifying matters apply, building height is amended to enable additional height and development capacity across the precinct.

Remove floor area ratio provisions to enable additional site intensity, density of urban form and development capacity.

Building frontage height and setback is introduced to sites adjacent to public open spaces within the precinct, to minimise shading and amenity effects as a result of the height and site intensity changes noted above. Public open spaces within the precincts are also identified on the precinct plans.

In addition to the above, it is also noted that additional built form provisions are proposed to be introduced into the Business City Centre Zone to manage adverse effects, with these provisions applicable to sites within the Quay Park Precinct.

Table 4: Proposed new controls to implement Policy 3(a)

Proposed AUP provision	Where does the control apply?	Does the control limit NPS UD intensification?	Does the control provide for a qualifying matter?	What effects is the control seeking to address/manage?	Related AUP provisions ²
N/A – no new controls introduced.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

² Some abbreviated terms used in this column. Obs: Objectives; Pols: Policies; Matters: Matters of discretion; Criteria: Assessment criteria.

Table 5: Options analysis of proposed new controls to implement Policy 3(a)

Proposed AUP provision	Which QM is being provided for? Where does it apply?	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts of imposing limits	Other considerations	Planner recommendation
N/A – no new controls introduced.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Summary of table 5: key findings and conclusions

No new controls have been introduced into the Quay Park Precinct to implement Policy 3(a).

Although the recommended changes to the height standard and removal of the site intensity control would result in consequential effects within the precinct, these effects would be managed by the existing and proposed zone standards to manage built form, in terms of building street frontage height, setback and tower dimensions. The recommendations in relation to these zone provisions are outlined in the Section 32 evaluation for the Business – City Centre Zone in detail.

3: Qualifying Matters:

The following qualifying matters apply to the provisions within I209 Quay Park Precinct:

- 770(a): a matter of national importance that decision makers are required to recognise and provide for under section 6:
 - 6(f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.
- 770 (f): open space provided for public use, but only in relation to land that is open space.
- 770(j): any other matter – City centre built form controls:
 - Connection with the Waitemata Harbour;
 - General streetscape, character, sense of enclosure and human scale; and
 - Protection of local and regionally significant views, in particular – the Auckland War Memorial Museum viewshaft and Railway Station and Gardens.

3.1: Compatibility / incompatibility of qualifying matters with Policy 3

Table 6: Controls providing for qualifying matters

AUP provisions	Which QM is being provided for?	Where does the QM apply?	How does the QM limit intensification through this control?	What effects are the QMs seeking to address/manage through this control? (Purpose)	Why is this incompatible with Policy 3 intensification?	Recommendation from subject matter experts
I209.6.1. Building height	770(a) protection of historic heritage (s6(f)) 770(f) open space provided for public use 770(j): any other matter: City centre built form controls	Whole precinct, as identified on Precinct Plan I209.10.2 and I209.10.3.	770(a): Matters of national importance – Historic Heritage (s6(f)). 770(f): open space provided for public use. 770(j): any other matter: City centre built form controls.	To manage the height of buildings to achieve Policies I209.3(5) and I209.4(6) of the Quay Park Precinct. Policy I209.3(5) relates to the transition of heights outside of the city centre (whilst allowing for some additional height to provide variation and interest in built form outcomes. Policy I209.4(6) requires heights to be limited in some parts of the precinct to protect views to significant historic heritage places.	Additional building height without appropriate assessment could result in the loss of heritage values and characteristics associated with the Railway Station. The Railway Station is a category A place scheduled for its historical, aesthetic, and its context significance.	Heritage: Retain existing heights for sites directly adjacent to scheduled Railway Station and gardens.
I209.6.2. Building frontage height	770(f) open space provided for public use	Sites identified on Precinct Plan I209.10.1.	770(f): open space provided for public use.	To manage the frontage height of buildings to maintain pedestrian amenity and maintain low building heights around public open space.	Additional building height will result in loss of sunlight and daylight to existing open spaces within the precinct.	Parks, Urban Ngahere, Urban Design: Retain control.

AUP provisions	Which QM is being provided for?	Where does the QM apply?	How does the QM limit intensification through this control?	What effects are the QMs seeking to address/manage through this control? (Purpose)	Why is this incompatible with Policy 3 intensification?	Recommendation from subject matter experts
	77O(j): any other matter: City centre built form controls		77O(j): any other matter: City centre built form controls		As the city centre grows, and as more height and development capacity is enabled, there is a need to ensure that public places have high amenity for users. The existing open spaces need to be high quality to accommodate the existing and future demands.	Add additional public open spaces to Appendix 11, to be protected by this control and avoid adverse effects of intensification on open spaces. Te Taou Reserve and Mahuhu ki-te-Rangi Park are proposed to be included into Appendix 11.

3.2: Options analysis

Identify options

For each control we considered the following basic options:

- Retain the control as-is.
- Remove the control in full.
- Amend the control.
 - Some rules in the activity table were only assessed as retain or remove, as there was not a sensible amendment option to consider.
 - For some controls, multiple “amend” options were considered. This was especially important to address the different ways in which a control might impact the provision of development capacity. E.g. a height limit AND the spatial extent of that limit.

Table 7: Options analysis of controls providing for qualifying matters

AUP provisions	Which QM is being provided for? Where does it apply?	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts of imposing limits	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
I209.6.1. Building height I209.10.2 and I209.10.3 Precinct plans 2 and 3	See Table 6.	1	Retain building height standards as existing.	Medium/ High cost. Development capacity within the precinct, particularly within Sub-Precinct A is limited due to existing building heights.	Medium/ high benefit The existing building height controls reflect the transition in height between the core central business district and the less intensive fringe from the city centre towards Parnell and Grafton Gully. The current height limits also reflect the existing topography within the surrounding area, in particular – the valley and ridgeline landform. The existing building heights have also been carried over from the legacy District Plan to protect the historic heritage values scheduled places within the precinct, in particular – the Railway Station and Gardens. This is a scheduled Category A historic heritage place that has been scheduled for its historical, aesthetic, and its context significance. It is noted that the lower heights within Sub-precinct A were originally proposed as a response to the Auckland Museum view protection plane and the Dilworth Terrace houses view protection plane controls,	The height controls work in conjunction with the site intensity and frontage controls to manage built form within the precinct.	Amend frontage height controls (Option 3).

AUP provisions	Which QM is being provided for? Where does it apply?	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts of imposing limits	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
					<p>which applied within this part of the precinct. The latter has since been removed from this precinct.</p> <p>With regard to open space, there is no indication in the IHP documents on how the currently operative building heights interact with open spaces within the precinct. However, the analysis for H8.6.3 Admission of sunlight to public places shows that the operative building heights do not currently protect daylight and/ or sunlight of public open spaces within the precinct, with shading occurring if development on adjacent sites were to be built to its currently permitted heights.</p>		
		2	Remove building height control in full.	<p>High cost.</p> <p>Increased building height, bulk and scale may result in inappropriate built forms that adversely affect the existing and planned character of the precinct, and create adverse dominance effects on streets and public open spaces.</p>	<p>Low benefit.</p> <p>Increased building height, bulk and scale may result in inappropriate built forms that adversely affect the existing and planned character of the precinct, and create significant adverse dominance effects on streets and public open spaces.</p> <p>The museum viewshaft also cuts through a significant part of the precinct, resulting in building heights between 40-44m on the eastern part of the precinct. This differs from the western part of the precinct, where depending on which sunlight admission controls apply, would enable developments between 115m to over 400m high.</p> <p>With regard to historic heritage, unlimited height within the precinct will lead to the loss of heritage values which the controls are providing for. An increase in building heights immediately around the scheduled Railway Station would also lead to building dominance and a significant impact on its overall historic visual appeal.</p>		
		3	<p>Retain but amend existing height controls - amendments to heights in Precinct Plans 2 and 3.</p> <p>Increase building heights across the precinct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 72.5m for sites currently noted as 50m (Scene and Dockside blocks). • Retention of existing heights – 18m and 30m (Spark Arena block, i.e. directly adjacent/ behind to Railway Station). <p>Site with 20m height limit and in Sub-precinct A – removal of all height</p>	<p>Medium cost.</p> <p>Additional height and development capacity within the precinct is enabled, particularly within the western part of the precinct.. However, development capacity would be limited by other restrictions around open space or heritage areas.</p>	<p>Medium/ high benefit</p> <p>This option enables for additional height and development capacity within the precinct, whilst taking into account consequential controls introduced to manage effects associated with design and built form, particularly in relation to the surrounding streets, the precinct's relationship with the harbour, open spaces and historic heritage places.</p> <p>Important visual connections within the precinct will continue to be maintained – notably – the Auckland War Memorial Museum and Railway Station and gardens through height limits (up to special height controls).</p> <p>The retention of the existing building heights around the Railway Station and its extent of place is proposed, as a means of protecting its scheduled aesthetic values (as noted in Option 1).</p> <p>With regard to open spaces, additional shading will occur due to the increase in building heights, which would impact on the amenity within these spaces. Noting the relationship between building heights and the building frontage height and setback control, the latter</p>	<p>Built form will be managed by the precinct's building frontage and setback controls, in addition to the following zone controls to manage effects due to building bulk, form and scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H8.6.3 Admission of sunlight to public places • Standard H8.6.24A Maximum east-west tower dimension • Standard H8.6.25. Building frontage alignment and height • Standard H8.6.25A Building setback from boundaries. 	

AUP provisions	Which QM is being provided for? Where does it apply?	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts of imposing limits	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
			limits, with these being controlled by Special height controls (resulting in heights between 40-44m).		control would need to be amended, to manage built form effects on the amenity of public open spaces as a result of the height increase.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> H8.6.7 Railway station building and gardens view protection plane 	
I209.6.2 Building frontage height I209.10.1 Precinct Plan 1	See Table 6.	1	Retain frontage height and setback controls as existing.	<p>Medium cost</p> <p>Building frontage height is restricted on these sites where this control currently applies, due to the frontage and setback requirements.</p>	<p>Medium benefit</p> <p>This control seeks to maintain low building heights around public open spaces, to minimise shading and sunlight within these areas and provide amenity for open space users.</p> <p>However, this control (as currently operative) is site specific surrounding the northern side of Mahuhu ki te Rangi Park. Other sites directly adjacent to or surrounding open spaces within the precinct have a minimum frontage height of 13m and no maximum or minimum height, with the exception of the open space at 78B The Strand, where no maximum or minimum frontage heights apply.</p> <p>In terms of built form, this control also provides a degree of pedestrian amenity and 'human scale' at street level within its specific area, through the provision of low building heights.</p>		Amend (Option 3)
		2	Remove all frontage height and setback controls.	<p>Low cost.</p> <p>No impact on building height.</p>	<p>Low benefit</p> <p>Significant additional height and development capacity is being enabled within the precinct. This could result in adverse effects on public open spaces within the precinct, notably – additional shading and sunlight. Should this control be removed, additional controls to manage building form around open spaces would need to be introduced within the precinct.</p> <p>With regard to built form, the sites where this control does not apply are subject to the proposed maximum frontage height controls within the City Centre Zone to minimise adverse amenity effects at street level, including shading, building dominance, loss of human scale and wind effects.</p>	If removed, H8.6.25. Building frontage alignment and height would need to apply to all sites within the precinct.	
		3	Retain frontage height controls/ Precinct Plan 1; and extend these to sites directly adjacent to or opposite an identified open space.	<p>Medium cost</p> <p>Building frontage height is restricted on these sites where this control currently applies, due to the frontage and setback requirements.</p>	<p>Medium/ high benefit</p> <p>This option extends this control around public open spaces along The Strand, with the maximum frontage height and building setback seeking to minimise amenity effects within these areas. Amenity within Mahuhu ki te Rangi Park continues to be retained, within this control extended to sites located west of this open space.</p> <p>Precinct Plan 1 is also updated to show where this control would apply; and highlights the location of public open spaces within the precinct. The matters of discretion and assessment criteria have also been updated, to enable an assessment on the effects on the vitality and amenity of streets and open spaces.</p> <p>With regard to streetscape, this control ensures that streets retain sunlight/daylight and are not too adversely affected by shading and dominance of extremely tall buildings. This works in conjunction with</p>	This option is consequential to the changes to I209.6.1. Building height, which enable significant building height within the precinct.	

AUP provisions	Which QM is being provided for? Where does it apply?	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts of imposing limits	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
					the built form controls within the City Centre Zone to protect and retain the “human scale” of streets.		

Summary of table 7: key findings and conclusions

The recommendations above seek to retain but amend the provisions which provide for qualifying matters, notably – the building height and building frontage height. These controls seek to protect important built form outcomes within the precinct, including outcomes in relation to the protection of historic heritage and amenity of open spaces; and they are summarised below:

The building height restrictions around the Railway Station and gardens would ensure that the historic heritage values associated with this place are protected.

As a consequential amendment, the frontage height and setback control has been extended to sites immediately surrounding public open spaces, to protect sunlight, daylight and amenity within these areas. It is also noted that Te Taou Reserve and Mahuhu ki-te-Rangi Park are proposed to be included into Appendix 11, with this control applying in conjunction with Standard H8.6.3.

These controls work in conjunction with the Business – City Centre’s recommended built form provisions, to manage adverse effects, with these provisions applicable to sites within the Quay Park Precinct.

Proposed Plan Change 78 (PC 78) to the Unitary Plan Operative in part: I210 Queen Street Valley Precinct

I210 Queen Street Valley Precinct Analysis

Purpose: Pre-1940s buildings largely define the precinct. A key purpose of the precinct is to maintain the integrity and coherence of the built form and architecture as this is important to retaining the precinct’s streetscape character. The precinct has a strong pedestrian focus and provides important connections from the city centre to the harbour’s edge.

Zoning: Business – City Centre Zone

Changes to the precinct required by MDRS: Not a relevant residential zone

Changes to the precinct required by NPS-UD: Policy 3 (a) changes (as much development capacity as possible)

Precinct provisions affected by MDRS or Policy 3	Outcome	Area subject to provision
I210.4.(A2)	Retain	Whole precinct
I210.4.(A3)	Retain	Buildings in the precinct constructed prior to 1 January 1940.
I210.6.1. Frontage height and setback	Amend	Sites as shown on I210.10.1 Queen Street Valley Precinct: Precinct plan 1 - Frontage types

EVALUATION REPORT

This report is prepared as part of the evaluation required by Section 32 and Sections 77P, 77Q and 77R of the Resource Management Act 1991 (‘the Act’) for proposed Plan Change 78 (PC 78) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP).

The background to and objectives of PC 78 are discussed in the overview report, as is the purpose and required content of section 32 and 77P, 77Q and 77R evaluations. Sections 77O, 77P, 77Q, 77R relate to evaluation steps for urban non-residential zones.

This report discusses the implications of applying qualifying matters within the [I205 Downtown West] Precinct to the implementation of policy 3 of the NPS-UD. It does not discuss MDRS as the City Centre Zone is not a relevant residential zone.

An existing qualifying matter is a qualifying matter referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) that is operative in the relevant district plan when the IPI is notified. There may also be “other” qualifying matters, in terms of sec 77O(j) (for non-residential zones) that are not covered by the qualifying matters listed in 77O (a) to (i).

The Council may make the relevant building height or density requirements under policy 3 less enabling of development in relation to an area within a relevant urban non-residential

zone only to the extent necessary to accommodate 1 or more of the qualifying matters listed in 77O.

Integrated evaluation for (a) to (i) qualifying matters

There are no controls in the Queen Street Valley Precinct which provide for 77O(a) to (i) qualifying matters.

Integrated evaluation for ‘other’ qualifying matters

For the purposes of PC 78, the evaluation of ‘other’ qualifying matters has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32, 77J / 77P and 77L / 77R requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be large.

This evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

‘Other’ qualifying matters sections 77I/O(j) and sites affected	77O(j) Character buildings in City Centre zone and Queen St Valley Precinct.	77O(j): City Centre built form controls.
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	I210.4.(A2) I210.4.(A3) I210.6.1. Frontage height and setback	I210.4.(A2) I210.6.1. Frontage height and setback
Sites to which the qualifying matter relates	Whole precinct Buildings in the precinct constructed prior to 1 January 1940. Sites as shown on I210.10.1 Queen Street Valley Precinct: Precinct plan 1 - Frontage types	Whole precinct Sites as shown on I210.10.1 Queen Street Valley Precinct: Precinct plan 1 - Frontage types
Effects managed	Building scale, dominance, design and visual effects on heritage buildings, character, public open space and on pedestrian amenity and access. The effects of building demolition on built form and streetscape character.	Building scale, dominance, design and visual effects on public open space and on pedestrian amenity and access.
Applies to non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3	City Centre Zone	City Centre Zone
Specific characteristics	The precinct has demolition controls and frontage and setback controls in	The Precinct’s frontage and setback requirements

that makes level of development provided by Policy 3 inappropriate	order to maintain the integrity and coherence of the built form and architecture, including pre-1940s buildings. This is important to retaining the precinct's streetscape character.	(which restrict development capacity) contribute to its streetscape, character, enclosure, and sense of human scale.
Why inappropriate with level of development provided in light national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD	Increased height and bulk of building may adversely affect the special character buildings such that their prominence in the precinct is lost thereby reducing the character of the precinct overall.	Increasing built form bulk and height and the inappropriate location of built form may adversely affect the carefully planned and curated character and streetscape of the precinct which achieves its purpose
Range of options to achieve the greatest heights and densities as provided for by Policy 3 while managing specific characteristics	Retain, remove or amend the provisions	Retain, remove or amend the provisions
Costs of applying QM	Reduced development capacity.	Reduced development capacity.
Benefits	Protection of Special Character buildings and their context	Protect the human scale and pedestrian amenity of the precinct.
Conclusion	Amend – remove references to zone site intensity provisions.	Amend – remove references to zone site intensity provisions.

**Proposed Plan Change 78 (PC78) to the Unitary Plan Operative in part
I211 Viaduct Harbour Precinct**

I211 Viaduct Harbour Precinct Analysis

Purpose: To provide for a scale of development and a range of uses which reflect and complement the Viaduct Harbour as a special place of character within the city centre.

Zoning: Business - City Centre, Coastal – General Coastal Marine

Changes to the precinct required by MDRS: Not applicable – not a relevant residential zone (as per s2 of the Act)

Changes to the precinct required by NPS-UD: Policy 3(a) - building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification.

Precinct provisions affected by MDRS or Policy 3	Outcome	Area subject to provision
Rule I211.4.1 (A34) New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for – RD activity status	Retained	Whole precinct
Rule I211.4.1 (A36) Development that does not comply with Standard I211.6.10(1)-(3) or I211.6.11(1)-(2) – NC activity status	Retained	Whole precinct, controls identified by I211.10.5 Viaduct Harbour: Precinct plan 5 - Pedestrian accessways and viewshafts
I211.6.4. Building height	Retained	Whole precinct; sites adjacent to Tepid Baths (86-102 Customs Street West) and the Auckland Harbour Board Workshops (former)(204 Quay Street)
I211.6.5. Site intensity	Retained	Whole precinct
I211.6.6. Building coverage	Retained	Waitemata Plaza and Market Square - I211.10.2 Viaduct Harbour: Precinct plan 2 - Wharves and open spaces
I211.6.8. Special yard A	Retained	I211.10.5 Viaduct Harbour: Precinct plan 5 - Pedestrian accessways and viewshafts
I211.6.9. Special yard B	Retained	I211.10.5 Viaduct Harbour: Precinct plan 5 - Pedestrian accessways and viewshafts
I211.6.10. Public spaces and accessways	Retained	I211.10.5 Viaduct Harbour: Precinct plan 5 - Pedestrian accessways and viewshafts
I211.6.11. Viewshafts	Retained	I211.10.5 Viaduct Harbour: Precinct plan 5 - Pedestrian accessways and viewshafts

section 32 and sec77K / sec 77Q alternative process for existing qualifying matters / Section 32 and section 77J / 77L “other” qualifying matter

EVALUATION REPORT

This report is prepared as part of the evaluation required by Section 32 and Sections 77K / 77Q and Sections 77J and 77L of the Resource Management Act 1991 (‘the Act’) for proposed Plan Change 78 (PPC78) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP).

The background to and objectives of PC78 are discussed in the overview report, as is the purpose and required content of section 32 and 77I / 77Q and 77J / L and 77P/R evaluations:

- Sec 77I / 77J/L relates to evaluation steps for relevant residential zones
- Sec 77O / 77P/R relates to evaluation steps for urban non-residential zones.

This report discusses the implications of applying qualifying matters within the I211 Viaduct Harbour Precinct to the medium density residential standards (MDRS) of Schedule 3A of the RMA and/or the implementation of policy 3 of the NPS-UD.

An existing qualifying matter is a qualifying matter referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) that is operative in the relevant district plan when the IPI is notified. There may also be “other” qualifying matter, in terms of sec 77I(j) that are not covered by the qualifying matters listed in 77I (a) to (i) (or 77O for non-residential zones).]

The Council may make the MDRS and the relevant building height or density requirements under policy 3 less enabling of development in relation to an area within a relevant residential zone or urban non-residential zone only to the extent necessary to accommodate 1 or more of the qualifying matters listed in 77I or 77O.

Integrated evaluation for (a) to (i) qualifying matters

For the purposes of PPC78, the evaluation of qualifying matters referred to in section 77I or 77O (a) to (i) has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32 and 77K / 77Q requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be medium due to the potential impacts on enabled development capacity while accommodating matters of national significance.

This section 32/77K/Q evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

Qualifying matters in section 77I/O(a) to (i)	77O(a) (s6(d) - the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes, and rivers)	77O(a) (s6(f) - the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development)	77O(f) open space provided for public use
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule I211.4.1 (A34) New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for • Rule I211.4.1 (A36) Development that does not comply with Standard I211.6.10(1)-(3) or I211.6.11(1)-(2) • I211.6.8. Special yard A • I211.6.9. Special yard B • I211.6.10. Public spaces and accessways • I211.6.11. Viewshafts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule I211.4.1 (A34) New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for • I211.6.4. Building height • I211.6.5. Site intensity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule I211.4.1 (A34) New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for • Rule I211.4.1 (A36) Development that does not comply with Standard I211.6.10(1)-(3) or I211.6.11(1)-(2) • I211.6.4. Building height • I211.6.5. Site intensity • I211.6.6. Building coverage • I211.6.8. Special yard A • I211.6.9. Special yard B • I211.6.10. Public spaces and accessways • I211.6.11. Viewshafts
Effects managed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public access to the coastal marine area. • Amenity values of the publicly accessible parts coastal marine area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Values of identified historic heritage sites (Categories A and B places) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity values and useability of public open spaces • Amenity values of the publicly accessible parts of the coastal marine area
Applies to residential / non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3 and / or MDRS	Business – City Centre zone	Business – City Centre zone	Business – City Centre zone
How qualifying matter changes level of development enabled by Policy 3 and / or MDRS	<p>Controls limit development capacity by reducing area where new buildings can locate e.g. in areas affected by pedestrian yard, pedestrian accessway and viewshaft controls.</p> <p>RD requirement creates cost in terms of time and money by requiring resource consents for new development within the precinct.</p>	<p>Building height and site intensity control limits total developable floor area within the Viaduct Harbour precinct, reducing potential development capacity.</p> <p>RD requirement creates cost in terms of time and money by requiring resource consents for new development within the precinct.</p>	<p>Combination of building bulk controls, building coverage over public spaces, pedestrian yard/accessway and viewshaft controls limits potential development capacity within the Viaduct Harbour precinct.</p> <p>Costs in terms of time and money due to requiring resource consents for new development within the precinct.</p>
Conclusion	See table above (multiple provisions retained)	See table above (multiple provisions retained)	See table above (multiple provisions retained)

Integrated evaluation for section 77J and 77L ‘other’ qualifying matters

For the purposes of PPC78, the evaluation of ‘other’ qualifying matters has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32 and 77J / 77L requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be medium due to the potential impacts on enabled development capacity while accommodating matters of national significance. This section 32/ 77J and L evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

‘Other’ qualifying matters sections 77O(j) and sites affected	77O(j) any other matter – City centre built form	77O(j) any other matter – City centre built form: Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour	77O(j) any other matter – City centre built form: Protecting amenity and retaining the “human scale” of streets
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule I211.4.1 (A34) New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for • Rule I211.4.1 (A36) Development that does not comply with Standard I211.6.10(1)-(3) or I211.6.11(1)-(2) • I211.6.4. Building height • I211.6.5. Site intensity • I211.6.6. Building coverage • I211.6.8. Special yard A • I211.6.9. Special yard B • I211.6.10. Public spaces and accessways • I211.6.11. Viewshafts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule I211.4.1 (A34) New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for • Rule I211.4.1 (A36) Development that does not comply with Standard I211.6.10(1)-(3) or I211.6.11(1)-(2) • I211.6.4. Building height • I211.6.5. Site intensity • I211.6.6. Building coverage • I211.6.8. Special yard A • I211.6.9. Special yard B • I211.6.10. Public spaces and accessways • I211.6.11. Viewshafts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule I211.4.1 (A34) New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for • Rule I211.4.1 (A36) Development that does not comply with Standard I211.6.10(1)-(3) or I211.6.11(1)-(2) • I211.6.4. Building height • I211.6.5. Site intensity • I211.6.6. Building coverage
Effects managed	<p>Effects of building bulk and form on the values of the precinct. Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low-medium rise character relative to the street - Prominent waterfront location - Complement height of adjoining parts of the City Centre 	<p>Effects of building bulk and form on the city centre’s relationship with the Waitemata Harbour. Particularly by;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognising the unique, ‘intimate’ character of the precinct area – especially in relation to the water’s edge - Requiring transition of form and heights sympathetic to the landform and hydrology of this part of the waterfront in relation to the wider city centre - Low-medium rise character relative to the street - Enhancing pedestrian access to the coastal marine area via public spaces and accessways 	<p>Effects of building bulk and form on the amenity values of adjoining streets and public open spaces. Particularly, to minimise bulk and visual dominance from affecting the sense of ‘human scale’ streets.</p>
Applies to residential / non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3 and / or MDRS	Business – City Centre zone	Business – City Centre zone	Business – City Centre zone

<p>Specific characteristics that makes level of development provided by the MDRS or Policy 3 inappropriate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low-medium rise built form which creates an intimate waterfront pedestrian environment; • Built form which enhances the amenity and accessibility of public spaces adjacent to the water's edge ; and • Built form which transitions from lower height waterfront to more intensive development towards the core of the city centre. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low-medium rise built form which creates an intimate waterfront environment; and • Built form which enhances the amenity and accessibility of public spaces adjacent to the water's edge • Built form which provides views connecting pedestrians with the Waitemata Harbour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low-medium rise built form which enhances the pedestrian environment
<p>Why inappropriate with level of development provided in light national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD</p>	<p>Increasing height and bulk will create potential adverse dominance effects which will compromise the values of the precinct.</p>	<p>Increasing height and bulk will create potential adverse dominance effects which compromise the intimate character of the precinct area and thereby its unique relationship with the Waitemata Harbour.</p> <p>Increasing building bulk and removal of access controls will adversely affect the physical access to the coastal marine area as well as the sense of connection provided by high-quality public spaces adjacent to the water.</p>	<p>Increasing height and bulk will create potential adverse dominance effects on adjoining streets and public spaces.</p>
<p>Range of options to achieve the greatest heights and densities permitted by the MDRS or as provided for by Policy 3 while managing specific characteristics</p>	<p>Retain, remove or amend the provisions</p>		
<p>Costs of applying QM</p>	<p>The qualifying matter's controls limit the potential capacity for residential and commercial development within the Viaduct Harbour precinct.</p> <p>Rule I211.4.1 (A34) creates cost in terms of money and time by requiring resource consents for new buildings.</p> <p>Taken together, the controls will impact the competitive operation of land and development markets within this part of the city centre. Likewise, economic costs from unrealisable development potential in a desirable location.</p>		
<p>Benefits</p>	<p>Protect the values of the precinct.</p>	<p>Protect the city's relationship with the Waitemata Harbour. This includes within the precinct as well as the wider city.</p> <p>A high-quality water-front environment will have broader social, cultural and economic benefits. This includes tourism opportunities, providing for cultural</p>	<p>Protect the amenity of streets and public spaces within the precinct.</p> <p>Contributing to the social wellbeing of residents and users of streets and public spaces within the precinct by creating a human scale urban environment.</p>

		and social uses and activities, and waterfront recreational spaces for all Aucklanders.	
Conclusion	See table above (multiple conclusions)	See table above (multiple conclusions)	See table above (multiple conclusions)

Appendix 1: 211 Viaduct Harbour precinct – options analysis

1: Relevant objectives

The key objectives that apply to I211 Viaduct Precinct are:

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

B2.2. Urban growth and form: B2.2.1. Objectives

(1) A quality compact urban form that enables all of the following:

- (a) a higher-quality urban environment;
- (b) greater productivity and economic growth;
- (c) better use of existing infrastructure and efficient provision of new infrastructure;
- (d) improved and more effective public transport;
- (e) greater social and cultural vitality;
- (f) better maintenance of rural character and rural productivity; and
- (g) reduced adverse environmental effects.

(3) Sufficient development capacity and land supply is provided to accommodate residential, commercial, industrial growth and social facilities to support growth.

(5) Enable higher residential intensification:

- (a) in and around centres;
- (b) along identified corridors; and
- (c) close to public transport, social facilities (including open space) and employment opportunities.

B2.3. A quality built environment: B2.3.1. Objectives

(1) A quality built environment where subdivision, use and development do all of the following:

- (a) respond to the intrinsic qualities and physical characteristics of the site and area, including its setting;
- (b) reinforce the hierarchy of centres and corridors;
- (c) contribute to a diverse mix of choice and opportunity for people and communities;
- (d) maximise resource and infrastructure efficiency;
- (e) are capable of adapting to changing needs; and
- (f) respond and adapt to the effects of climate change.

B2.4. Residential growth: B2.4.1. Objectives

(3) Land within and adjacent to centres and corridors or in close proximity to public transport and social facilities (including open space) or employment opportunities is the primary focus for residential intensification.

B2.5. Commercial and industrial growth: B2.5.1. Objectives

(1) Employment and commercial and industrial opportunities meet current and future demands.

(2) Commercial growth and activities are primarily focussed within a hierarchy of centres and identified growth corridors that supports a compact urban form.

B2.7. Open space and recreation facilities: B2.7.1. Objectives

(1) Recreational needs of people and communities are met through the provision of a range of quality open spaces and recreation facilities.

(2) Public access to and along Auckland's coastline, coastal marine area, lakes, rivers, streams and wetlands is maintained and enhanced.

(3) Reverse sensitivity effects between open spaces and recreation facilities and neighbouring land uses are avoided, remedied or mitigated.

H8. Business – City Centre Zone

H8.2. Objectives: General objectives for all centres, Business – Mixed Use Zone, Business – General Business Zone and Business – Business Park Zone

- (1) A strong network of centres that are attractive environments and attract ongoing investment, promote commercial activity, and provide employment, housing and goods and services, all at a variety of scales.
- (2) Development is of a form, scale and design quality so that centres are reinforced as focal points for the community.
- (3) Development positively contributes towards planned future form and quality, creating a sense of place.

H8.2. Objectives: Business – City Centre Zone objectives

- (7) The city centre is an attractive place to live, learn, work and visit with 24hour vibrant and vital business, education, entertainment and retail areas.
- (8) Development in the city centre is managed to accommodate growth and the greatest intensity of development in Auckland and New Zealand while respecting its valley and ridgeline form and waterfront setting.
- (9) The distinctive built form, identified special character and functions of particular areas within and adjoining the city centre are maintained and enhanced.

I211 Viaduct Harbour Precinct

I211.2 Objectives

- (1) An attractive public waterfront and world-class visitor destination that is recognised for its distinctive character, quality buildings, public open spaces, recreational opportunities, community and cultural facilities and events.
- (2) Maintain and enhance the Viaduct Harbour land and adjacent water space as a special place of character in the City Centre and retain significant views of the water and areas within and adjacent to the precinct.
- (3) A safe, convenient and interesting environment, which optimises pedestrian and cycling use and improves connectivity within the precinct and to adjacent areas of the City.
- (4) An attractive place for business and investment is provided for marine and port activity, maritime passenger operations and commercial business activity which benefit from a high amenity waterfront location.
- (5) Adverse effects arising from activities and development are avoided, remedied or mitigated, in an integrated manner across mean high water springs.
- (6) A mix of activities is encouraged including residential, business, tourism and events that create a vibrant environment.
- (7) Maintain the residential character and amenity in Sub-precinct C as an attractive place for permanent residents

2: Giving effect to Policy 3

NPS UD requires that:

In relation to tier 1 urban environments, regional policy statements and district plans enable:

- (a) in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification.

In the city centre this is being done primarily through enabling additional height and density of urban form in the City Centre Zone.

With regards to the precincts, each control has been reviewed individually to understand whether it limits intensification and to see where there are possibilities to increase height and/or density of urban form in city centre precincts (while still providing for qualifying matters).

2.1: Review of operative controls

Review parameters

- Review undertaken by assessing rules and standards against the Policy 3(a) requirement to enable “building heights and density of urban form”. This is assumed to refer to the building envelope, rather than to internal density. For this reason the following activities and standards have been assessed as **not** limiting NPS UD intensification:
 - “Use” activity controls
 - Controls which manage the internal arrangements of buildings, e.g. dwelling size, floor-to-floor height.
 - Activities with a Permitted or Controlled activity status
 - Use conversion controls
- Controls which do not limit NPS UD intensification were not further assessed, as they are out of scope of the IPI.
- Once controls (rules or standards) were identified as limiting intensification, further analysis was done holistically – also looking at the related objectives, policies, matters of discretion, assessment criteria, maps, appendices, etc.

Table 1: Assessment of rules in activity table (I211.4)

AUP provision	Activity status	Where does the control apply?	Does the control limit NPS UD intensification?	Does the control provide for a qualifying matter?	What effects is the control seeking to address/manage?	Related AUP provisions ¹
I211.4.1 (A34) New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for	RD	Whole of precinct	Development dependent. Requires assessment of proposed development against matters which (depending on context and building design) may result in restrictions to development capacity.	No	Matters of discretion refers to underlying H8 Business – City Centre Zone addresses effects of building design (H8.8.1(1)) and effects on public access, navigation, and safety.	N/A
I211.4.1 (A36) Development that does not comply with Standard I211.6.10(1)-(3) [Public spaces and accessways] or I211.6.11(1)-(2) [Viewshafts]	NC	Whole of precinct	Development dependent. Requires assessment of proposed development against matters which (depending on context and building design) may result in restrictions to development capacity.	Yes	See assessment of Standards I211.6.10 and I22.6.11.	N/A

Table 2: Assessment of standards (I211.6)

AUP provision	Where does the control apply?	Does the control limit NPS UD intensification?	Does the control provide for a qualifying matter?	What effects is the control seeking to address/manage?	Related AUP operative provisions
I211.6.4. Building height	Whole of precinct	Yes. Restricts development capacity by limiting building height.	Yes. S77O(a)(f)(j): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection of identified historic heritage buildings Maintain the values of open space provided for public use Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata harbour Protecting amenity and retaining human scale of streets 	To manage the height of buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to maintain low-medium rise, intimate character the Viaduct Harbour precinct, to maintain the precinct's connection to public spaces/water's edge; and to respect the heritage values of specifically identified buildings. 	I211.8.1.(12) Matters of discretion I211.8.2.(12) Assessment criteria
I211.6.5. Site intensity	Whole of precinct	Yes. Restricts development capacity by limiting gross floor area as a ratio to site size.	Yes. S77O(a)(f)(j): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection of identified historic heritage buildings Maintain the values of open space provided for public use Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata harbour Protecting amenity and retaining human scale of streets 	To manage the scale, form and intensity of development to maintain the character and amenity of the precinct.	I211.8.1.(13) Matters of discretion I211.8.2.(13) Assessment criteria
I211.6.6. Building coverage	Open spaces within precinct: Waitemata Plaza and Market Square	Yes. Restricts development capacity by limiting building/structure coverage on identified open spaces.	Yes. S77O(f): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain the values of open space provided for public use 	To manage the scale of development within Waitemata Plaza and Market Square to maintain their open space character.	I211.8.1.(14) Matters of discretion I211.8.2.(14) Assessment criteria
I211.6.8. Special yard A	Water's edge near Halsey Street as identified in Precinct plan 5 – Pedestrian accessways and viewshafts	Yes. Restricts development capacity by restricting building location on the identified sites.	Yes. S77O(a)(f)(j): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain and enhance public access to the coast Maintain the values of open space provided for public use Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata harbour. 	To ensure that buildings do not restrict public access along the water's edge	I211.8.1.(16) Matters of discretion I211.8.2.(16) Assessment criteria

¹ Some abbreviated terms used in this column. Obs: Objectives; Pols: Policies; Matters: Matters of discretion; Criteria: Assessment criteria.

AUP provision	Where does the control apply?	Does the control limit NPS UD intensification?	Does the control provide for a qualifying matter?	What effects is the control seeking to address/manage?	Related AUP operative provisions
I211.6.9. Special yard B	Area between Customs St West and Waitemata Plaza, as identified in Precinct plan 5 – Pedestrian accessways and viewshafts	Yes. Restricts development capacity by restricting building location on the identified sites.	Yes. S770(a)(f)(j): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain and enhance public access to the coast Maintain the values of open space provided for public use Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata harbour. 	To maintain unobstructed pedestrian access between Customs Street West and the water's edge in Waitemata Plaza.	I211.8.1.(16) Matters of discretion I211.8.2.(16) Assessment criteria
I211.6.10. Public spaces and accessways	Parts of Market Square, as identified in Precinct plan 5 – Pedestrian accessways and viewshafts	Yes. Restricts development capacity by restricting building location on the identified sites.	Yes. S770(a)(f)(j): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain and enhance public access to the coast Maintain the values of open space provided for public use Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata harbour. 	To manage public spaces and accessways to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enable diverse uses while maintain access to the water's edge and avoid adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity Ensure continue uses of commercial marine and port/maritime activities Encourage pedestrian and cycling permeability and accessibility Enable and maintain a network of public open spaces along the water's edge 	N/A
I211.6.11. Viewshafts	As identified in Precinct plan 5 – Pedestrian accessways and viewshafts	Yes. Restricts development capacity by restricting building location on the identified sites.	Yes. S770(j): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata harbour. 	To maintain significant views of the water and adjacent areas within, and to, the Viaduct Harbour precinct.	N/A

3: Qualifying Matters:

3.1: Compatibility / incompatibility of qualifying matters with Policy 3

Table 6: Controls providing for qualifying matters

AUP provisions	Which QM is being provided for?	Where does the QM apply?	How does the QM limit intensification through this control?	What effects are the QMs seeking to address/manage through this control? (Purpose)	Why is this incompatible with Policy 3 intensification?	Recommendation from subject matter experts
I211.4.1 (A34) New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for	770(a) – maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area lakes and rivers 770(a) – the protection of historic heritage 770(f) – open space provided for public use 770(j) - protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour 770(j) – protecting amenity and “human scale” of streets	Whole of precinct	Development dependent. Requires assessment of proposed development against matters which (depending on context and building design) may result in restrictions to development capacity.	To manage the effects of building form, scale and dominance, and relevantly matters of discretion which includes effects on public access.	Additional intensification without appropriate assessment will lead to the loss of the qualities and characteristics that the precinct seeks to maintain for developments which not complying with the relevant standards.	N/A
I211.4.1 (A36) Development that does	770(a) – maintenance and enhancement of public access to and	Whole of precinct	Development dependent. Requires assessment of proposed	To manage public spaces and accessways to:	Additional intensification without appropriate assessment will lead to	N/A

AUP provisions	Which QM is being provided for?	Where does the QM apply?	How does the QM limit intensification through this control?	What effects are the QMs seeking to address/manage through this control? (Purpose)	Why is this incompatible with Policy 3 intensification?	Recommendation from subject matter experts
not comply with Standard I211.6.10(1)-(3) or I211.6.11(1)-(2)	along the coastal marine area lakes and rivers 770(f) – open space provided for public use 770(j) - protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour		development against matters which (depending on context and building design) may result in restrictions to development capacity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable diverse uses while maintain access to the water’s edge and avoid adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity • Ensure continue uses of commercial marine and port/maritime activities • Encourage pedestrian and cycling permeability and accessibility • Enable and maintain a network of public open spaces along the water’s edge • To maintain significant views of the water and adjacent areas within, and to, the Viaduct Harbour precinct. 	the loss of the qualities and characteristics that the precinct seeks to maintain for developments which not complying with the relevant standards.	
I211.6.4. Building height	770(a) – the protection of historic heritage 770(f) – open space provided for public use 770(j) - protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour 770(j) – protecting amenity and “human scale” of streets	Whole of precinct	Yes. Restricts development capacity by limiting building height.	To manage the height of buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to maintain low-medium rise, intimate character the Viaduct Harbour precinct, • to maintain the precinct’s connection to public spaces/water’s edge; and • to respect the heritage values of specifically identified buildings. 	Additional height will lead to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the loss of identified historic heritage values • the loss of amenity for, and values of, identified open spaces • the loss of physical, and visual connections between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour • the loss of amenity to people using the streets and open spaces within the precinct. 	
I211.6.5. Site intensity	770(a) – the protection of historic heritage 770(f) – open space provided for public use 770(j) - protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour 770(j) – protecting amenity and “human scale” of streets	Whole of precinct	Yes. Restricts development capacity by limiting gross floor area as a ratio to site size.	To manage the scale, form and intensity of development to maintain the character and amenity of the precinct.	Additional site intensity will enable increased building bulk which will lead to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the loss of identified historic heritage values • the loss of amenity for, and values of, identified open spaces • the loss of physical, and visual connections between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour • the loss of amenity to people using the streets and open spaces within the precinct. 	
I211.6.6. Building coverage	770(f) – open space provided for public use	Open spaces within precinct: Waitemata Plaza and Market Square	Yes. Restricts development capacity by limiting building/structure coverage on identified open spaces.	To manage the scale of development within Waitemata Plaza and Market Square to maintain their open space character.	Additional building coverage will lead to loss of open space values	

AUP provisions	Which QM is being provided for?	Where does the QM apply?	How does the QM limit intensification through this control?	What effects are the QMs seeking to address/manage through this control? (Purpose)	Why is this incompatible with Policy 3 intensification?	Recommendation from subject matter experts
I211.6.8. Special yard A	770(a) – maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area lakes and rivers 770(f) – open space provided for public use 770(j) - protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour	Water’s edge near Halsey Street as identified in Precinct plan 5 – Pedestrian accessways and viewshafts	Yes. Restricts development capacity by restricting building location on the identified sites.	To ensure that buildings do not restrict public access along the water’s edge	Enabling development in this area will lead to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the loss of existing access to the water’s edge the loss of open space provided for public use the loss of physical, and visual connections between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour 	
I211.6.9. Special yard B	770(a) – maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area lakes and rivers 770(f) – open space provided for public use 770(j) - protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour	Area between Customs St West and Waitemata Plaza, as identified in Precinct plan 5 – Pedestrian accessways and viewshafts	Yes. Restricts development capacity by restricting building location on the identified sites.	To maintain unobstructed pedestrian access between Customs Street West and the water’s edge in Waitemata Plaza.	Enabling development in this area will lead to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the loss of existing access to the water’s edge the loss of open space provided for public use the loss of physical, and visual connections between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour 	
I211.6.10. Public spaces and accessways	770(a) – maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area lakes and rivers 770(f) – open space provided for public use 770(j) - protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour	Parts of Market Square, as identified in Precinct plan 5 – Pedestrian accessways and viewshafts	Yes. Restricts development capacity by restricting building location on the identified sites.	To manage public spaces and accessways to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enable diverse uses while maintain access to the water’s edge and avoid adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity Ensure continue uses of commercial marine and port/maritime activities Encourage pedestrian and cycling permeability and accessibility Enable and maintain a network of public open spaces along the water’s edge 	Enabling development in the identified areas will lead to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the loss of existing access to the water’s edge the loss of open space provided for public use the loss of physical, and visual connections between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour 	
I211.6.11. Viewshafts	770(j) - protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour	As identified in Precinct plan 5 – Pedestrian accessways and viewshafts	Yes. Restricts development capacity by restricting building location on the identified sites.	To maintain significant views of the water and adjacent areas within, and to, the Viaduct Harbour precinct.	Additional building coverage will lead to loss of existing visual and physical connections between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour.	

3.2: Options analysis

Identify options

For each control we considered the following basic options:

- Retain the control as-is
- Remove the control in full.

- Amend the control
 - Some rules in the activity table were only assessed as retain or remove, as there was not a sensible amendment option to consider.
 - For some controls, multiple “amend” options were considered. This was especially important to address the different ways in which a control might impact the provision of development capacity. E.g. a height limit AND the spatial extent of that limit.

Table 7: Options analysis of controls providing for qualifying matters

AUP provisions	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
I211.4.1 (A34) New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for I211.4.1 (A36) Development that does not comply with Standard I211.6.10(1)-(3) or I211.6.11(1)-(2)	1	Retain	Low impact The intention is still to enable as much height and development capacity in the City Centre Zone as possible	Medium - High benefit. In practical terms, we consider that it is appropriate for the design and potential effects of new buildings to be the subject of assessment given the proximity of the precinct to the waters edge and the importance of associated amenity and access values.	Relies upon matters of discretion and assessment criteria. Approach is consistent with the underlying zone matters and provides for additional	Retain
	2	Remove (change to P or C activity status)	Would not be limiting development capacity, building height, or density.	Low benefit / high cost.		
I211.6.4. Building height	1	Retain	High impact Does not enable any additional height in the precinct	Medium – High benefit. This control in addition with site intensity, provide the key mechanisms to manage built form outcomes in the precinct. The built form outcomes are intrinsically linked to the identified qualifying matters by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enabling medium-rise perimeter block (including some small block building forms) typologies that create an intimate street environment and a clear definition of the street edge. This character is highly valuable as it sets the Viaduct precinct apart from the central city environment and reflects its proximity to the water’s edge. • The height and form of the building types in the viaduct and supports the relationship between the city centre to the Waitemata by maintaining views and public access supported by public open spaces. • Recognising that the current building stock is early 2000’s. Likely development sites include the car park building next to the tepid baths and the car park building north of Lucy Lane. It is considered that maintaining the current building forms and heights on these sites would be valuable in maintaining the character attributes of the precinct. Enabling additional building height in close proximity to the Tepid Baths would be difficult due to the heritage values. 	Building height and site intensity work together to manage building bulk and scale.	Retain
	2	Remove	No impact Will enable significant increase in height and development capacity	Low benefit / high cost. The impacts on city centre amenity may mean that removing building height limits does not enable the city centre to maximise the benefits of intensification. Increasing height and bulk will create potential dominance effects which will compromise the values of the precinct. Maintain the values of open space provided for public use. Medium. Significant increase in build heights and bulk can impact the values of adjacent open spaces, including dominance, wind and daylight effects. Note that Special Yard A, Waitemata Plaza and Market Square as north facing spaces helps to ameliorate some effects. Protection of identified historic heritage buildings. Low. Increases in building height and bulk is likely to have potential adverse effects on identified historic heritage- namely the two category A buildings – Auckland Harbour Board Workshops and Tepid Baths. This means these buildings have outstanding values and are regionally significant; risks to values		

AUP provisions	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
				<p>include overshadowing their presence and importance within the precinct/wider city fabric.</p> <p>Protecting amenity and retaining the “human scale” of streets. Low. The amenity of streets would be greatly reduced in the precinct due to the dominance and shading of the increased height.</p> <p>Protecting the outcomes achieved by the existing city centre precincts. Low. Tall buildings will compromise the precinct’s intimate street environment with clear street edges. This character is important given the precinct’s proximity to the water’s edge and contribute to enhancing pedestrian access to the coast and in enhancing the spaces’ values as a public space on the water’s edge.</p> <p>Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour. Low. Additional height will adversely affect the relationship between the city centre and the harbour, within the precinct as well as the wider city centre. The precinct’s location directly on the waterfront mean height will have more impact on this connection.</p>		
	3	Retain but increase allowable height to 40m.	Medium impact	<p>Low - Medium benefit / medium – high cost</p> <p>This option provides a compromise in attempting to provide for additional development capacity while addressing identified qualifying matters values. The additional height will provide some increased capacity enabled by additional height, potential effects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain the values of open space provided for public use. Medium. Even with this degree of increase in build heights, potential dominance, wind and daylight effects will still affect adjacent open space/public accessways. This also relates to increases beyond “human scale” spaces as a possible threshold. • Protection of identified historic heritage buildings. Low. This degree of increase in build heights it is still considered to be incompatible with the values of identified historic heritage- namely the two category A buildings – Auckland Harbour Board Workshops and Tepid Baths. As previously noted, these buildings have outstanding values and are regionally significant. • Protecting amenity and retaining the “human scale” of streets. Low. The amenity of streets would be greatly reduced in the precinct due to the dominance and shading of the increased height. • Protecting the outcomes achieved by the existing city centre precincts. Low - medium. Taller buildings will still compromise the precinct’s intimate street environment given the height translate to approximately 10-11 storeys – which creates an urban environment that is more vertical and greater than “human scale”. The lost of this character is important given the precinct’s proximity to the water’s edge and is important in enhancing pedestrian access to the coast and in the spaces’ values as a public space on the water’s edge. • Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour. Low - medium. Additional height will adversely affect the relationship between the city centre and the harbour, within the precinct as well as the wider city centre. The precinct’s location directly on the waterfront mean height will have more impact on this connection. 		
I211.6.5. Site intensity	1	Retain	High impact Does not enable any additional height in the precinct	Medium – High benefit.	Building height and site intensity work together to	Retain

AUP provisions	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
				<p>This control in addition with building height, provide the key mechanisms to manage built form outcomes in the precinct. The built form outcomes are intrinsically linked to the identified qualifying matters by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enabling medium-rise perimeter block (including some small block building forms) typologies that create an intimate street environment and a clear definition of the street edge. This character is highly valuable as it sets the Viaduct precinct apart from the central city environment and reflects its proximity to the water's edge. • The height and form of the building types in the viaduct and supports the relationship between the city centre to the Waitemata by maintaining views and public access supported by public open spaces. • Recognising that the current building stock is early 2000's. Likely development sites include the car park building next to the tepid baths and the car park building north of Lucy Lane. It is considered that maintaining the current building forms and heights on these sites would be valuable in maintaining the character attributes of the precinct. Enabling additional building height in close proximity to the Tepid Baths would be difficult due to the heritage values. 	manage building bulk and scale.	
	2	Remove	<p>No impact</p> <p>Will enable significant increase in gross floor area and development capacity</p>	<p>Low benefit / high cost.</p> <p>The impacts on city centre amenity may mean that removing site intensity does not enable the city centre to maximise the benefits of intensification. Increasing site intensity and height will result in building bulk and scale which create potential dominance effects that compromises the values of the precinct.</p> <p>Maintain the values of open space provided for public use. Medium. Significant increase in build heights and bulk can impact the values of adjacent open spaces, including dominance, wind and daylight effects. Note that Special Yard A, Waitemata Plaza and Market Square as north facing spaces help to ameliorate some effects.</p> <p>Protection of identified historic heritage buildings. Low. Increases in building height and bulk is likely to have potential adverse effects on identified historic heritage- namely the two category A buildings – Auckland Harbour Board Workshops and Tepid Baths. This means these buildings have outstanding values and are regionally significant; risks to values include overshadowing their presence and importance within the precinct/wider city fabric.</p> <p>Protecting amenity and retaining the “human scale” of streets. Medium. The amenity of streets would be reduced in the precinct due to the dominance and shading of the increased bulk.</p> <p>Protecting the outcomes achieved by the existing city centre precincts. Low. Increased building bulk and scale will compromise the precinct's intimate street environment with clear street edges. This character is important given the precinct's proximity to the water's edge and contribute to enhancing pedestrian access to the coast and in enhancing the spaces' values as a public space on the water's edge.</p> <p>Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour. Low. Additional bulk and scale will adversely affect the relationship with the Waitemata Harbour by changing the planned unique character of the precinct.</p>		
	3	Retain in the northern most parts of the precinct	<p>Medium impact</p>	<p>Low - Medium benefit / medium – high cost</p> <p>This option provides a compromise in attempting to provide for additional development capacity while addressing identified qualifying matters values. Removing parts of the control</p>		

AUP provisions	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
				<p>away from the coast will provide some increased capacity enabled by additional gross floor area, potential effects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain the values of open space provided for public use. Medium – High. This will ensure the control continues to manage potential dominance, wind and daylight effects on adjacent open space/public accessways. • Protection of identified historic heritage buildings. Medium - High. This will ensure the control continues to manage potential effects on the values of identified historic heritage- namely the two category A buildings – Auckland Harbour Board Workshops and Tepid Baths. • Protecting amenity and retaining the “human scale” of streets. Low. The amenity of streets would still be reduced in the precinct due to the dominance and shading of the increased height. The transition from parts of the precinct with the control to parts without the control can result in streetscapes which are partially human scale before abruptly becoming no dominated by adjoining buildings. • Protecting the outcomes achieved by the existing city centre precincts. Low-Medium. Site intensity and building height controls work in tandem to manage building bulk and scale. Partial removal of the site intensity control can result in transitions which compromise precinct’s outcomes relating to transitioning and connecting with the water’s edge. Likewise, increased intensity will also impact the precinct’s intimate character, which is important to the precinct’s unique proximity to the water’s edge. • Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour. Low - medium. Additional bulk and an abrupt transition of urban form can adversely affect the relationship between the city centre and the harbour, within the precinct as well as the wider city centre. The precinct’s location directly on the waterfront mean height will have more impact on this connection. 		
I211.6.6. Building coverage	1	Retain	<p>Low impact</p> <p>Does not enable any additional height in the precinct, but only in very spatial limited parts of the precinct i.e. Identified public open spaces</p>	<p>High benefit.</p> <p>Retains control which protect the functional needs of Waitemata Plaza and Market Square as key public open spaces in the precinct. The limited reduction in capacity as a result of protecting and enhancing these identified open spaces is insignificant in the context of the significant plan enabled development capacity in the wider city centre zone;</p> <p>Protecting sunlight and daylight to open spaces: High.</p> <p>Maintain the values of open space provided for public use: High.</p>		Retain
	2	Remove	<p>No impact</p> <p>Will enable limited increase in development capacity through more enabling building locations</p>	<p>Low benefit / high cost.</p> <p>Removal of the control will significantly compromise the sense of openness while providing for appropriate uses (e.g., still enables 20 per cent building coverage). The lost of these values will result in little increase in capacity in the context of the wider city centre zone given this relates to 80 per cent of discrete (i.e., Waitemata Plaza and Market Square) spatial extent of the precinct.</p>		
	3	Retain control but increase allowable building coverage	<p>Low impact</p>	<p>Low benefit / high cost.</p> <p>The increase in capacity is minor – particularly with only partial increases in building coverage.</p>		
I211.6.8. Special yard A	1	Retain	<p>Low impact</p>	<p>High benefit.</p>		Retain

AUP provisions	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
			Does not enable any additional height in the precinct, but only in very spatial limited parts of the precinct i.e. parts along the water's edge identified as Special yard A	Retains control which protect the public access along north facing parts of the water's edge. The limited reduction in capacity as a result of protecting and enhancing the area identified as Special yard A to maintain public access along the water's edge, is insignificant in the context of the significant plan enabled development capacity in the wider city centre zone; Protecting sunlight and daylight to open spaces: High. Maintain the values of open space provided for public use: High. Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour. High		
	2	Remove	No impact Will enable limited increase in development capacity through more enabling building locations	Low benefit / high cost. Development have already given effect to the outcome of the control. Removal will compromise existing public access to the water's edge and degrade the amenity of the public space. The loss of the public access will result in little increase in capacity in the context of the wider city centre zone given this relates to a small portion of the precinct.		
	3	Retain but reduce extent of yard	Low impact	Low benefit / high cost. The increase in capacity is minor – particularly with only partial increases in building coverage. Likewise, development have already occurred in accordance with the control.		
I211.6.9. Special yard B	1	Retain	Low impact Does not enable any additional height in the precinct, but only in very spatial limited parts of the precinct i.e. parts of the precinct between Waitemata Plaza and Customs St West	High benefit. Retains control which protect the public connection/accessibility between Waitemata Plaza along the water's edge, with Customs Street West. The limited reduction in capacity as a result of protecting and enhancing the area identified as Special yard A to maintain public access along the water's edge, is insignificant in the context of the significant plan enabled development capacity in the wider city centre zone; Protecting sunlight and daylight to open spaces: High. Maintain the values of open space provided for public use: High. Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour. High		Retain
	2	Remove	No impact Will enable limited increase in development capacity through more enabling building locations	Low benefit / high cost. Development have already given effect to the outcome of the control. Removal will compromise existing public access to the water's edge and degrade the amenity of the public space, particularly loss of amenity for Waitemata Plaza. The loss of the public access will result in little increase in capacity in the context of the wider city centre zone given this relates to a small portion of the precinct.		
	3	Retain but reduce extent of yard	Low impact	Low benefit / high cost. The increase in capacity is minor – particularly with only partial increases in building coverage. Likewise, development have already occurred in accordance with the control.		
I211.6.10. Public spaces and accessways	1	Retain	Low impact Does not enable any additional height in the precinct, but only in very spatial limited parts of the precinct i.e. Market Square	High benefit. Retains controls which pedestrian access through Market Square. The limited reduction in capacity as a result of protecting and enhancing public open space/access to the coast is insignificant in the context of the significant plan enabled development capacity in the wider city centre zone;		Retain

AUP provisions	Option #	Description of option	Impact that limiting development capacity, building height, or density (as relevant) will have on the provision of development capacity	Benefits / broader impacts	Interactions with other controls / consequential changes.	Planner recommendation
				Protecting sunlight and daylight to open spaces: High. Protecting the relationship between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour. High.		
	2	Remove	No impact Will enable limited increase in development capacity through more enabling building locations on Market Square	Low benefit / high cost. Development have already given effect to the outcome of the control. Removal will compromise existing public access to the water's edge and degrade the amenity of the public space, particularly amenity of, and access through, Market Square. The loss of the public access will result in little increase in capacity in the context of the wider city centre zone given this relates to a small portion of the precinct.		
	3	Retain in part	Low impact	Low benefit / high cost. The increase in capacity is minor – particularly with only partial increases in building coverage. Likewise, development have already occurred in accordance with the control.		
I211.6.11. Viewshafts	1	Retain	Low impact Does not enable any additional height in the precinct, but only in very spatial limited parts of the precinct i.e. Identified public open spaces	High benefit. Retains controls which protect visual and physical connections between the city centre and the Waitemata Harbour. The limited reduction in capacity as a result of protecting and enhancing connections to the water's edge is insignificant in the context of the significant plan enabled development capacity in the wider city centre zone.		Retain
	2	Remove	No impact Will enable limited increase in development capacity through more enabling building locations	Low benefit / high cost. Development have already given effect to the outcome of the control. Removal will compromise, the now established, visual and physical connections between the city centre and the water's edge. The loss of this relationship will result in little increase in capacity in the context of the wider city centre zone given this relates to a small portion of the precinct. Pakenham Street East compromise the majority of the landward viewshafts further reducing the potential increase in terms of development capacity.		
	3	Retain in part	Low impact	Low benefit / high cost. The increase in capacity is minor – particularly with only partial increases in building coverage. Likewise, development have already occurred in accordance with the control.		
	4	Introduce additional viewshafts	High impact	Medium benefit / high cost Introducing additional viewshafts will provide minor, marginal benefits given the existing identified viewshafts and development that have already occurred in accordance with the precinct outcomes. This is also against the intention of the NPS-UD insofar this may potentially further reduce development capacity than what is currently allowable.		

Proposed Plan Change 78 (PC 78) to the Unitary Plan Operative in part: I212 Victoria Park Market Precinct

I212 Victoria Park Market Precinct Analysis

Purpose: The purpose of the Victoria Park Market Precinct is to maintain the heritage values and the existing distinctive character of the market area.

Zoning: City Centre Zone

Changes to the precinct required by MDRS: Not a relevant residential zone

Changes to the precinct required by NPS-UD: Policy 3 (a) changes (as much development capacity as possible)

Precinct provisions affected by MDRS or Policy 3	Outcome	Area subject to provision
I212.4.(A2)	Retain	Whole precinct
I212.4.(A3)	Retain	As shown on I212.10.1 Victoria Park Markets Precinct: Precinct plan 1
I212.4.(A4)	Retain	As set out in Standards I212.6.2(1)-(2), I212.6.3(1), I212.6.4(1) and I212.6.5(1)
I212.6.2. Building height	Retain	As shown on I212.10.1 Victoria Park Markets Precinct: Precinct plan 1
I212.6.3. Courtyard	Retain	As shown on I212.10.1 Victoria Park Markets Precinct: Precinct plan 1
I212.6.4. Adelaide Street Viewshaft	Retain	As shown on I212.10.1 Victoria Park Markets Precinct: Precinct plan 1, Figure I212.6.4.1 and Figure I212.6.4.2.
I212.6.5. Building setback - Building platform 4	Retain	As shown on I212.10.1 Victoria Park Markets Precinct: Precinct plan 1

EVALUATION REPORT

This report is prepared as part of the evaluation required by Section 32 and Sections 77P, 77Q and 77R of the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act') for proposed Plan Change 78 (PC 78) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP).

The background to and objectives of PC 78 are discussed in the overview report, as is the purpose and required content of section 32 and 77P, 77Q and 77R evaluations. Sections 77O, 77P, 77Q, 77R relate to evaluation steps for urban non-residential zones.

This report discusses the implications of applying qualifying matters within the I212 Victoria Park Market Precinct to the implementation of policy 3 of the NPS-UD. It does not discuss MDRS as the City Centre Zone is not a relevant residential zone.

An existing qualifying matter is a qualifying matter referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) that is operative in the relevant district plan when the IPI is notified. There may also be “other” qualifying matters, in terms of sec 77O(j) (for non-residential zones) that are not covered by the qualifying matters listed in 77O (a) to (i).

The Council may make the relevant building height or density requirements under policy 3 less enabling of development in relation to an area within a relevant urban non-residential zone only to the extent necessary to accommodate 1 or more of the qualifying matters listed in 77O.

Integrated evaluation for (a) to (i) qualifying matters

For the purposes of PC 78, the evaluation of qualifying matters referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32 and 77K / 77Q requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be large.

This evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

Qualifying matters in section 77O(a) to (i)	77 (a) Historic Heritage (s6(f))
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	I212.4.(A2) I212.4.(A3) I212.4.(A4) I212.6.2. Building height I212.6.3. Courtyard I212.6.4. Adelaide Street Viewshaft I212.6.5. Building setback - Building platform 4
Effects managed	Protect Historic heritage and its context
Applies to non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3	City Centre Zone
How qualifying matter changes level of development enabled by Policy 3	Reduced height restriction of building locations. Reduced availability of development land due to viewshaft.
Conclusion	Retain

Proposed Plan Change 78 (PC78) to the Unitary Plan Operative in part: I214. Wynyard Precinct

I214. Wynyard Precinct Analysis

Purpose: The purpose of the Wynyard Precinct is to provide for the comprehensive and integrated redevelopment of this large brownfields area while enabling the continued operation of marine industry and hazardous industry.

Zoning: Business – City Centre Zone, Open Space - Conservation Zone

Changes to the precinct required by MDRS: Not a relevant residential zone

Changes to the precinct required by NPS-UD: Policy 3 (a) changes (as much development capacity as possible)

Precinct provisions affected by Policy 3	Outcome	Area subject to provision
I214.4.(A48) Substantial demolition or any demolition of the front facade of a special character building within the Wynyard precinct identified on Business – City Centre Zone – Map H8.11.1	Retain	Sites shown on Business – City Centre Zone – Map H8.11.1.
I214.4.(A51) New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings (not otherwise provided for as a permitted activity)	Retain	Whole precinct
I214.4.(A53) Subdivision	Retain	Whole precinct
I214.4.(A58) Development that does not comply with I214.6.7(1) Maximum site intensity	Retain	Whole precinct, as shown on Wynyard: Precinct plan 2 - Basic floor area ratio and I214.10.3 Wynyard: Precinct plan 3 - Maximum floor area ratio.
I214.4.(A59) Development that does not comply with I214.6.7(2) for the building footprint of an identified special character building	Retain	Sites shown on Business – City Centre Zone – Map H8.11.1.
I214.4.(A60) A lane that does not meet the requirements of I214.6.12(5) Lanes and view shafts	Retain	As shown on I214.10.6 Wynyard: Precinct plan 6 - Indicative lanes and viewshafts
I214.4.(A61) Development that does not comply with I214.6.6. Building height	Retain	Whole precinct, as shown on I214.10.4 Wynyard: Precinct plan 4 – Basic height and I214.10.5 Wynyard: Precinct plan 5 – Maximum height

I214.6.6. Building height	Retain	Whole precinct, as shown on I214.10.4 Wynyard: Precinct plan 4 – Basic height and I214.10.5 Wynyard: Precinct plan 5 – Maximum height
I214.6.7. Maximum site intensity	Retain	Whole precinct, as shown on I214.10.2 Wynyard: Precinct plan 2 - Basic floor area ratio and I214.10.3 Wynyard: Precinct plan 3 - Maximum floor area ratio
I214.6.8. Building frontage alignment and height	Retain	As set out in standard
I214.6.12. Lanes and view shafts	Retain	As shown on I214.10.6 Wynyard: Precinct plan 6 - Indicative lanes and viewshafts

EVALUATION REPORT

This report is prepared as part of the evaluation required by Section 32 and Sections Sections 77P, 77Q and 77R of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“the Act”) for proposed Plan Change 78 (PC 78) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP).

The background to and objectives of PC 78 are discussed in the overview report, as is the purpose and required content of section 32 and 77P, 77Q and 77R evaluations. Sections 77O, 77P, 77Q, 77R relate to evaluation steps for urban non-residential zones.

This report discusses the implications of applying qualifying matters within the I214 Wynyard Precinct to the implementation of policy 3 of the NPS-UD. It does not discuss MDRS as the City Centre Zone is not a relevant residential zone.

An existing qualifying matter is a qualifying matter referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) that is operative in the relevant district plan when the IPI is notified. There may also be “other” qualifying matters, in terms of sec 77O(j) (for non-residential zones) that are not covered by the qualifying matters listed in 77O (a) to (i).

The Council may make the relevant building height or density requirements under policy 3 less enabling of development in relation to an area within a relevant urban non-residential zone only to the extent necessary to accommodate 1 or more of the qualifying matters listed in 77O.

Integrated evaluation for (a) to (i) qualifying matters

For the purposes of PC 78, the evaluation of qualifying matters referred to in section 77 I or 77O (a) to (i) has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32 and 77K / 77Q requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be large.

This evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

Qualifying matters in section 770(a) to (i)	770 (f): open space provided for public use, but only in relation to land that is open space.
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	I214.4.(A51) I214.4.(A58) I214.4.(A60) I214.4.(A61) I214.6.6. Building height I214.6.7. Maximum site intensity I214.6.8. Building frontage alignment and height I214.6.12. Lanes and view shafts
Effects managed	Amenity values and useability of public open spaces Amenity values of the publicly accessible parts of the coastal marine area
Applies to non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3	Business – City Centre zone
How qualifying matter changes level of development enabled by Policy 3.	Combination of site intensity, open space and lane controls limits potential development capacity within the Wynyard Precinct. Costs in terms of time and money due to requiring resource consents for new development within the precinct.
Conclusion	Retain

Integrated evaluation for 'other' qualifying matters

For the purposes of PC 78, the evaluation of 'other' qualifying matters has been undertaken in an integrated way that combines sections 32, 77J / 77P and 77L / 77R requirements.

The scale and significance of the issues is assessed to be large.

This evaluation report will continue to be refined in response to any consultation feedback provided to the council, and in response to any new information received.

'Other' qualifying matters sections 77I/O(j) and sites affected	77O(j) Character buildings	77O(j) City centre built form controls	77O(j) City centre built form controls – local views
Relevant precinct provisions supporting QMs	I214.4.(A48) I214.4.(A51) I214.4.(A59)	I214.4.(A51) I214.4.(A53) I214.4.(A58) I214.4.(A60) I214.4.(A61) I214.6.6. Building height I214.6.7. Maximum site intensity I214.6.8. Building frontage alignment and height I214.6.12. Lanes and view shafts	I214.4.(A60) I214.6.12. Lanes and view shafts
Sites to which the qualifying matter relates	Sites shown on Business – City Centre Zone – Map H8.11.1. Whole precinct	Whole precinct As shown on Wynyard: Precinct plan 2 - Basic floor area ratio and I214.10.3 Wynyard: Precinct plan 3 - Maximum floor area ratio. As shown on I214.10.4 Wynyard: Precinct plan 4 – Basic height and I214.10.5 Wynyard: Precinct plan 5 – Maximum height As shown on I214.10.6 Wynyard: Precinct plan 6 - Indicative lanes and viewshafts	As shown on I214.10.6 Wynyard: Precinct plan 6 - Indicative lanes and viewshafts
Effects managed	Effects of demolition and development on special character buildings.	Effects of development scale, form and intensity on public open space, streets, the harbour, pedestrian amenity and pedestrian permeability.	Effects of development scale, form and intensity on public open space, pedestrian amenity and pedestrian permeability.
Applies to non-residential zone in relation to Policy 3	Business – City Centre zone	Business – City Centre zone	Business – City Centre zone
Specific characteristics that makes level of development provided by Policy 3 inappropriate	The precinct has demolition and development controls in order to maintain the integrity of special character buildings. These buildings are an important part of the history of the precinct area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low-medium rise built form which creates an intimate waterfront pedestrian environment; • Built form which enhances the amenity and accessibility of public spaces adjacent to the water's edge ; and • Built form which transitions from lower height waterfront to more intensive development towards the core of the city centre. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built form which enhances the amenity and accessibility of public spaces adjacent to the water's edge • Built form which provides views connecting pedestrians with the Waitemata Harbour

Why inappropriate with level of development provided in light national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD	Increased height and bulk of building may adversely affect the special character buildings such that their prominence in the precinct is lost thereby reducing the character of the precinct overall.	Increasing height and bulk (and the removal of lane controls) will create potential adverse dominance effects which compromise the open spaces, fine urban grain, pedestrian permeability and character of the precinct area and thereby its physical and visual connections with the Waitemata Harbour.	Increasing building bulk and removal of view protections will adversely affect the sense of connection between the precinct and the harbour.
Range of options to achieve the greatest heights and densities as provided for by Policy 3 while managing specific characteristics	Retain, remove or amend the provisions	Retain, remove or amend the provisions	Retain, remove or amend the provisions
Costs of applying QM	Reduced development capacity.	Reduced development capacity.	Reduced development capacity.
Benefits	Protection of Special Character buildings and their context	<p>Protect the city's relationship with the Waitemata Harbour. This includes within the precinct as well as the wider city.</p> <p>A high-quality water-front environment will have broader social, cultural and economic benefits. This includes tourism opportunities, providing for cultural and social uses and activities, and waterfront recreational spaces for all Aucklanders.</p> <p>Protect the amenity of streets and public spaces within the precinct.</p> <p>Contributing to the social wellbeing of residents and users of streets and public spaces within the precinct by creating a human scale urban environment.</p>	Protect the city's relationship with the Waitemata Harbour. This includes within the precinct as well as the wider city.
Conclusion	Retain	Retain	Retain