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Terms of Reference

Responsibilities

This committee guides the physical development and growth of Auckland through a focus on land use planning, housing and the appropriate provision of infrastructure and strategic projects associated with these activities. Key responsibilities include:

- Relevant regional strategy and policy
- Infrastructure strategy and policy
- Unitary Plan
- Spatial plans
- Plan changes to operative plans
- Housing policy and projects
- Special Housing Areas
- City centre development
- Tamaki regeneration
- Built heritage
- Urban design
- Environmental matters relating to the committee’s responsibilities
- Acquisition of property relating to the committee’s responsibilities and within approved annual budgets
- Initiatives of the following CCOs that have a significant impact upon the implementation of the Auckland Plan and other relevant plans, policies and strategies:
  - Panuku Development Auckland
  - Auckland Transport
  - Watercare Services Limited
  - Regional Facilities Auckland (stadia)

Powers

(i) All powers necessary to perform the committee’s responsibilities, including:
   (a) approval of a submission to an external body
   (b) establishment of working parties or steering groups.

(ii) The committee has the powers to perform the responsibilities of another committee, where it is necessary to make a decision prior to the next meeting of that other committee.

(iii) The committee does not have:
   (a) the power to establish subcommittees
   (b) powers that the Governing Body cannot delegate or has retained to itself (section 2).
**Exclusion of the public – who needs to leave the meeting**

**Members of the public**

All members of the public must leave the meeting when the public are excluded unless a resolution is passed permitting a person to remain because their knowledge will assist the meeting.

**Those who are not members of the public**

**General principles**

- Access to confidential information is managed on a “need to know” basis where access to the information is required in order for a person to perform their role.
- Those who are not members of the meeting (see list below) must leave unless it is necessary for them to remain and hear the debate in order to perform their role.
- Those who need to be present for one confidential item can remain only for that item and must leave the room for any other confidential items.
- In any case of doubt, the ruling of the chairperson is final.

**Members of the meeting**

- The members of the meeting remain (all Governing Body members if the meeting is a Governing Body meeting; all members of the committee if the meeting is a committee meeting).
- However, standing orders require that a councillor who has a pecuniary conflict of interest leave the room.
- All councillors have the right to attend any meeting of a committee and councillors who are not members of a committee may remain, subject to any limitations in standing orders.

**Independent Māori Statutory Board**

- Members of the Independent Māori Statutory Board who are appointed members of the committee remain.
- Independent Māori Statutory Board members and staff remain if this is necessary in order for them to perform their role.

**Staff**

- All staff supporting the meeting (administrative, senior management) remain.
- Other staff who need to because of their role may remain.

**Local Board members**

- Local Board members who need to hear the matter being discussed in order to perform their role may remain. This will usually be if the matter affects, or is relevant to, a particular Local Board area.

**Council Controlled Organisations**

- Representatives of a Council Controlled Organisation can remain only if required to for discussion of a matter relevant to the Council Controlled Organisation.
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1  **Apologies**

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2  **Declaration of Interest**

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

3  **Confirmation of Minutes**

That the Planning Committee:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 2 October 2018 as a true and correct record.

4  **Petitions**

At the close of the agenda no requests to present petitions had been received.

5  **Public Input**

Standing Order 7.7 provides for Public Input. Applications to speak must be made to the Governance Advisor, in writing, no later than **one (1) clear working day** prior to the meeting and must include the subject matter. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders. **A maximum of thirty (30) minutes** is allocated to the period for public input with **five (5) minutes** speaking time for each speaker.

5.1  **Public Input - Auckland Waterfront Consortium - redevelopment proposal of Auckland Waterfront**

**Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report**

1. Dave Wigmore and Michael Sage, Auckland Waterfront Consortium and Bill Loutit from Simpson Grierson will be in attendance to present their proposal regarding the redevelopment of Auckland Waterfront.

**Summary of the proposal provided by the Auckland Waterfront Consortium**

2. The Auckland Waterfront Consortium and Simpson Grierson will present a proposal for the redevelopment of the Auckland Waterfront between Queens and Bledisloe Wharves to include an iconic multi-purpose fully enclosed stadium seating 50,000 people and expandable to 65,000 to 70,000.

3. The stadium project will be at no cost to the tax or rate payer and will include redeveloping Eden Park.

4. Included in the development proposal is a mixed-use development of Bledisloe Wharf to include 2,500 apartments, offices for 6,000 worker, hotels, recreational uses and open space. Provision for cultural and tourism related activities are also being considered.
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) thank Dave Wigmore and Michael Sage, Auckland Waterfront Consortium and Bill Loutit from Simpson Grierson for their attendance and presentation.

5.2 Public Input - Panmure Community Action Group - Unlock Panmure and the potential sale of the Panmure Library and Community Hall site at Pilkington Road

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Keith Sharp will speak to the committee on behalf of the Panmure Community Action Group about Panuku Development Auckland’s plans for Panmure (Unlock Panmure) and the potential for the sale of the Panmure Library and Community Hall site at Pilkington Road.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the public input from Keith Sharp on behalf of the Panmure Community Action Group about Unlock Panmure and the potential for the sale of the Panmure Library and Community Hall site at Pilkington Road and thank him for attending.

6 Local Board Input

Standing Order 6.2 provides for Local Board Input. The Chairperson (or nominee of that Chairperson) is entitled to speak for up to five (5) minutes during this time. The Chairperson of the Local Board (or nominee of that Chairperson) shall wherever practical, give one (1) day’s notice of their wish to speak. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders.

This right is in addition to the right under Standing Order 6.1 to speak to matters on the agenda.

6.1 Local Board Input - Papakura Local Board - Metropolitan Centre Plan

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Papakura Local Board Chair, Brent Catchpole will be present to address the committee on the Papakura Metropolitan Centre Plan outlining the board’s vision for Papakura.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the local board input from Brent Catchpole, Chair Papakura Local Board regarding the Papakura Metropolitan Centre Plan and the board’s vision for Papakura.
7 Extraordinary Business

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

(a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and

(b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-

(i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and

(ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.”

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

(a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-

(i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and

(ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”
Regional Public Transport Plan

File No.: CP2018/19234

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To inform the Planning Committee about the preparation of the draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2018-2028, the key focus areas and the timeline for public engagement and approval.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The RPTP (Regional Public Transport Plan) lays out a 10-year plan for public transport (PT) in Auckland. It identifies all PT services in the Auckland region that are integral to the PT network and that receive financial support from Auckland Transport (AT). It also describes some exempt services that are considered integral to the PT network. It contains the policies, projects and key focus areas that will guide the development of the PT network over the next 10 years, with a focus on the next 3 years of funded projects.

3. It is proposed to release the draft RPTP for public submissions from 19 November 2018, with a final version approved in the first quarter of 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) note that the draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2018-2028 will be released for public submissions from 19 November 2018 with a decision on the final version in the first quarter of 2019.

b) note that the feedback provided by the Planning Committee in the workshop held on 30 October 2018 will be considered for the final version of the plan.

c) note that in February 2019, Auckland Transport will come back to the Planning Committee with the revised plan for the committee’s feedback, prior to Auckland Transport Board’s approval of the plan.

Horopaki / Context
4. The RPTP is a statutory document and is required to be reviewed every 3 years under the Land Transport Management Act. This draft RPTP includes the PT network changes that were foreshadowed in 2015 version, such as the successful rollout of the New Bus Network. In the next 3 years, the key focus areas of the draft RPTP are:

- consolidating the patronage growth from the Rapid and Frequent network improvements (such as improving reliability with extending bus priority on key arterial corridors),
- improving first and last leg access (e.g. cycling, walking, park and ride, wayfinding, etc.) to PT,
- Maori responsiveness (e.g. in the design of PT interchanges and te reo destination announcements) and;
- taking advantage of emerging technology (such as apps, etc).

The RPTP also outlines the more transformational PT changes to come post 2021, such as the completion of the City Rail Link and the construction of Rapid Transit Light Rail, subject to available funding.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

5. The RPTP is a key delivery mechanism for the Auckland Plan, supporting the outcomes for Transport and Access but also delivering across the other key directives such as, for example, homes and place, and Maori identity and well-being.

6. The RPTP can be seen as a companion document to the recently adopted Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) 2018-2028, which is a blueprint for transport investment in Auckland over the next decade. Both these documents sit within the context of the long-term planning and funding directions outlined by Auckland Council, Central Government and the Auckland Transport Alignment Programme agreement.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

7. The provision of public transport affects all local boards as it provides alternative means of transport around Auckland.

8. Two rounds of engagement were undertaken with local boards in the development of the draft RPTP. The first cluster workshops occurred in July 2018, followed up by another round in October. Sessions with individual local boards were also held as requested.

9. The feedback provided through these sessions, along with any received during the formal submission phase in November/December, will be considered as part of the final version of the plan.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

10. Auckland Transport is committed to and has a statutory obligation to engage meaningfully with iwi/mana whenua across all of its capital and operational programmes. The improved provision of public transport will provide greater choices for moving around Auckland and Māori will be beneficiaries of this.

11. Two rounds of Mana whenua hui on the draft RPTP have been undertaken, the first round in late 2017 and then the second round in August/September 2018. The feedback provided through these sessions, along with any received during the formal submission phase in November/December, will be considered as part of the final version of the plan.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

12. The financial implications of the RPTP are based on the outcomes agreed through the LTP/RLTP statutory processes. The cost of preparing the RPTP is covered by existing Auckland Transport budgets.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

13. The risks are assessed as moderate. The next 3 years will focus on the consolidation of patronage growth arising the PT network. Beyond 2021, further development of the public transport network is based on assessed available funding. (Note that the Rapid Transit Light Rail projects are being led by New Zealand Transport Agency and that funding is yet to be confirmed).

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

14. The draft RPTP is intended to be released for public engagement, which will occur for 4 weeks from 19 November 2018, with an expected final version released to the public in the first quarter of 2019.
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1 What is the RPTP and why do we need it?

The Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP) is a requirement of the Land Transport Management Act. It sets out the changes that will occur to Auckland’s Transport System during the life of the Plan.

Transport is a key component of the success of a city. Auckland is a growing city and as more people live here, the number of trips taken on our various transport networks increases. As space available for transport networks and corridors is finite, we need as many people as possible to travel using efficient modes, such as walking, cycling and public transport. These modes take less space and are more environmentally sustainable than private motor vehicles. The less pressure on the road network the more capacity is available for critical modes that require the use of the road network, including road based public transport, emergency services and freight. Given this, a fantastic, well-used public transport (PT) system is fundamental to the success of Auckland and a plan to identify the needs and opportunities and to then set out the solutions is critical.
2 What’s happened over the last 3 years?

2.1 Changes and Improvements

Over the last few years, we have fundamentally redesigned the public transport network in order to better serve the customer. Auckland Transport has created a connected network built around new rapid and frequent services enabled by a zone based fare structure and the HOP smartcard ticketing system. These initiatives have resulted in improved services, greater reliability, improved perceptions of the public transport network and, ultimately, a record increase in boardings.

Below are the key changes AT has made to the public transport system since 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service changes</td>
<td>The New Bus Network has been developed and largely implemented over the last 2 years, with a better, streamlined network and new network of turns up and go services creating a spine to the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator contracts</td>
<td>52 new operator contracts have been implemented across the various public transport modes. These contracts have resulted in a 32% increase in service kms and 40% increase in service hours as well as an increase in capacity of around 25%, for only a 7% increase in costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated tickets and fares</td>
<td>A new fare system, based on zones, has been implemented across Auckland, which eliminates transfer penalties between and within the bus and train networks. A key support system for this new fare system has been the implementation of the AT HOP card, a single smartcard ticketing system which can be used on all bus, all train and most ferry services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| New infrastructure      | • Parnell train station opened;  
                          • Pukenake station upgrade;  
                          • Manure, Otahuhu and Manukau interchanges completed and opened for operation. Successful incorporation of Te Aranga principles;  
                          • New Ferry terminal at Half Moon Bay;  
                          • Improvements to Downtown ferry terminal. |
| New fleet                | A new rollingstock of trains has been procured and delivered, which provide for accessible boarding.  
                          In the bus fleet a new network of double decker buses has been procured and implemented across high demand routes. |
| Improved customer        | • Improved wayfinding signage has been delivered in and around major stations and stops;  
                          • the provision to users of real-time maps of services; and  
                          • a consistent branding and livery system for all buses and trains. |
| information              | Ongoing major projects are currently underway within Auckland:  
                          • City Rail Link; and  
                          • Light Rail. |
2.2 The results of these changes

Customer satisfaction

As shown, customer satisfaction has increased across the multi-modal network over the last 5 years.

Public transport boardings

Auckland’s historic pattern of public transport patronage shows that total boardings has more than doubled since a low point in the early 1990s, and increased by over 34 per cent in the last five years. Total boardings is now at its highest level since the 1950s.

Growth by mode for the 2013-2018 period is set out in the table below. For the period, the RTN components of the network have grown the fastest and contributed the largest absolute increase in patronage – with 60 percent of the increase in boardings coming from the RTN services. This reflects the major investment in these systems – particularly rail – over the last decade. It also reflects the advantages of the RTN network customer experience: frequent peak period services operating uncongested in their own right of way. Together, rapid and frequent services accounted for 90 percent of the increase in boardings over the period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>2017/18 boardings (million)</th>
<th>Increase since 2014/15 (million)</th>
<th>Percentage increase 2014/15 -- 2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network impacts

Although the last three years has seen major growth in boardings at a region-wide network level, the impact of increasing public transport patronage on overall demand for vehicle travel has been modest. Per capita vehicle travel and per capita car ownership have also increased over the last three years – most likely as a result of the buoyant economic conditions. i.e. instead of replacing other vehicle travel, public transport use is increasing alongside other travel. This shows that there are still challenges to face. AT needs to ensure that people don’t just use and enjoy the public transport system, but that it results in changing travel behaviour and modal shift. Making these changes to public transport result in genuine and sustained shifts in mode choice is a key challenge for AT going forward.
3 What are we planning for the next 3 years?

3.1 Our Vision and Plan

Our vision is a system with seamless end-to-end customer journeys that are safe, accessible and reliable. Our key direction across all of our activities will be a customer focus.

To achieve this, we have set out four focus areas of action. These are:

- Expanding and enhancing the Rapid and Frequent Networks;
- Improving customer access to public transport;
- Harnessing emerging technologies and trials; and
- Improving Māori responsiveness.

These flow directly to our policies and actions, which are set out in 9 categories. Some key policies/actions which AT want to progress, subject to available funding, include:

- Delivering a step-change in the Rapid Transit Network, including the City Rail Link, City to Mangere Light Rail, Northwest Light Rail, SH208 upgrade, Puhinui interchange and Eastern Busway;
- Integrated Corridor Priority Programme, giving modal priority to ensure a correct hierarchy of road networks aligns to the primary needs;
- Moving towards higher frequencies on the FTN/RTN networks;
- Improving the first and last leg journeys (from public transport trips);
- Optimising space allocation of park and rides;
- Having greater insight into customer needs and travel patterns;
- On-demand and micro transit trials, including technological integration;
- Bilingual wording and announcements across the network;
- Utilisation of Te Aranga Māori design principles in new infrastructure projects;
- Social procurement models for delivery projects;
- Ferry service level increase and intermodal connection improvement; and
- Moving to a low emissions public transport network.

While there are many policies and actions associated with the RPTP, it is important to note that some items will take time to be implemented. While the pace of visible change will slow over the next three years, past that time there is expected to be a realisation of many of the projects listed above, which will constitute a further evolution of Auckland’s public transport system, similar to the evolution seen as part of the New Bus Network over the last 2 years.
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Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To obtain endorsement from the Planning Committee to complete the preparation of a Proposed Plan Change (Plan Change) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (Unitary Plan), regarding amendments to provisions of the Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential (Special Character overlay).

2. To seek a delegation from the Committee to confirm the final content of the Plan Change and associated section 32 evaluation report for public notification.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

3. The Plan Change forms a response to Environment Court Declaration Auckland Council v London Pacific Family Trust¹ regarding the Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential (Special Character overlay), and its relationship with the relevant underlying zone, predominantly the Single House Zone (SHZ).

4. The Court’s decisions on the Declaration proceedings determined that unless there is a specific rule that allows it, overlay provisions do not replace those within the underlying zones, and that all rules relevant to an activity must be applied.

5. The decision required a change in the Council’s approach to the relationship between the Special Character overlay and the underlying SHZ. As a consequence, the Special Character overlay provisions do not function well, and the approach results in uncertainty and unnecessary complexity for resource consent assessments.

6. The Plan Change will clarify that where there are equivalent provisions, the provision in the Special Character overlay will prevail over the underlying zone. Furthermore, as a consequence of the Declaration and the recommendations of the Auckland Unitary Plan Independent Hearings Panel (Panel), some of the standards within the Special Character overlay are proposed to be refined. These include standards relating to height in relation to boundary, yards, paved areas and fences.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Planning Committee:

a) approve the development of a proposed plan change to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) to resolve the current conflict between the Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential and the underlying zones;

b) delegate to a sub-group of the Planning Committee the approval of the final content of the proposed plan change and the accompanying section 32 evaluation report for public notification.

¹ Auckland Council v Trustees of London Pacific Family Trust [2017] NZEnvC 209 (‘interim decision’) issued 19 December 2017. The decision was further clarified in the Court’s second interim decision issued on 23 January 2018 as Auckland Council v Budden and others as Trustees of the London Pacific Family Trust [2018] NZEnvC 003 (‘second decision’) and in the third decision issued on 15 March 2018 Auckland Council v London Pacific Family Trust [2018] NZEnvC 030 (‘third decision’).
Horopaki / Context Special Character Overlay and Single House Zone

7. The Special Character overlay applies to various older parts of Auckland. The Special Character overlay applies to 50 different special character areas and each area has a ‘character statement’ in the Unitary Plan that summarises the particular values and qualities of that area. The overlay seeks to retain and manage the special character values of identified residential areas. Some parts of the Special Character overlay have small narrow sites, with dwellings built closer to front boundaries than generally occurs in more recent suburbs.

8. The Special Character overlay provisions focus on building works, not the use of those buildings. The SHZ and Special Character overlay have several provisions which overlap, including the activity status for various works relating to buildings (e.g. construction, alteration, demolition, relocation), and the related standards (e.g. building height, yards, height in relation to boundary, building coverage and fences).

9. Some standards in the Special Character overlay are more permissive compared to the corresponding standard in the underlying zone, while others are more restrictive. For example, the Special Character overlay provides for a larger building envelope than the SHZ (through the height in relation to boundary and front yard standards), but also requires a wider rear and side yard than the SHZ, reflecting the historical built form in some of the older residential areas of Auckland.

10. A key difference between the Special Character overlay and SHZ is that only the SHZ includes matters of discretion related to managing effects on the amenity values of neighbouring sites. The matters of discretion are relevant in situations where standards are infringed.

Auckland Unitary Plan Hearings

11. Council’s closing position for the Special Character overlay provisions through the Auckland Unitary Plan Hearings process was that the standards varied for different special character areas. For example, Council’s closing position stated that the underlying zone height in relation to boundary rules applied, except in areas such as Isthmus A and C1, where the more enabling control applied. Standards for yards, building coverage, landscaped area and paved surfaces also varied for the different special character areas to reflect different subdivision and development patterns.

12. Council’s tailored approach was changed through the Panel’s recommendations, and the standards were generalised across the Special Character overlay; particularly the height in relation to boundary control of 3m and 45 degrees which is now applied across the entire overlay.

Environment Court Declaration

13. To provide clarity about the status of standards in the Special Character overlay and those in the underlying zone the Council sought a Declaration from the Environment Court. The Declaration decision issued in December 2017 confirmed that provisions within overlays, zones or Auckland-wide chapters in the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) do not prevail over more restrictive provisions, unless there is a specific rule that allows it.

14. The Environment Court Declaration decision determined that where a proposed activity is located within both the SHZ and Special Character overlay, “then the relevant SHZ, SCAR [Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential] and General Rules (and any relevant objectives and policies) apply, in the processing and determination of any resource consent application for the proposed activity, without the SCAR rules prevailing over or cancelling out other rules.”

15. The Council began applying both sets of rules when the first interim decision was received. The ‘incorrect’ approach had been applied to consents issued between 1 December 2016 and 19 December 2017.
16. In August 2018, it was identified that this issue potentially affected around 420 resource consents, largely for additions or alterations to an existing house in the Special Character overlay. Consent holders are at different stages of implementing their consents and each existing consent has a different risk profile depending on the specifics of each proposal. Having undertaken further detailed analysis, it is confirmed that 319 existing consents are impacted.

17. Some of the consent holders are required to reapply for resource consent. The council has notified all the affected consent holders and has waived the processing fees for the new consent applications.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

18. The Declaration required a change in the Council’s approach to the relationship between the Special Character overlay and the underlying zone. Resource consent applications must now be considered against all provisions of the Plan, including both sets of standards in the Special Character overlay and the underlying zone. This means that assessments under two different thresholds must occur.

19. Having two standards controlling the same effect (e.g. two different height in relation to boundary standards) is causing difficulty for assessments, as it is unclear which threshold should be used to determine the appropriate building envelope.

20. This is resulting in unnecessary complexities and time costs for home owners, and more fundamentally, the Special Character overlay provisions do not function as they were intended.

21. To resolve the issue raised by the Declaration, the following high-level policy response options have been identified:

1. Status Quo: keep the current approach specified by the Declaration;

2. Undertake a Plan Change to clarify that the Special Character overlay provisions prevail (take precedence) over any corresponding underlying zone provisions;

3. Undertake a wider review of the planning tools used to manage special character, including its spatial extent, and undertake a Plan Change to implement the outcomes of this review.

There are various benefits and costs associated with each option, including the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Status Quo</td>
<td>• Reflects current practice since the declaration</td>
<td>• Overlay not functioning as intended, as the more restrictive or enabling territory provisions are also applied (in all Special Character overlay areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not a policy shift from the current Unitary Plan</td>
<td>• Difficulty in assessing applications against two sets of corresponding rules – which threshold has more weighting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows a case by case assessment of effects on the amenity of neighbouring sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Special Character</td>
<td>• Overlay provisions function as they were intended</td>
<td>• A policy shift from the current AUP and Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character overlay Plan</td>
<td>• Aligns with the Council’s approach to overlays before the declaration</td>
<td>• A larger piece of work to undertake regarding refinement of standards for different areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change (Preferred)</td>
<td>• Will provide clarity and certainty of process and avoid unnecessary assessment</td>
<td>• May result in re-litigating some of the issues/policies relating to special character generally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The underlying zone still applies where there are no equivalent overlay provisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to create more tailored provisions according to specific site characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3 – Wider review of special character

- Allows time for a rethink – is the current approach delivering the outcomes the Council wants?
- Allows for a more comprehensive approach tailored to individual character areas
- Will provide clarity and certainty of process and avoid unnecessary assessment
- A large piece of work, therefore time consuming
- Will result in re-litigating the policies relating to special character generally
- Potentially large costs involved

---

#### 22. Of these identified options, **Option two** is preferred. This option requires a plan change that would involve:

- Specifying where the Special Character overlay prevails over the underlying zone provisions. Where there are equivalent standards (i.e. where there are standards relating to the same effect), then the standard in the overlay will be used in assessment.
- Refining some of the standards within the Special Character overlay, based on the particular characteristics of the site. This is because some of the standards have been overly generalised;
- Introducing matters of discretion relating to the effects on the amenity of neighbouring sites as a consideration of the Special Character overlay. Currently the Special Character overlay itself does not have scope to consider effects on neighbours’ amenity when standards are infringed.

#### 23. It is also proposed to refine the standards to apply to particular site characteristics, to create consistency of terminology, and to improve consistency with the underlying zone. The specific provisions to be amended include the following, and a more detailed description of the changes is contained within **Attachment A**.

**Height in Relation to Boundary**
Amend the Special Character overlay height in relation to boundary standard to confirm the underlying zone standard applies, except for sites/areas with specific characteristics where a more permissive control of 3m and 45 degrees would apply.

**Building Coverage, Paved Area and Landscaped Area**
Refine the terminology within the Special Character overlay standards for building coverage, landscaped area and maximum paved area, to make the terminology consistent with the equivalent zone standards;

**Yards**
Remove the more restrictive rear yard standards within the Special Character overlay, and refer instead to the underlying zone rear yard standards, as well as any relevant underlying riparian and coastal protection yard requirements.

**Fences and walls**
Make amendments to the Special Character overlay fence standard to clarify 1.2m only refers to fences and walls along front boundaries.

**Development of buildings**
Confirm that the activity status for development of buildings within the Special Character overlay prevails over the underlying zone, but that the land use activity status and the standards to be complied with related to the land use for the underlying zone still apply.
Subdivision
Include a new provision specifying that the standards related to subdivision within the Special Character overlay (located in Chapter E38) prevail over the subdivision standards for the relevant zone.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
24. It is intended that directly affected Local Boards will be engaged with during the preparation of the Plan Change. Feedback received from the Local Boards will be carefully considered and presented to the delegated Planning Committee members to approve the final version of the Plan Change for notification.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement
25. Māori have the potential to be impacted by the Plan Change, particularly if they are property owners within the Special Character overlay. However, they are not considered to be more affected than any other property owners within the Special Character overlay.
26. Iwi have not yet been engaged with in the development of the Plan Change. However, iwi authorities will be invited to give their feedback on the draft Plan Change, in accordance with requirements under clause 3 of the Resource Management Act. All feedback received will be carefully considered and presented to the delegated Planning Committee members to approve the final version of the Plan Change for notification.

Ngā rirenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
27. The costs associated with the Plan Change can be managed within the existing Plans and Places department budget.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
28. The special character provisions in the Unitary Plan and the legacy district plans have attracted significant interest in the past. Re-litigation of the Special Character overlay policy direction is therefore a risk associated with the Plan Change. The benefits of the Plan Change are considered to outweigh this risk, which can be mitigated through the development of a clear scope, robust provisions and an associated section 32 evaluation report.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
29. The next steps are:
   - Complete the draft section 32 evaluation report and draft Plan Change
   - Seek feedback from Iwi authorities and Local Boards
   - Present the final section 32 evaluation report and Plan Change to the delegated Planning Committee members to approve the final version of the Plan Change for notification.
30. As well as public notification, a copy of the public notice will be served on all property owners within the Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential and the Special Character Areas Overlay - General.
31. The Court Declaration considered only the Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential and did not consider whether there were wider implications for other Unitary Plan overlays. However, the Declaration did require the Council to continue the work to assess the relationship between overlays and zones more generally. A draft report to this effect was provided to the Court in July 2018.
32. The issues that have been identified with other overlays are much more limited in scale and significance, and cannot all be addressed by a single amendment to the General Rules of the Unitary Plan. It is anticipated that a separate plan change will be progressed to address issues identified within other overlays. This plan change will be presented to the Planning Committee in the new year.
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ATTACHMENT 1: SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE SPECIAL CHARACTER AREAS OVERLAY - RESIDENTIAL

Height in Relation to Boundary (HIRB)
1. At present, two height in relation to boundary controls apply to sites that are located within the SCAR Overlay: the control in the overlay as well as the control in the zone. However, the purpose of the overlay may not be achieved when both the SCAR and SHZ standards are applied together, because the underlying SHZ is more restrictive.

2. Council’s position through the IHP Hearings was changed through the IHP recommendations. The IHP standardised the height in relation to boundary controls – applying a blanket control of 3m and 45 degrees across the entire overlay. However, the more enabling control was only intended to apply to Isthmus A and C1, as well as the part of Devonport south of Ngataina Bay and Seabreeze Rd.

3. It is considered that having a singular (and more enabling) HIRB control across all the character areas is too broad given the varying characteristics of the character areas across the region. The application of a more fine-grained approach to the HIRB standards would better reflect the different characteristics of the character areas.

4. Therefore in order to address the issues with the height in relation to boundary provisions, it is proposed that:
   - Standard D18.6.1.2 be amended to confirm the underlying zone height in relation to boundary standard applies, except for sites with specific characteristics where a more permissive 3m and 45 degrees would apply.
   - Within the matters of discretion, create a link to all relevant matters from both the overlay and the underlying zone for assessment of infringements; in order to create scope for the assessment of amenity effects on neighbours.

Maximum Paved Area, Building Coverage and Landscaped Area
5. Coverage and surface controls within the SCAR acknowledge that the variety of lot sizes within the overlay require more tailored provisions to enable varying habitable built form without adversely impacting on the established character of the place (as identified in the character statement).

6. However, the meaning of the term ‘maximum paved area’ within the SCAR is different to the meaning of maximum impervious area in the underlying zone. ‘Paved area’ is not defined in the Unitary Plan, however, the coverage, landscaped area and paved area controls within the SCAR overlay all work together to ensure an adequate area for soakage.

7. Therefore in order to address these issues, it is proposed to:
   - Refine the terminology within standards D18.6.1.4 Building coverage, D18.6.1.5 Landscaped area and D18.6.1.6 Maximum paved area to make the terminology consistent with the zone standards;
   - Confirm that those standards should prevail over the underlying zone standards, such as Building coverage, Landscaped area and Maximum impervious area.
Yards

8. Front yards in the SCAR relate to historic built form patterns, in particular the relationship between the building and the street. The front yard width is determined in relation to the average of existing setbacks of dwellings on adjacent sites. Therefore the front yard standard enables the unique conditions of each street to be retained in new development.

9. However, as a result of the IHP Recommendations, the yard provisions were standardised: side and rear yard provisions of 1.2m and 3m respectively were applied to the entire SCAR, where they had previously only applied to the North Shore area. While side yards contribute to the relationship of built form to street and streetscape qualities, rear yards are not visible and therefore do not need to be managed by the SCAR.

10. Given the building coverage and maximum paved area standards within the SCAR, a separate side and rear yard control that is more restrictive than the underlying zone is not considered necessary to achieve the desired built form outcomes.

11. Therefore in order to address the issues with the yard provisions, it is proposed to:
   - Confirm that D18.6.1.3. front and side yard standards should prevail over the underlying zone yard standards
   - Remove the more restrictive rear standards within the SCAR, and refer instead to the underlying zone rear yard standards, as well as any relevant underlying riparian and coastal protection yard requirements.

Fences

12. The provision for fences and walls within the SCAR requires clarification. Currently there is no specific consideration of fencing within the relevant SCAR activity table (D18.4.1), only a standard (D18.6.1.7) that restricts fencing to 1.2 m on all boundaries.

13. The provisions also require amendment to allow for fencing to 2 metres on boundaries where they are not adjacent to the street and therefore do not affect the streetscape values of a special character area.

14. In order to address these issues it is proposed to:
   1. Make amendments to the activity table D18.4.1 to include an activity status for new fences and walls;
   2. Make amendments to D18.6.1.7 to clarify 1.2m only refers to fences and walls along front boundaries.

Activity status for buildings

15. The SCAR overlay is concerned with building works and not land uses, as its purpose is to maintain the physical attributes that contribute to the special character of the area. The SCAR provides for external alterations or additions, and for new or relocated buildings, as restricted discretionary activities. The matters of discretion are specific to the SCAR and will retain the intended built form character.
16. Some buildings within residential zones become discretionary or non-complying, because they have the same activity status as the land use (e.g. café, community facilities, visitor accommodation). In these instances, the development needs to be decoupled from the use.

17. Therefore in order to address the activity status provisions, it is proposed to:
   - Confirm that D18.4.1(A4) and (A5) prevails over the development related activities in the underlying zone, but that the land use activity of the underlying zone determines the status of the activity and the standards to be complied with (related to the land use).

Subdivision

18. Subdivision within the SCAR is specifically provided for within E38 Urban Subdivision. A finer grained approach has been applied to the sites within the SCAR, relating to the historic development pattern of the respective areas. This is articulated in Table E38.8.2.6.1. In some instances the minimum net site area is more permissive and in others more restrictive than the underlying zone.

19. However, E38 does not confirm whether the SCAR subdivision controls prevail. Because these net site areas reflect the predominant subdivision pattern in the area, it is considered that the SCAR specific controls should prevail over the relevant underlying zone.

20. Therefore, it is proposed to:
   - Include a new provision E38.8.2.6.2 (2) specifying that the standards within Table E38.8.2.6.1 prevail over those within Table E38.8.2.3.1.

Special Character Areas Overlay - General

21. The Special Character Areas General Overlay (SCAG) includes both residential or business zoned areas. D18.1 Background contains a paragraph stating that any sites in a residential zone that are within the SCAG Overlay, the SCAR provisions apply. Similarly the sites within the SCAG that have a business zoning, then the Special Character Areas Business provisions apply.

22. Activity table D18.4.1 also includes references to sites within the SCAG with a residential zoning. However there are no references to the SCAG within the standards D18.6.1.

23. It is considered specific reference needs to be made to the SCAG (with a residential zoning) within the standards, in order to make it explicit that these provisions apply to those areas as they would the SCAR.
Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) - Proposed Plan Changes to Improve Consistency in Chapter F Coastal, Chapter H Zones, Chapter J Definitions, Chapter M Appendices and the Geospatial Viewer

File No.: CP2018/19854

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To obtain approval from the Planning Committee (the ‘committee’) to publicly notify amendments to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (‘Unitary Plan’) contained in:
   - Proposed Plan Change ‘A’ - Improving consistency of provisions in Chapter D Overlays, Chapter E Auckland-wide, Chapter J Definitions, Appendix 2, Appendix 17 and the Viewer of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) (‘PCA Auckland-wide and Overlays’); and
   - Proposed Plan Change ‘B’ – Improving consistency of provisions in Chapter F Coastal, Chapter J Definitions, Appendix 7 and the Viewer of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) (‘PCB Coastal’); and
   - Proposed Plan Change ‘C’ – Improving consistency of provisions in Chapter H Zones and Chapter J Definitions of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) (‘PCC Zones’).

2. To obtain approval from Committee to publicly notify amendments on a limited basis contained in:
   - Proposed Plan Change ‘D’ – Improving consistency of provisions in the Viewer of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) (‘PCD Unitary Plan Viewer’).

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

3. Since the Unitary Plan became operative in part on 15 November 2016, the council has been registering potential errors and issues that have been identified by both staff and members of the public.

4. Four plan changes have been drafted to address technical issues identified within Chapter D Overlays, Chapter E Auckland-wide, Chapter F Coastal, Chapter H Zones, Chapter H Definitions and Chapter M Appendices, and identified mapping anomalies within the Unitary Plan Viewer. Amendments within Chapter I Precincts are limited to 11 diagrams where a consequential amendment is required as a result of a proposed change to the Viewer. The four proposed plan changes align to the chapters of the Unitary Plan.

5. The proposed plan changes do not include any amendments to the Regional Policy Statement, Chapter C General Rules, Chapter K Designations or Chapter L Schedules.

6. The proposed plan changes seek to address technical issues and mapping anomalies only and will not affect the policy direction of the Auckland Unitary Plan.

7. In accordance with Part 5 of Schedule 1 and section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (‘RMA’), evaluation reports have been prepared to determine the appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency as well as costs and benefits of the proposed plan changes. The section 32 evaluation reports (Attachments D-K available online only) found that a plan change to the Unitary Plan is the most appropriate option for correcting the technical issues and mapping anomalies.
8. Clause 5 of Schedule 1 of the RMA requires local authorities to publicly notify the proposed policy statement or plan or provide limited notification (Clause 5A). This Committee holds the delegation to approve the notification of the plan changes to the Unitary Plan.

9. Approval is sought to publicly notify PCA Auckland-wide and Overlays, PCB Coastal and PCC Zones. Approval is also sought to notify PCD Unitary Plan Viewer on a limited basis in accordance with Clause 5A of Schedule 1 of the RMA. A notification assessment is included as Attachment C to this report.

10. Council staff are also seeking that the Chair of the Planning Committee is granted delegation to approve the final version of the proposed plan changes and section 32 evaluations prior to public notification. This is to enable minor editorial changes should any be required.

11. If approval is obtained to notify the proposed plan changes, notification will likely occur mid November 2018.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) approve the public notification of Proposed Plan Change ‘A’ – Improving consistency of provisions in Chapter D Overlays, Chapter E Auckland-wide, Chapter J Definitions, Appendix 2 and Appendix 17 of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part).

b) approve the public notification of Proposed Plan Change ‘B’ – Improving consistency of provisions in Chapter F Coastal, Chapter J Definitions, Appendix 7 and the Viewer of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part).

c) approve the public notification of Proposed Plan Change ‘C’ – Improving consistency of provisions in Chapter H Zones and Chapter J Definitions of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part).

d) approve the limited notification of Proposed Plan Change ‘D’ – Improving consistency of provisions in the Viewer of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part).

e) delegate authority to the Planning Committee Chair to make any minor edits or amendments to PCA, PCB, PCC and PCD and approve the proposed plan changes and the accompanying section 32 evaluations for public notification.

f) delegate authority to the Planning Committee Chair to approve the final list of affected persons to be served notice of PCD.

g) note that plan change numbers which currently include placeholders A, B, C & D will be allocated at the time of public notification.

Horopaki / Context

Background to the Proposed Plan Changes

12. The structure of the Unitary Plan is complex. It is a combined plan pursuant to section 80 of the Resource Management Act 1991, bringing the regional policy statement, the regional plan (including the regional coastal plan) and the district plan into a single document. The separation of controls amongst overlays, zones, Auckland-wide and precinct provisions means that a single site may be subject to four or more layers of plan provisions. The scale of such a combined planning exercise has never before been undertaken in New Zealand.
13. As a result of the scale of the Unitary Plan and the nature of the layered provisions, plan users\(^2\) and Council planning staff have identified a number of technical issues affecting the usability and the overall integration between different provisions. Since the Unitary Plan has become operative in part (15 November 2016), the council has been registering potential errors and issues that have been identified by both staff and members of the public.

14. Plan Change 4: Corrections to technical errors and anomalies in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) (‘PC4’) addressed many errors and anomalies in the Unitary Plan. At the conclusion of the preparation of PC4, the council was left with a number of issues which required further investigation for potential inclusion in a plan change with broader scope. Additionally, a range of issues across the Unitary Plan continued to be added to the register. Consequently, these series of plan changes with broader scope than PC4 are now proposed to continue to address technical issues within the Unitary Plan.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice**

**Overview of the Proposed Plan Changes**

15. The key objective of the proposed plan changes is to address technical issues within Chapter D Overlays, Chapter E Auckland-wide, Chapter F Coastal, Chapter H Zones, Chapter J Definitions and Chapter M Appendices, and to address mapping anomalies within the Unitary Plan Viewer. Amendments within Chapter I Precincts are limited to 11 diagrams where a consequential amendment is required as a result of a proposed change to the Viewer.

16. Attachment A provides an overview of the themes of the technical issues and mapping anomalies being addressed in each proposed plan change.

17. A technical issue is where a change is required so that the Unitary Plan will function in the way it was intended.

18. A mapping anomaly is where there is an issue with the spatial application of zones, overlays, controls or precinct boundaries. For instance, the zone or precinct may not follow road or property boundaries leading to an unintended "split zoning".

19. Many of the technical issues and anomalies within the proposed plan changes relate to a specific part of the Unitary Plan that is causing ambiguity. Other technical issues relate to the integration of provisions across the Unitary Plan. It is essential to the effectiveness of the Unitary Plan that it promotes the purpose of the RMA in an integrated way. This integration must also address the regional, coastal and district functions of the council. This means that to support integration and to align provisions where they are related, the plan should have vertical or horizontal integration and alignment.

20. Examples of the types of technical issues which are being addressed through the proposed plan changes include:

- Format and language changes to clarify provisions or policies where the intent is not clear;
- Amendments to the methods to ensure that they give effect to the objectives and policies;
- Amendments to the polices where there are methods but there is an absence of a policy direction;
- Amendments across sections to achieve consistency of restrictions or assessments and the removal of duplicate controls;
- Amendments where zone and precinct boundaries fail to correctly follow road or property boundaries; and

\(^2\) Council’s resource consents department and external planning practitioners involved in consenting processes as well as the property owners themselves.
Amendments where there are identified inconsistencies in the mapping of controls and overlays

21. The identified technical issues and mapping anomalies within the Unitary Plan have the potential to create confusion for plan users. The uncertainty or ambiguity created by the identified technical issue or mapping anomalies causes users of the Unitary Plan to interpret these provisions differently. This can lead to varying outcomes that do not line up with the intent of the provisions, increased risk of litigation and processes that impede the functioning of the Unitary Plan.

22. The outcomes sought through the proposed plan changes are to address these technical issues and mapping anomalies to remove ambiguity in the Unitary Plan. The amendment of technical issues will not, by themselves, result in any substantive changes to the policy direction of the plan.

**Options and assessment**

23. In accordance with Part 5 of Schedule 1 and section 32 of the RMA, evaluation reports have been prepared to determine the appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency as well as costs and benefits of the proposed plan changes.

24. Four potential options for addressing technical issues within the Unitary Plan were identified and evaluated. These options included:

- **Option 1**: Adopt a ‘do nothing’ approach/retain the status quo. Technical issues which have the potential to compromise the integrity of the Unitary Plan will not be addressed.

- **Option 2**: Non-regulatory methods. Non-regulatory methods to address the identified technical issues include practice notes, guidance or interpretation notes.

- **Option 3**: Regulatory methods. This option would result in a plan change to amend the identified technical issues.

- **Option 4**: Other regulatory methods. Wait to amend the Unitary Plan to address the identified technical issues as part of a full plan review.

25. The section 32 evaluation reports (Attachments D-K available online only) found that of the four options identified, a plan change to the Unitary Plan (Option 3) is the most appropriate option for correcting the technical issues and mapping anomalies. The section 32 evaluations also investigated the option of remedying these technical issues and mapping anomalies as part of the ten-year review of the Unitary Plan (Option 4). However, this does not bring a swift resolution to the identified issues and it impedes the functionality of the Unitary Plan in the interim.

26. The proposed plan changes are not altering the outcomes of any of the objectives and policies of the Unitary Plan, and nor are they proposing any amendments to the Regional Policy Statement, Chapter C General Rules or Chapter L Schedules.

27. Only minor amendments to four precinct diagrams are proposed to Chapter I Precincts. Further potential issues with the precincts are not proposed to be amended through this series of plan changes. It is envisioned that once amendments have been completed through these plan changes then amendments to precinct provisions (which built on the zone and Auckland-wide provisions) can commence.

28. If an identified technical issue is affected by provisions subject to appeals, it has been excluded from the proposed plan changes to enable it to be remedied as part of the relevant appeals process for consideration (given that there is scope and there is agreement to do so).
29. A process was established to determine the final content of the proposed plan changes (see Attachment B). Quality assurance was included in the review and recommendation stages of the process. This was to ensure that the issues remained within the determined scope of the proposed plan changes and assessments were conducted in accordance with Section 32 of the RMA (i.e. for its appropriateness to existing objectives in the Unitary Plan and the purpose of the RMA).

Consultation on the Draft Plan Changes

30. Members of the public and internal staff within the Council who had sent in potential issues to the email address (unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz) were advised on the course of action in response to the issue raised. A number of these customers were advised that their potential issue would be addressed as part of a plan change process.

31. Letters were sent out to all owners and occupiers of the sites for which spatial changes are being proposed. These letters detailed the specific change and invited the owners and occupiers to contact staff if they wished to discuss or understand the proposed amendment further.

32. Copies of the proposed plan changes were also sent to statutory bodies and parties specifically affected by amendments in the proposed plan changes, including the Ministry of the Environment, the Department of Conservation and the Ministry of Primary Industries.

33. A draft copy of PCB Coastal and its section 32 evaluation report were sent to a targeted group of stakeholders who had been involved in the coastal topic for the AUP Independent Hearings Panel process. These stakeholders included the New Zealand Defence Force, Ports of Auckland Ltd, marina operators and several infrastructure providers (New Zealand Transport Agency, Transpower, Kiwirail, Spark, Chorus and Vector). Feedback was received from several of these parties and the draft plan change has been amended in response.

34. Sections of PCA Auckland-wide and Overlays and the corresponding sections of the Section 32 evaluation report were also provided to targeted stakeholders for feedback. In particular, the Auckland Utility Operators Group was provided with proposed amendments to Chapter E26 Infrastructure and the Tupuna Maunga Authority was provided with the proposed amendments in relation to volcanic viewshafts and Height Sensitive Areas.

Consultation with iwi

35. Clause 3(1)(d) of Schedule 1 of the RMA requires that local authorities consult with tangata whenua of the area who may be so affected, through iwi authorities, during the preparation of a proposed policy statement or plan.

36. Due to the nature and large scale of the proposed plan changes, Council has identified, through the mana whenua-defined rohe maps, the following iwi authorities with whom Council must consult on this matter:

- Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua
- Te Uri o Hau
- Ngāti Manuhiri
- Ngātiwai Trust Board
- Ngāti Rehua
- Te Kawerau a Maki
- Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara
- Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei
- Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki
- Ngāti Tamaoho
37. Clause 4A of Schedule 1 of the RMA states that local authorities must:
   - Provide a copy of a draft proposed policy statement or plan to iwi authorities to consider;
   - Have regard to feedback provided by iwi authorities on the draft proposed policy statement or plan; and
   - Provide iwi authorities with sufficient time to consider the draft policy statement or plan.

38. In October 2017, Council staff informed iwi authorities about the proposed plan changes and invited them to advise about any issues they may have with the current provisions in the Unitary Plan ahead of formal consultation.

39. In July 2018, Council staff wrote again to enquire as to whether they were interested in seeing the draft plan change prior to notification and their views on whether a commissioner with tikanga understanding will be required for the hearing of these plan changes.

40. A draft copy of PCB Coastal, PCC Zones and PCD Unitary Plan Viewer were provided to the iwi authorities in the Auckland region on 14 August 2018 with the accompanying section 32 evaluation reports. PCA Auckland-wide and Overlays was provided to the iwi authorities in the Auckland region with the accompanying Section 32 evaluation report on 24 September 2018.

41. The only response received was from Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei who were supportive of the proposed plan changes. A hui was held with the planning representative from Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei to go over the key points kanohi ki te kanohi.

42. In October 2018 a draft copy of all four proposed plan changes, and the corresponding Section 32 evaluation reports, were provided to the Independent Maori Statutory Board with the invitation to meet to discuss any aspect of the proposed plan changes.

### Notification of the Proposed Plan Changes

43. Clause 5 of Schedule 1 of the RMA requires local authorities to publicly notify the proposed policy statement or plan or provide limited notification (Clause 5A). This Committee holds the delegation to approve the notification of the plan changes to the Unitary Plan.

44. Given the range of topics and the scale of proposed amendments; public notification of PCA Auckland-wide and Overlays, PCB Coastal and PCC Zones is appropriate. Therefore, approval is sought to publicly notify these plan changes.
45. PCD Unitary Plan Viewer proposes amendments to the viewer in relation to 189 private properties to address mapping anomalies. The property owners and occupiers have been contacted. Under Clause 5A of the First Schedule of the RMA there is the option to give limited notification of a proposed plan change. An assessment has been undertaken to determine if this plan change meets the requirements within the RMA to follow the option of limited notification (see Attachment C). As the Council is able to identify all the persons directly affected by PCD approval is sought to notify this plan change on a limited basis. The notification assessment provides a broad overview of the affected parties who should be served notice of the plan change with the final list of affected parties to be signed off under delegation from this committee once this list has been compiled.

46. Council staff also seek that the Chair of the Planning Committee is granted delegation to approve the final version of the proposed plan changes and section 32 evaluations prior to public notification. This is to enable minor editorial changes.

47. Certain types of rules in the Unitary Plan will have immediate legal effect from notification of the proposed plan changes. This is required under section 86B(3) of the RMA. The section 32 evaluation reports (Attachments D-K available online only) identify the proposed amendments that will have immediate legal effect on, and from the date on which the relevant plan change is publicly notified.

Ngā whakaaweawae ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

48. In October 2017, a memo was sent to local boards to advise on this proposed plan change and invite local board members to advise of any technical issues that they may have identified.

49. In August 2018, a further memo was sent to local boards providing an overview of PCB Coastal, PCC Zones and PCD Unitary Plan Viewer and specifically identified the mapping amendments relevant to each local board. A further memo was sent to local boards in September 2018 providing an overview of PCA Auckland-wide and Overlays. A draft of the proposed plan changes and Section 32 Evaluation Reports were attached to the memo. Within the memo staff offered to answer any questions or meet with local boards to discuss any aspects of the plan changes. Two local boards sought clarification on amendments proposed that would affect their local board area.

50. Local boards will be invited to provide written feedback on the plan changes through the processes established with Local Board Services. Any feedback received from local boards will be assessed and included verbatim in the final recommendations on the plan changes.

Tauākī whakaaweawae Māori / Māori impact statement

51. The proposed plan changes will have the potential to impact Māori as in some instances the proposed amendments will result in a different application of the rules. The amendments proposed within the four plan changes however, are consistent with the objectives and policies contained within the Unitary Plan and the policy direction set within the Regional Policy Statement.

52. In accordance with Clause 4 of Schedule 1 of the RMA, feedback on the proposed amendments has been sought from iwi authorities prior to public notification (see paragraphs 35-42). All feedback received from iwi authorities has been summarised and incorporated into the evaluation reports and included as attachments to this report.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

53. The costs of the plan change process are within the Plans and Places department’s operating budget.
Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

54. There are risks associated with not addressing the identified technical issues and mapping anomalies. These issues and anomalies are resulting in differing interpretations of the Unitary Plan, delay consenting and have an overall impact on the functionality and integrity of the Unitary Plan.

55. There are no material risks associated with undertaking the proposed plan changes to the Unitary Plan.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

56. If approval is obtained to notify the proposed plan changes, notification will likely occur mid-late November 2018.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

Due to the size and complexity of Attachments A and C – K (over 800 pages) they are available online at http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/ > Planning Committee 6 November 2018 > Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Overview of the Themes of the Technical Issues and Mapping Anomalies Proposed to be Addressed <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Methodology for assessing issues for inclusion within the proposed plan changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Notification Assessment Proposed Plan Change ‘D’ – Improving consistency of provisions in the Viewer of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Proposed Plan Change ‘A’ - Improving consistency of provisions in Chapter D Overlays, Chapter E Auckland-wide, Chapter J Definitions, Appendix 2, Appendix 17 and the Viewer of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) <em>(Available online only)</em> <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Section 32 Evaluation Report: Proposed Plan Change ‘A’ - Improving consistency of provisions in Chapter D Overlays, Chapter E Auckland-wide, Chapter J Definitions, Appendix 2, Appendix 17 and the Viewer of the Auckland Unitary Plan <em>(Available online only)</em> <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Proposed Plan Change ‘B’ – Improving consistency of provisions in Chapter F Coastal, Chapter J Definitions, Appendix 7 and the Viewer of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) <em>(Available online only)</em> <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Section 32 Evaluation Report: Proposed Plan Change ‘B’ – Improving consistency of provisions in Chapter F Coastal, Chapter J Definitions, Appendix 7 and the Viewer of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) <em>(Available online only)</em> <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Proposed Plan Change ‘C’ – Improving consistency of provisions in Chapter H Zones and Chapter J Definitions of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) <em>(Available online only)</em> <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Section 32 Evaluation Report: Proposed Plan Change ‘C’ – Improving consistency of provisions in Chapter H Zones and Chapter J Definitions of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) <em>(Available online only)</em> <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) - Proposed Plan Changes to Improve Consistency in Chapter F Coastal, Chapter H Zones, Chapter J Definitions, Chapter M Appendices and the Geospatial Viewer
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### Methodology for assessing issues for inclusion within the proposed plan changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Determine the scope of the proposed plan changes</strong></td>
<td>The purpose of this step is to determine the scope of the proposed plan changes. This is to ensure that the issues proposed for inclusion cannot be addressed using a Clause 20a or Clause 16 process or are not going to create a policy review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Review of issues and quality assurance</strong></td>
<td>A project team was established to review the issues that were out of scope of PC4 in addition to the issues that continued to be identified by both staff and members of the public. The scope statement developed in step 1 was used to guide this review. The recommendations of the project team were audited by a review panel comprising of senior managers, representatives from the Council’s legal and resource consent departments, and Auckland Transport. The review panel sought to ensure the issues proposed to be included within the relevant plan change were within scope of that plan change and most appropriately addressed by the plan change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3: Issue definition</strong></td>
<td>The issues proposed for inclusion within the plan changes were recorded verbatim from the original source email. As a first step, the project team grouped similar issues and wrote clear issue statements so that it was clear what the plan change is trying to achieve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4: Research and collection of evidence</strong></td>
<td>Once the issues had been clearly defined, the project team undertook background research to determine how the issue had come about and to build up an evidence basis to support or reject proposed amendments to the plan. Depending on the issue, this process included reviewing recent consent decisions, seeking input from experts, undertaking site visits, consulting with internal and external stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 5: Development of draft plan change and section 32 evaluation report</strong></td>
<td>The project team drafted amendments to the Unitary Plan to address the various issues and documented the section 32 evaluation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 6: Identify affected sections of the Unitary Plan</strong></td>
<td>The project team identified an initial index of the sections of the Unitary Plan affected by the proposed amendments. The purpose of the index was to ensure that consequential amendments could be identified and to identify any crossover between different workstreams. It was also used in consulting with stakeholders to determine areas of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 7: Stakeholder review of draft plan change and section 32 evaluation report</strong></td>
<td>The proposed amendments and draft section 32 evaluation report was circulated to internal stakeholders for comment and feedback. The internal stakeholders included plan users across the council including the resource consents department, Healthy Waters and Parks Services as well as council controlled organisations such as Auckland Transport and Watercare. Upon receiving the feedback, the proposed amendments and section 32 evaluation report were further refined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 8: Finalise draft plan changes for consultation and notification</strong></td>
<td>This step includes collating the evaluation reports for the proposed plan changes, including the proposed amendments for iw consultation. Following which, public notification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To receive a summary and provide a public record of memos or briefing papers that have been distributed to committee members.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. This is a regular information-only report which aims to provide greater visibility of information circulated to committee members via memo/briefing or other means, where no decisions are required.
3. The following information items are attached:
   • Planning Committee work programme (Attachment A)
4. The following workshops/briefings have taken place:
   • 2 October– Confidential Update from City Centre to Mangere Light Rail project team on proposed communications strategy (no attachment)
   • 15 October – Confidential City Centre, Downtown Programme and Waterfront (no attachment)
   • 30 October – Confidential Marinas Strategy (no attachment)
   • 30 October - Regional Public Transport Plan (no attachment)
5. This document can be found on the Auckland Council website, at the following link: [http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/](http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/)
   o at the top of the page, select meeting “Planning Committee” from the drop-down tab and click ‘View’;
   o under ‘Attachments’, select either the HTML or PDF version of the document entitled ‘Extra Attachments’.
6. Note that staff will not be present to answer questions about the items referred to in this summary. Committee members should direct any questions to the authors.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:
   a) receive the Summary of Planning Committee information memos and briefings – 6 November.
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PLANNING COMMITTEE FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME 2018

This committee guides the physical development and growth of Auckland through a focus on land use planning, housing and the appropriate provision of infrastructure and strategic projects associated with these activities.

Priorities for the second 12 months are:

- Auckland Plan refresh
- Strategic infrastructure planning
- City Centre and Waterfront development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Planning Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Highlight financial year quarter and state month if known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Sep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOUSING**

**Auckland Council**

Auckland Housing Accord monitoring and National Policy Statement requirements

All decisions on Special Housing Areas have been completed in the last council term. This relates to ongoing monitoring of the outcomes of the Housing Accord and the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.

Direction
Completion of Housing Accord obligations and assessment of effectiveness of interventions.

Progress to date

Update on affordable housing in Special Housing Areas Oct 2017

PLA/2017/192

National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) initial assessment results PLA/2017/156 and high-level findings of housing capacity assessment reported Nov 2017 PLA/2017/157

Quarterly reporting on NPS-UDC in Feb and Jun 2018

**Auckland Council**

Implementation of Housing Taskforce

The Housing Taskforce is led by His Worship the Mayor. The taskforce is likely to recommend actions to council and some of these actions may fall under the Planning Committee remit. Actions may include strategic overview and spatial outcomes of council’s role in housing.

Direction
Provide strategic direction and oversight of council’s role in housing to ensure the remedying of any impediments to effective housing supply

Progress to date
Workshop with Housing NZ and HLC March 2018

**Auckland Council**

Auckland Housing Programme

Housing New Zealand Limited, HLC and Auckland Council are working together to speed up the delivery of housing in Auckland. Some initiatives will also include the delivery of affordable housing.

Auckland Council’s role focuses on the delivery of infrastructure which enables delivery of housing. Staff are currently working with Housing New Zealand Limited and HLC to determine what actions and decisions are required from Council. There may be

Direction and Decision
Provide strategic direction and decisions as required

Progress to date
Workshop with Housing NZ and HLC March 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Planning Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highlight financial year quarter and state month if known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27 Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Jun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direction and decisions required from the Planning Committee as well as Finance and Performance Committee and Governing Body.**

### REGIONAL LAND USE AND INFRASTRUCTURE

**Auckland Council**

**Auckland Plan Implementation**

The Auckland Plan, *Auckland 2050*, will be adopted in June 2018. Focus is now on implementation of the plan. A decision will be sought on the overall framework and priority initiatives for implementation. Update reports will be provided at 6-monthly intervals, highlighting both progress on initiatives as well as emerging issues and trends impacting on Auckland 2050 including central government policy and legislation.

**Direction and Decision**

Adoption of the Auckland Plan 2050. Approval and oversight of implementation of *Auckland 2050*. Baseline monitoring report to be presented in Q3 followed by six-monthly update reports.

**Progress to date**

Adoption of Auckland Plan 2050 Jun 2018 PLA/2018/62

Formation of working group to develop core targets in collaboration with central government Aug 2018 PLA/2018/76

**Direction**

Regional strategy and policy relating to infrastructure, land use and housing. Auckland Transport and Central Government have decision-making responsibilities. Financial recommendations made to Finance and Performance Committee

**Progress to date**

AT Board/Governing Body workshop April 2017 PLA/2017/74

Auckland Smarter Transport Pricing Project delegation agreed Jul 2017 PLA/2017/74

Phase One Congestion Question project report received Feb 2018 PLA/2018/7

Updated Auckland Transport Alignment Project given support and implementation actions agreed by Governing Body GB/2018/76

Congestion Question Phase Two project update workshop scheduled Sep 2018

**Auckland Transport**

**Auckland Transport Alignment Project Implementation (including the Congestion Question)**

The second version of the Auckland Transport Alignment Project strategic approach was adopted by Government and Council in April 2018. Any consideration of transport should be for the purpose of informing future Long-term Plans.

**Direction**

Regional strategy and policy relating to infrastructure, land use and housing. Auckland Transport and Central Government have decision-making responsibilities. Financial recommendations made to Finance and Performance Committee

**Progress to date**

AT Board/Governing Body workshop April 2017 PLA/2017/74

Auckland Smarter Transport Pricing Project delegation agreed Jul 2017 PLA/2017/74

Phase One Congestion Question project report received Feb 2018 PLA/2018/7

Updated Auckland Transport Alignment Project given support and implementation actions agreed by Governing Body GB/2018/76

Congestion Question Phase Two project update workshop scheduled Sep 2018

**Auckland Council**

**Auckland Unitary Plan appeals**

The Auckland Unitary Plan is Operative in Part until all current appeals are resolved.

**Decision**

Decisions on council’s position on the current Auckland Unitary Plan appeals as required. Once the current appeals are resolved, the Regulatory Committee will be responsible for future appeals.

**Auckland Council**

**Auckland Unitary Plan Monitoring of Performance**

The development of an internal strategy to identify key performance measures of the Auckland Unitary Plan together with establishing Plan effectiveness monitoring and reporting is being progressed.

**Direction**

Reporting on project progress

**Direction and decisions required from the Planning Committee as well as Finance and Performance Committee and Governing Body.**

### Summary

- **Auckland Plan Implementation**
  - Adoption of the Auckland Plan 2050.
  - Approval and oversight of implementation.
  - Baseline monitoring report.
- **Auckland Transport Alignment Project Implementation**
  - Strategic approach adoption.
  - Decision-making responsibilities.
  - Financial recommendations.
- **Auckland Unitary Plan appeals**
  - Current appeals resolution.
  - Regulatory Committee responsibility.
- **Auckland Unitary Plan Monitoring of Performance**
  - Development of internal strategy.
  - Key performance measures.
  - Plan effectiveness monitoring and reporting.
### HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Planning Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes highlight financial year quarter and state month if known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Auckland Unitary Plan plan changes</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong>&lt;br&gt;Decisions on Auckland Unitary Plan plan changes</td>
<td>FY19&lt;br&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Auckland Unitary Plan plan changes</td>
<td><strong>Progress to date</strong>&lt;br&gt;8 council plan changes and 3 private plan changes have been notified since the Auckland Unitary Plan became operative in part in November 2016. Two of those plan changes are now operative. Further plan changes are currently being developed in accordance with the plan change programme endorsed by the Planning Committee in July 2017 PLA/2017/76&lt;br&gt;The Auckland Unitary Plan enhancements plan change and corrections to the Schedule of Notable Trees plan change will be presented to the Planning Committee in Q1/Q2 of the 2019 financial year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Auckland Unitary Plan plan changes</td>
<td><strong>Progress to date</strong>&lt;br&gt;Staff report on options for rezoning road reserve and public owned “paper roads” as open space requested Aug 2018 PLA/2018/72&lt;br&gt;Approval to make operative Plan Change 11 to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) - PLA/2018/100&lt;br&gt;Approval to notify Proposed Plan change – rural activities PLA/2018/101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Mass transit - airport</td>
<td><strong>Direction</strong>&lt;br&gt;Strategic direction relating to infrastructure and land use. Auckland Transport has responsibility for the provision of public transport in Auckland.</td>
<td>Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Mass transit - airport</td>
<td><strong>Progress to date</strong>&lt;br&gt;Workshops held Apr, Jun and Oct 2017 and Feb 2018&lt;br&gt;Elected member site visits of key locations along proposed route Mar and Apr 2018&lt;br&gt;Workshop on Update from City Centre to Mangere Light Rail project team on proposed communications strategy on 2 Oct 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Mass transit – light rail</td>
<td><strong>Direction</strong>&lt;br&gt;Strategic direction relating to infrastructure and land use. Auckland Transport has responsibility for the provision of public transport in Auckland.</td>
<td>Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Mass transit – light rail</td>
<td><strong>Progress to date</strong>&lt;br&gt;Workshop Apr 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Planning Committee role (decision or direction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport and City Rail Link Limited</td>
<td>City Rail Link (public realm)</td>
<td>Provide direction to Auckland Transport on the public realm works associated with the City Rail Link.</td>
<td>Direction Strategic direction relating to infrastructure and land use. CRL Company has responsibility for the delivery of the City Rail Link. Auckland Transport has responsibility for the road corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport Auckland Council</td>
<td>Additional Waitemata Harbour Crossing</td>
<td>Provide strategic direction to Auckland Transport as it considers the Additional Waitemata Harbour Crossing project. Provide strategic direction to the New Zealand Transport Agency as it develops the Additional Waitemata Harbour Crossing project.</td>
<td>Direction To Auckland Transport relating to public transport options. Decision Approve Auckland Council’s submission on the consent applications made by New Zealand Transport Agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Active Transport (Walking and Cycling)</td>
<td>Delivery of active transport initiatives</td>
<td>Direction Feedback to Auckland Transport on the plans and programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Supporting growth Delivering transport networks</td>
<td>Delivery and route protection phase of the former Transport for Future Urban Growth process jointly undertaken by Auckland Council/Auckland Transport and New Zealand Transport Agency</td>
<td>Direction Reporting on project progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Technical Guidance Programme</td>
<td>To deliver a programme of technical guidance documents to facilitate development to comply with the Unitary Plan and Auckland Council’s infrastructure standards</td>
<td>Decision Approval of some documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Spatial Planning Work Programme</td>
<td>Spatial Planning is an important placemaking tool that enables the integration of land use aspirations with the identification of the necessary supporting infrastructure.</td>
<td>Decision Approve the proposed spatial planning work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Drury-Opaheke and Paerata structure plans</td>
<td>The Drury-Opaheke and Paerata structure plans will provide specific spatial planning for this area and assist with infrastructure investment decisions.</td>
<td>Decision Approve the Drury-Opaheke and Paerata Structure Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Silverdale and Warkworth structure plans</td>
<td>The Silverdale and Warkworth structure plans will provide specific spatial planning for these areas and assist with infrastructure investment decisions.</td>
<td>Decision Approve the Silverdale and Warkworth structure plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Auckland Council
### Port Future Study
The Port Future Study was recommended to this council by the previous council. In conjunction with the Governing Body this committee will need to decide the next steps with this study.

**Direction**
Likely to recommend actions to the Governing Body for decision

**Progress to date**
Decision to undertake further scoping work on an alternative port location and identifying related triggers/constraints PLA/2017/126

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>Jul-Sep</th>
<th>Oct-Dec</th>
<th>Jan-Mar</th>
<th>Apr-Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Jul</td>
<td>2 Oct</td>
<td>5 Feb</td>
<td>2 Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Aug</td>
<td>6 Nov</td>
<td>5 Mar</td>
<td>7 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Sep</td>
<td>27 Nov</td>
<td>4 Jun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q1   | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |

### Panuku
#### Tamaki redevelopment
Panuku leads council’s involvement in the Tamaki redevelopment programme. There are some decisions of council required from time to time. This is part of the Spatial Priority Area programme.

**Decision**
Regional strategy and policy relating to infrastructure, land use and housing.

| Q1   | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |

### Panuku
#### Transform Manukau
The previous council approved the High Level Project Plan for Transform Manukau, covering 600 hectares around the Manukau metropolitan centre.

**Direction**
Feedback on the Framework Plan and priorities for Manukau. Panuku has responsibility for the delivery of Transform Manukau.

| Q1   | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |

## Auckland Council
### National Planning Standards
The Resource Legislation Amendment Act 2017 introduced national planning standards to improve the consistency of resource management plans and policy statements under the Act. Council will have the opportunity to make a formal submission in July – August 2018.

**Decision**
Approve Auckland Council Submission.

**Progress to date**
Endorsement of feedback on discussion papers Aug 2017 PLA/2017/97
Approval of submission on draft standards Aug 2018 PLA/2018/75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>Jul-Sep</th>
<th>Oct-Dec</th>
<th>Jan-Mar</th>
<th>Apr-Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Jul</td>
<td>2 Oct</td>
<td>5 Feb</td>
<td>2 Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Aug</td>
<td>6 Nov</td>
<td>5 Mar</td>
<td>7 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Sep</td>
<td>27 Nov</td>
<td>4 Jun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q1   | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |

## Auckland Council
### Urban Development Authorities
Urban Development Authorities legislation is planned to be introduced by the end of 2018.

**Decision/Direction**
Approve Auckland Council submission.

| Q1   | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |

## Auckland Council
### Tax Working Group
The Tax Working Group has been directed by government to advise on a number of specific challenges including taxation as it relates to housing affordability. The Tax Working Group will produce an interim report and draft recommendations to government in September 2018. There will be an opportunity for submissions. This work may sit under the Finance and Performance Committee. However, its scope is very broad.

**Decision/Direction**
Approve Auckland Council submission.
### Auckland Council

**Resource Management Act reforms**

The Government has indicated that Resource Management Act reform will be a focus from November 2018. Opportunities may arise to provide feedback to early discussion papers.

**Decision/Direction**

Approve Auckland Council submission.

**Expected timeframes**

- **Q1**: 3 Jul - 2 Oct
- **Q2**: 3 Oct - 6 Nov
- **Q3**: 7 Nov - 27 Nov
- **Q4**: 28 Nov - 4 Jun

### Auckland Council

**Local Government Act 2002 Amendment Bill**

The Local Government and Environment Select Committee reported back on this bill in Jun 2017. The bill provides greater flexibility for councils to collaborate on service delivery, new processes for council-led reorganisations, and a more proactive role for the Local Government Commission. There is no formal timeframe for the bill's progression.

**Decision/Direction**

Approve Auckland Council submission

**Expected timeframes**

- **Q1**: 3 Jul - 2 Oct
- **Q2**: 3 Oct - 6 Nov
- **Q3**: 7 Nov - 27 Nov
- **Q4**: 28 Nov - 4 Jun

### Auckland Council

**National Environmental Standards**

**Decision/Direction**

As required

**Expected timeframes**

- **Q1**: 3 Jul - 2 Oct
- **Q2**: 3 Oct - 6 Nov
- **Q3**: 7 Nov - 27 Nov
- **Q4**: 28 Nov - 4 Jun

### Auckland Council

**National Policy Statements**

**Decision/Direction**

As required

**Expected timeframes**

- **Q1**: 3 Jul - 2 Oct
- **Q2**: 3 Oct - 6 Nov
- **Q3**: 7 Nov - 27 Nov
- **Q4**: 28 Nov - 4 Jun

### RESOLUTIONS OF OTHER COMMITTEES WHICH IMPACT PLANNING COMMITTEE

#### Panuku

**Transform and Unlock programmes**

Panuku produces High Level Project Plans which outline redevelopment projects and the delivery of initiatives in areas assessed against specific criteria i.e. scale of development based on council-owned land area, proximity to transport, potential for partnerships, infrastructure readiness and commercial opportunities.

**Finance and Performance Committee decision for Panuku to consider additional areas for inclusion in the Transform and Unlock Programmes, including Manurewa, Takanini and Papakura and workshop these with the Planning Committee.**

**RESOLUTIONS OF PLANNING COMMITTEE WHICH IMPACT OTHER COMMITTEES**

#### Auckland Council

**Urban Forest Strategy**

The Environment and Community Committee approved the Urban Forest Strategy, a strategic approach to delivering on the wider social, economic and environmental benefits of a growing urban forest in the context of rapid population growth and intensification.

**The Environment and Community Committee requested a report on the results of the LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) survey, an implementation plan for the Urban Forest Strategy including costs and benefits and funding sources, by Aug 2018.**

**PLA/2018/41**

**Planning Committee decision to include resource consents data in the report to the Environment and Community Committee Apr 2018.**
### Auckland Council

#### Strategic approach to marinas

The Planning Committee has requested a workshop with council staff to develop a strategic approach and forward plan regarding the future of Auckland’s marinas.

Planning Committee recommendation to Finance and Performance Committee not to proceed with the sale of any marina land pending the development of a strategic approach and forward plan for Auckland marinas Sep 2018 PLA/2018/87

**Progress to date**

Planning Committee workshop held 30 October

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
<th>Jul-Sep</th>
<th>Oct-Dec</th>
<th>Jan-Mar</th>
<th>Apr-Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Auckland Council

**Future Urban Land Supply Strategy refresh**

Regional strategy and policy relating to greenfield infrastructure, land use and housing. Financial and Infrastructure Strategy recommendations made to Finance and Performance Committee

Decision to adopt the refreshed Future Urban Land Supply Strategy Jul 2017 PLA/2017/75

#### Auckland Council

**Manurewa/Takanini/Papakura Integrated Area Plan**

The Manurewa/Takanini/Papakura Integrated Area Plan is part of the Spatial Priority Area programme. It provides specific spatial planning of the area and assists with infrastructure investment decisions.

Decision to endorse the Manurewa/Takanini/Papakura Integrated Area Plan Nov 2017 PLA/2017/153

#### Panuku

**Transform Onehunga**

Panuku completed the High Level Project Plan for Transform Onehunga in 2017 (slightly delayed because of the East West Link proposal).

Decision to adopt the High Level Project Plan for Transform Onehunga Mar 2017 PLA/2017/34

#### Panuku

**Unlock Henderson**

Panuku completed the High Level Project Plan for Henderson which outlines the delivery of initiatives for the Henderson metropolitan centre.

Decision to adopt the Unlock Henderson High Level Project Plan May 2017 PLA/2017/53

#### Panuku

**Unlock Papatoetoe**

Panuku completed the High Level project for Papatoetoe which outlines redevelopment projects and the delivery of initiatives in Papatoetoe.

Decision to adopt the Unlock Papatoetoe High Level Project Plan Jul 2017 PLA/2017/78

#### Panuku

**Unlock Panmure**

Panuku completed the High Level Project Plan for Panmure which outlines the delivery of initiatives for the Panmure metropolitan centre.

Decision to endorse the Unlock Panmure High Level Project Plan Mar 2018 PLA/2018/21

Decision of the Finance and Performance Committee to dispose of properties specified in the Unlock Panmure High Level Project Plan Apr 2018 FIN/2018/59

#### Panuku

**Unlock Avondale**

Panuku completed the High Level Project Plan for Avondale which outlines the delivery of initiatives for the Avondale town centre. This is part of the Spatial Priority Area programme.

Decision to endorse the Unlock Avondale High Level Project Plan Nov 2017 PLA/2017/142

### Auckland Council

**Seachange – Tai Timu Tai Pari**

The marine spatial plan for the Hauraki Gulf – Seachange Tai Timu Tai Pari – was completed by the independent stakeholder working group in November 2016. Staff reported on implications of the plan and options for Auckland Council implementation.

Decision to establish a political reference group to provide direction to council on how to implement the plan, propose a work programme of activities and collaborate with other agencies. Further reporting referred to the Environment and Community Committee. May 2017 PLA/2017/50
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Unit Titles Act review</td>
<td>The Government released the Unit Titles Act discussion document in December 2016. Auckland Council submission March 2017 on regional strategy and policy relating to infrastructure, land use and housing.</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> to approve Auckland Council submission Mar 2017 PLA/2017/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Whenuapai structure plan</td>
<td>The Whenuapai Structure Plan provides specific spatial planning for these areas and assists with infrastructure investment decisions.</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> to adopt the Whenuapai structure plan adopted by Auckland Development Committee Sep 2016 AUC/2016/117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Auckland Council | City Centre and Waterfront development | A refresh of the 2012 City Centre Master Plan will ensure that it remains current and will inform Long-term Plan prioritisation and budget decisions. Panuku is leading the refresh of the spatial planning for the Wynyard Point area in Wynyard Quarter, and a refresh of the Central Wharves strategy which was deferred while the Port Future Study was undertaken. | **Decision** to update the City Centre Master Plan Mar 2017 PLA/2017/31  
In principle approval of Queens Wharf inner dolphin Mar 2017 PLA/2017/32  
**Decision** to approve updated implementation of City Centre Master Plan and Waterfront Plan Sep 2017 PLA/2017/111 |
| Auckland Council | Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill | The Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill seeks to reinstate the purpose of local government to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of communities and restore the power to collect development contributions for a wider group of infrastructure projects. | **Decision/Direction** to establish a political working group to provide direction and approve Auckland Council submission May 2018 PLA/2018/58 |