

# Proposed Plan Change X

---

Amendments to Schedule 14 Historic Heritage  
Schedule, Statements and Maps in the  
Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part)

**SECTION 32  
EVALUATION REPORT**

**DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION  
FEBRUARY 2019**

**DRAFT**

# Table of Contents

1	Introduction .....	4
1.1	Scope and purpose of this report .....	4
1.2	Background to the proposed plan change.....	5
2	The proposed plan change.....	6
3	Reasons for the proposed plan change .....	6
3.1	Development of options .....	7
3.2	Evaluation of options .....	7
3.3	Risk of acting or not acting.....	10
3.4	Reasons for the preferred option .....	10
4	Resource Management Framework.....	10
4.1	Part 2 of the Act .....	10
4.2	Other relevant sections of the Act.....	11
4.3	National Policy Statements.....	11
4.4	National Environmental Standards.....	12
4.5	National Planning Standards.....	12
4.6	Other Acts .....	12
4.7	The Auckland Plan.....	14
4.8	The Auckland Unitary Plan.....	14
5	Development of the Proposed Plan Change .....	15
5.1	Methodology.....	15
5.2	Consultation undertaken .....	18
	Consultation with iwi authorities.....	19
	Consultation with Local Boards .....	20
6	Evaluation of provisions.....	20
6.1	Overview of the amendments .....	20
6.2	Amendments to Schedule 14.1.....	21
6.2.1	Amendments to ‘Place Name and/or Description’ column.....	21
6.2.2	Amendments to ‘Verified Location’ and ‘Verified Legal Description’ columns .....	21
6.2.3	Amendments to ‘Category’ column, including A* .....	22
6.2.4	Amendments to ‘Primary Feature’ column .....	23
6.2.5	Amendments to ‘Heritage Values’ column.....	24
6.2.6	Amendments to ‘Extent of Place’ column .....	24

6.2.7 Amendments to 'Exclusions' column .....	24
6.2.8 Amendments to 'Additional Rules for Archaeological Sites or Features' column .....	25
6.2.9 Amendments to 'Place of Māori Interest or Significance' column .....	25
6.3 Amendments to the Plan maps (extent of place) .....	26
6.4 Amendments to delete places .....	26
7 Conclusion.....	27

Draft

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Scope and purpose of this report

This report is prepared by Auckland Council (**Council**) to fulfil the statutory requirements of section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**the Act**) for proposed Plan Change X (**PPCX**) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (**AUP**).

PPCX introduces changes to Chapter L Schedules, Schedule 14.1 Historic Heritage Schedule (**Schedule 14.1**) and the Plan maps of the AUP. Schedule 14.1 includes information for each scheduled historic heritage place in the AUP, including an identification number (also shown on the Plan maps), a description of each scheduled place, the verified location and legal description, and information about the heritage values of the place.

The plan change seeks to amend information for 73 historic heritage places identified in Schedule 14.1 and, for some of these places, to add or amend the 'extent of place'<sup>1</sup> map shown in the Plan maps for the place.

The amendments will correct errors and, where appropriate, update information for the historic heritage places included in PPCX. The amendments enable the provisions of the AUP to apply appropriately to these historic heritage places, and will assist in their management and protection.

Section 32 of the Act requires that before adopting any objective, policy, and rule or other method, the Council shall have regard to the extent to which each objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act, and whether the policies and rules or other methods are the most appropriate way of achieving the objectives. A report must be prepared summarising the evaluation and giving reasons for the evaluation.

In accordance with section 32(6) of the Act and for the purposes of this report:

- the 'proposal' means PPCX,
- the 'objectives' means the purpose of the proposal/PPCX, and
- the 'provisions' means the policies and rules or other methods that implement, or give effect to the objectives of the proposal.

The AUP contains existing objectives, policies, and rules or other methods for the purpose of managing historic heritage places<sup>2</sup>. PPCX is not altering or re-litigating any of these provisions. This evaluation report on PPCX relates only to the amendment of the 73 identified historic heritage places in Schedule 14.1 within the existing policy framework of the AUP. The policy approach remains unchanged, and this report will not evaluate it in any more detail.

---

<sup>1</sup> The 'extent of place' of a scheduled historic heritage place defines the location and physical extent of the place and shows the area that contains the historic heritage values of the place and, where appropriate, any area relevant to an understanding of the function, meaning, and relationships of the historic heritage values (AUP B5.2.2(2))

<sup>2</sup> AUP B5 Ngā rawa tuku iho me te āhua - Historic heritage and special character and D17 Historic Heritage Overlay

This section 32 evaluation will continue to be refined in relation to any consultation that occurs, and in relation to any new information that may arise, including through submissions on PPCX and during hearings.

## 1.2 Background to the proposed plan change

The AUP contains objectives, policies and rules to protect significant historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. The AUP methods to achieve this protection are primarily focused on the Historic Heritage Overlay. Schedule 14.1 identifies the historic heritage places that are subject to the Historic Heritage Overlay.

Each historic heritage place identified in Schedule 14.1 was either “rolled over” from a legacy plan or introduced through the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (**PAUP**). Schedule 14.1 contains over 2,200 scheduled historic heritage places. These are identified in Schedule 14.1 and shown spatially in the Plan maps (by an extent of place). A limited number of these places have additional information shown in Schedule 14.3 Historic Heritage Place maps (**Schedule 14.3**). All places are subject to the objectives, policies and rules of the Historic Heritage Overlay<sup>3</sup>.

A number of places in Schedule 14.1 are subject to errors and/or require information to be updated, for example changes to align with the Council’s property information (including updating legal descriptions and street addresses). In some cases, the error identified is that the place does not have sufficient historic heritage value to meet the criteria and thresholds for scheduling in the AUP’s Regional Policy Statement (**RPS**). Some places also require amendments to ensure there is consistency with how similar places are identified within Schedule 14.1.

All the historic heritage places included in PPCX have been included within Schedule 14.1 primarily for their built heritage values, with the exception of four places<sup>4</sup>. These places are included in Schedule 14.1 for their archaeological values, and three of the four places are also identified in Schedule 14.1 as being of Māori interest or significance.

PPCX is the second dedicated plan change to correct errors and update information for scheduled historic heritage places. The Council notified Proposed Plan Change 10: Historic Heritage Schedule (errors, anomalies and information update) (**PPC10**) to the AUP on 25 January 2018. PPC10 proposed amendments to the identification of 145 historic heritage places, both in Schedule 14.1 and in the Plan maps. A decision is expected to be issued on PPC10 in March 2019.

---

<sup>3</sup> AUP D17 Historic Heritage Overlay

<sup>4</sup> ID 00569 Combes/Daldy lime works site R09\_2240; ID 00729 Te Marae o Hinekakea village site, including grave R10\_163; ID 01270 Mill site R11\_1633, site of water-powered mill, including water race and dam; ID 01587 Te Kōpua Kai a Hiku/Panmure Basin, including Mokoia pā site, terrace/midden, and middens Midden R11\_98, R11\_1255, R11\_1377, R11\_1384, R11\_1385, R11\_2158 R11\_2263, R11\_2264, R11\_2265, R11\_2266

## 2 The proposed plan change

PPCX introduces changes to 73 historic heritage places in Schedule 14.1. The changes proposed are amendments to Schedule 14.1 and/or to the Plan maps to correct errors and update information.

The plan change documents for PPCX show:

- proposed amendments to Schedule 14.1, and
- proposed amendments to the extent of place mapping within the Plan maps.

An index forms part of the plan change documentation. The index lists the historic heritage places subject to PPCX and identifies if an amendment is proposed to Schedule 14.1 and/or to the Plan maps for each place.

## 3 Reasons for the proposed plan change

An evaluation under section 32 of the Act must examine the extent to which the objectives of PPCX are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.<sup>5</sup> The objective of PPCX, or the purpose of the plan change, is to correct errors and, where required, update information for 73 historic heritage places in Schedule 14.1 of the AUP and in the Plan maps.

The plan change will assist the Council to carry out its functions in order to achieve the purpose of the Act, being to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

Built heritage and character is identified as an issue of regional significance in the AUP's RPS<sup>6</sup>. Chapter B5.1 of the RPS states following issues:

- (1) *Auckland's distinctive historic heritage is integral to the region's identity and important for economic, social, and cultural well-being.*
- (2) *Historic heritage needs active stewardship to protect it from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.*

The approach of the AUP is to protect significant historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development, in the context of the identified values of each historic heritage place. The AUP methods to achieve this protection are primarily focused on Schedule 14.1, which identifies and recognises historic heritage places. The provisions of the AUP's Historic Heritage Overlay apply to scheduled historic heritage places on land and in the coastal marine area. These places are identified in Schedule 14.1 and shown on the Plan maps.

A number of historic heritage places identified in Schedule 14.1 are known to contain errors, either in Schedule 14.1 or mapping errors in the Plan maps. PPCX seeks to correct these

---

<sup>5</sup> RMA s32(1)(a)

<sup>6</sup> AUP B1.4 Issues of regional significance (Note: the name of this issue has been amended in AUP B5 to Historic heritage and special character but the name of the issue in B1.4 has not yet been updated)

errors and, where appropriate, update information for these places. For some places included in PPCX, the error is that the place does not have significant historic heritage value. These places have been re-evaluated and it has been found that they do not meet the criteria and thresholds outlined in the RPS to be eligible for inclusion in Schedule 14.1. If this is the case, PPCX proposes to delete the historic heritage place from Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps.

The amendments in PPCX enable the provisions of the AUP to apply appropriately to these historic heritage places, and will ensure that they are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. The amendments will also ensure that places in Schedule 14.1 that do not contain significant historic heritage values are not subject to the provisions of the Historic Heritage Overlay<sup>7</sup>. PPCX is considered to be the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act, as outlined in the analysis below.

### **3.1 Development of options**

In the preparation of PPCX, the following options have been identified:

**Option 1** – do nothing/retain the status quo

**Option 2** – correct errors at the next AUP review

**Option 3** – a plan change to amend errors, including by deleting places from Schedule 14.1, and update information in Schedule 14.1.

### **3.2 Evaluation of options**

See following table for a summary of analysis under section 32(2) of the Act.

---

<sup>7</sup> Places proposed for deletion are likely to have historic heritage values, but not to the extent that subdivision, use and development is broadly inappropriate.

Options	Efficiency and effectiveness of provisions in achieving the objectives <sup>8</sup>	Benefits	Costs
<p><b>Option 1</b> Do nothing/ retain status quo</p>	<p>Will not achieve the objective of PPCX, being to correct errors and, where required, update information for the identified historic heritage places in Schedule 14.1.</p> <p>Is not efficient or effective due to increased time and money to assess resource consent applications for historic heritage places when the information about them is incorrect and/or outdated.</p> <p>Is not efficient to owners of the historic heritage places identified for inclusion in the plan change, as the use and development allowed by the AUP for each of these places may not be appropriate to each place because of the incorrect and/or outdated information in Schedule 14.1 for these places.</p>	<p>There is no cost to Council to undertake a public plan change; an economic benefit.</p>	<p>Historic heritage places may not be appropriately managed and protected due to errors in Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps. These errors could cause the loss of significant historic heritage values through inappropriate subdivision, use and, development.</p> <p>Costs may be imposed on owners of historic heritage places because the errors and outdated information in Schedule 14.1 may impose an additional and unnecessary consenting burden, when the historic heritage values of a place do not warrant the scheduling of the place.</p> <p>The known errors and inaccuracies in Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps may affect the integrity of the Historic Heritage Overlay and the AUP, and cause a reputational cost to Council.</p>
<p><b>Option 2 – wait for AUP review</b></p>	<p>Will not achieve the objective of PPCX, being to correct errors and, where required, update information for the identified historic heritage places in Schedule 14.1.</p> <p>Is not efficient or effective due to increased time and money to assess resource consent applications for historic heritage places when the information about them is incorrect and/or outdated.</p> <p>Is not efficient to owners of the historic heritage places identified for inclusion in the plan change, as the use and development allowed by the AUP for each of these places may not be appropriate to each place</p>	<p>There is no cost at present to Council to undertake a public plan change; an economic benefit.</p>	<p>Historic heritage places may not be appropriately managed and protected due to errors in Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps. These errors could cause the loss of significant historic heritage values through inappropriate subdivision, use and, development.</p> <p>Costs may be imposed on owners of historic heritage places because the errors and outdated information in Schedule 14.1 may impose an additional and unnecessary consenting burden, when the historic heritage values of a place do not warrant the scheduling of the place.</p> <p>The known errors and inaccuracies in Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps may affect the integrity of the Historic Heritage Overlay and the AUP, and cause a</p>

<sup>8</sup> RMA s32(1)(b)(ii)

Options	Efficiency and effectiveness of provisions in achieving the objectives <sup>8</sup>	Benefits	Costs
<p><b>Option 3 – plan change</b></p>	<p>because of the incorrect and/or outdated information in Schedule 14.1 for these places.</p> <p>The amendment of historic heritage places to correct errors and update information means the places, as well as their values and significance, are clearly identified. This will ensure these places are protected and managed appropriately through the provisions of the Historic Heritage Overlay.</p> <p>For the Historic Heritage Overlay to be efficient and effective, Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps must use correct and up-to-date information.</p>	<p>The plan change will give greater certainty to owners of historic heritage places, as the correction of errors property are correctly and more clearly set out.</p> <p>There are social and cultural benefits through the recognition, protection and appropriate management of significant historic heritage places.</p> <p>The integrity of the Historic Heritage Overlay, including Schedule 14.1 and Plan maps, and of the AUP is protected.</p> <p>There is no economic growth or employment benefits anticipated.</p>	<p>reputational cost to Council.</p> <p>There is a cost to the Council to proceed with a plan change.</p> <p>There is likely to be costs to owners of historic heritage places included in the plan change if there is disagreement with the proposed amendments to the place, through the need to engage in the plan change process.</p> <p>There may be perceived opportunity costs, through particular properties being subject to greater management and protection through the correction of errors in Schedule 14.1 and Plan maps.</p>

### **3.3 Risk of acting or not acting**

Section 32(2)(c) of the Act requires this evaluation to assess the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions. There is considered to be sufficient information about the historic heritage places included in PPCX for the plan change to proceed.

The section 32 evaluation will continue to be refined in relation to any new information that may arise following notification, including information arising from submissions on PPCX and during hearings on PPCX.

### **3.4 Reasons for the preferred option**

All places proposed to be included in PPCX are known to be subject to an error either in the way they are identified in Schedule 14.1 and/or relating to the mapping of the Historic Heritage Overlay in the Plan maps (extent of place). To ensure these historic heritage places are identified using correct and up-to-date information, amendments to Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps are required. Therefore, the 'do nothing' approach is not considered to be an appropriate option.

The evaluation of options in section 3.2 of this report shows that the preferred option for meeting the objectives of the proposal, and the most efficient and effective option, is a plan change to the AUP to amend individual historic heritage places within Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps to correct errors and update information.

In accordance with section 32(1)(a) of the Act, the objectives of the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. No new objective or policy is proposed in PPCX. PPCX uses the existing objectives, policies and rule framework for the recognition and protection of historic heritage.

## **4 Resource Management Framework**

### **4.1 Part 2 of the Act**

The purpose of the Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, as defined in section 5(2) of the Act. Part 2 matters in the Act relevant to significant historic heritage as provided for in the AUP include:

- Section 6(f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

Historic heritage is also relevant to sections 7 and 8 of the Act:

- section 7(aa) the ethic of stewardship,
- section 7(c) the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values,
- section 7(f) the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment,
- section 7(g) finite characteristics of natural and physical resources, and
- section 8 the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi).

PPCX is consistent with Part 2 of the Act, and in particular with the purpose of the Act, as it seeks to provide for the sustainable management of Auckland's historic heritage resources.

The amendment of historic heritage places in Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps will continue to provide for the use, development, and protection of these physical resources and for them to be managed in a way, or at a rate which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being, and for their health and safety.

The management and protection of historic heritage is a core responsibility of the Council's role in exercising its powers and functions under the Act. The scheduling of historic heritage places is an appropriate method for assisting the management of significant historic heritage resources in Auckland. This relies on the use of correct and up-to-date information to identify historic heritage places, both within Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps.

## **4.2 Other relevant sections of the Act**

Section 31(a) of the Act states that a function of the Council is: the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district. It is considered that PPCX assists the Council to carry out its functions as set out in section 31 of the Act.

Section 74 of the Act sets out the matters to be considered by a territorial authority when preparing or changing its district plan. These matters include any proposed RPS, proposed regional plan, and management plans or strategies prepared under other legislation, relevant entries in the New Zealand Heritage List/Rāraangi Kōrero (**NZHL/RK**), to the extent that these are relevant to the resource management issues of the district. The authority must take into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority to the extent that its content has a bearing on the resource management issues of the district, but must not have regard to trade competition.

When determining the date on which a plan change takes effect the Act provides in section 86B(3) that:

*A rule in a proposed plan has legal effect only once a decision on submissions relating to the rule is made and publicly notified.*

Exceptions are provided in section 86B(3) of the Act, but are not considered relevant in relation to PPCX.

## **4.3 National Policy Statements**

National policy statements are instruments issued under section 52(2) of the Act and state objectives and policies for matters of national significance. The AUP is required to give effect to any national policy statements<sup>9</sup>. The only national policy statement that is relevant to the proposed plan change is the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (**NZCPS**).

---

<sup>9</sup> RMA s67(3) and s75(3)

## **New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement**

Of the historic heritage places proposed to be amended through PPCX, three are located within the coastal marine area<sup>10</sup>. Other places are located within the wider coastal environment.

Objective 6 of the NZCPS is relevant to historic heritage. This objective seeks to enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and their health and safety, through subdivision, use and development, recognising that historic heritage in the coastal environment is extensive but not fully known, and is vulnerable to loss or damage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

A number of policies in the NZCPS generally relate to historic heritage in the coastal environment. Policy 17 specially relates to the identification and protection of historic heritage in the coastal environment from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

PPCX gives effect to the NZCPS as it assists in the identification of historic heritage, and therefore the recognition and protection of historic heritage places from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

### **4.4 National Environmental Standards**

There are currently five National Environmental Standards in force as regulations, but none of these relate to the management and protection of historic heritage.

### **4.5 National Planning Standards**

The purpose of the National Planning Standards (**standards**) is to improve consistency in plan and policy statement structure, format and content so they are easier to prepare, understand, compare, and comply with. The standards will also support implementation of national policy statements and help people observe the procedural principles of the Act.

The standards, which were introduced as part of the 2017 amendments to the Act, are currently under development. The first set of standards was released for public consultation in June 2018. The Minister for the Environment must approve the first set of standards by April 2019, after which time Councils will be required to amend their plans to incorporate the standards. As the first set of standards has not yet been approved, they are not yet relevant to PPCX.

### **4.6 Other Acts**

#### **Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014**

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (**Heritage NZ**) is the principal agency operating under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (**HNZPTA**). Heritage NZ

---

<sup>10</sup> ID 00569 Combes/Daldy lime kilns work site; ID 0729 Te Marae o Hinekakea village site, including grave; ID 01587 Te Kōpua Kai a Hiku/Panmure Basin, including Mokoia pā site, terrace/midden, and middens Midden R11\_98, R11\_1255, R11\_1377, R11\_1384, R11\_1385, R11\_2158 R11\_2263, R11\_2264, R11\_2265, R11\_2266

maintains the NZHL/RK<sup>11</sup> for the purposes of providing information to the public and landowners, and to promote and assist in the protection of these places. The NZHL/RK is primarily an advocacy tool and the inclusion of a place on the NZHL/RK does not in itself protect the place.

Protection of some heritage places is also achieved through the regulatory provisions of the HNZPTA. Part 3 of the HNZPTA requires any person wishing to undertake work that may damage, modify or destroy an archaeological site to obtain an authority from Heritage NZ for that work.

Thirteen places proposed to be amended in PPCX are included in the NZHL/RK<sup>12</sup>. Amending these places is compatible with the NZHL/RK and the HNZPTA, as the amendments sought are to correct errors and update information about the historic heritage places subject to the plan change.

### **Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000**

The Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 (**HGMPA**) was established to promote the integrated management and the protection and enhancement of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and its catchments. In order to achieve the purpose of the HGMPA, all persons exercising powers or carrying out functions for the Hauraki Gulf under any Act specified in Schedule 1 must, in addition to any other requirement specified in those Acts for the exercise of that power or the carrying out of that function, have particular regard to the provisions of sections 7 and 8.

Section 7 of the HGMPA recognises the national significance of the Hauraki Gulf. Section 8 of the HGMPA seeks to protect and enhance the Hauraki Gulf's resources, including its historic resources.

The Hauraki Gulf Marine Park includes all the coast and coastal marine area from Mangawhai in the north and to an area beyond the Auckland region in the south. The catchment area of the park extends inland to the first ridgeline. A number of historic heritage places proposed to be included in PPCX are therefore within the park's boundaries.

The amendment of historic heritage places within the Hauraki Gulf Island Marine Park has particular regard to sections 7 and 8 of the HGMPA as it will assist in the protection and enhancement of these places and is therefore compatible with the HGMPA.

### **Reserves Act 1997**

The purpose of the Reserves Act is for the Department of Conservation (**DOC**) or local authorities (where DOC has delegated responsibility), to administer land for its preservation

---

<sup>11</sup> The NZHL/RK includes historic places, historic areas, waahi tapu and waahi tapu areas

<sup>12</sup> ID 00452 Minniesdale Chapel; ID 01350 Guy Homestead; ID 01354 Flat Bush School House (former)/Murphy Homestead; ID 01444 Metro Theatre (former)/Mangere East Hall; ID 01466 St Saviour's Chapel and Papatoetoe Orphan's Home and School (former); ID 01597 Stoneleigh (former)/Epworth (former); ID 01634 Dilworth Terrace Houses; ID 01642 Dominion Road Methodist Church; ID 01747 Crystal Palace Theatre; ID 01979 George Court Department Store (former); ID 02728 Citizens Advice Bureau (former); ID 02735 Queens Wharf; ID 02745 No Deposit Piano Company Building (note that ID 02728 and ID 02745 are the same place)

and management for the benefit and enjoyment of the public. These areas of reserve land possess various values and features, including those that are historic in nature.

Some of the historic heritage places subject to PPCX are located within reserves managed by Auckland Council. The proposed amendment of historic heritage places within these reserves supports the historic values of the reserves, and has the potential to enhance the benefit and enjoyment of the public of these places, due to the places and their values being identified correctly.

### **Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008**

Of the historic heritage places proposed to be amended through PPCX, four are located within the Waitakere Ranges heritage area<sup>13</sup>.

The purpose of the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008 (**WRHAA**) is to recognise the national, regional and local significance of the Waitakere Ranges heritage area and to promote the protection and enhancement of its heritage features for present and future generations. The objectives of establishing and maintaining the heritage area include the protection, restoration, and enhancement of the area and its heritage features, and to ensure that impacts on the area as a whole are considered when decisions are made affecting any part of it.

Amendments to the scheduling of the places within the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area will assist in the protection and enhancement of the historic heritage features within the heritage area. PPCX therefore gives effect to the purpose of the WRHAA and its objectives, as the information in the AUP for these places will be correct.

### **4.7 The Auckland Plan**

The Auckland Plan includes the following direction 'Ensure Auckland's natural environment and cultural heritage is valued and cared for'<sup>14</sup>. The Auckland Plan states that we must actively seek opportunities to protect and enhance these values [including cultural heritage values] through our short and long-term decisions.

PPCX will assist with the protection and enhancement of Auckland's historic heritage, and will help value and care for this heritage, through using correct and up-to-date information to identify these places.

### **4.8 The Auckland Unitary Plan**

When preparing or changing a district plan, Council must give effect to any RPS and have regard to any proposed RPS<sup>15</sup>. The RPS identifies a number of issues of regional significance, including:

---

<sup>13</sup> ID 00060 Residence; ID 00091 Infant Block; ID 00107 Residence; ID 00119 Church

<sup>14</sup> Auckland Plan, Direction 1

<sup>15</sup> RMA s74(2) and s75(3)

## **B5 Ngā rawa tuku iho me te āhua - Historic heritage and special character**

Chapter B5 contains two objectives:

- (1) *Significant historic heritage places are identified and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.*
- (2) *Significant historic heritage places are used appropriately and their protection, management and conservation are encouraged, including retention, maintenance and adaptation.*

These objectives are supported by policies B5.2.2 (1) to (9). The objective of PPCX aligns with these objectives and policies as it seeks to identify historic heritage places by using correct and up-to-date information and to ensure the places in Schedule 14.1 contain sufficient historic heritage value to be included in the schedule. This will assist the historic heritage places to be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

### **B6 Mana Whenua**

The objectives and policies in B6.3 Recognising Mana Whenua values are relevant to PPCX. Council has sent the draft plan change to the iwi authorities of Auckland. Feedback has not yet been received, but will be outlined in section 5.2 below. **[insert details of feedback when received]**

### **B8 Toitū te taiwhenua – Coastal environment**

This chapter contains objectives and policies relating to the natural character of the coastal environment; subdivision, use and development of the coastal environment; public access and open space; and managing the Hauraki Gulf.

Three historic heritage places in PPCX are located in the coastal marine area, with other places are located within the wider coastal environment. The objective of the plan change aligns with B8 as it seeks to correctly identify these places and therefore assist in ensuring any subdivision, use and development of historic heritage places is appropriate to their values.

## **5 Development of the Proposed Plan Change**

This section outlines the development of PPCX and the consultation undertaken in preparing the plan change.

### **5.1 Methodology**

#### **Background**

Each historic heritage place included in PPCX has, as part of a previous plan process, been evaluated for its historic heritage significance. Schedule 14.1 contains over 2,200 historic heritage places, most of which were “rolled over” from legacy regional and district plans into a single historic heritage schedule in the PAUP. In addition, Schedule 14.1 contains historic

heritage places added through the PAUP, and places added through Plan Change 7 to the AUP<sup>16</sup>.

The amalgamation of places from the legacy plan schedules into the PAUP Historic Heritage Schedule was undertaken in 2012 by Heritage Unit staff, assisted by external planning and heritage consultants. This rollover process involved a number of steps to produce a single schedule containing all legacy places and new places. Considerable work went into identifying the criteria in the PAUP that related to each legacy historic heritage place that was to be amalgamated into the PAUP Schedule.

All the historic heritage places included in the PAUP Historic Heritage Schedule were assumed to have considerable or outstanding value in relation to one or more of the RPS evaluation criteria, and have considerable or outstanding overall significance to their locality or a greater geographic area<sup>17</sup>. For this reason, these places were identified in the historic heritage schedule and the Plan maps.

The identification of historic heritage places within Schedule 14.1 is required to be in accordance with:

- RPS Policy B5.2.2; and
- the Methodology for Evaluating Historic Heritage Significance (**Methodology**)<sup>18</sup>.

Schedule 14.1 is known to contain errors. While many legacy errors were corrected through the AUP process and the creation of Schedule 14.1, some legacy errors not corrected in the rollover, and some new errors were inadvertently introduced during the PAUP process. In addition, research on some scheduled historic heritage places has provided additional information, which now needs to be reflected in Schedule 14.1.

In addition to the errors, some places require amendments to align with the Council's property information, including legal descriptions and street addresses. Some places also require amendments to ensure there is consistency with how similar places are identified in Schedule 14.1.

Nearly all places included in PPCX have been included within the Historic Heritage Overlay primarily for their built heritage values. There are however, four places included in the plan change that were scheduled for their archaeological values. These places are:

- ID 00569 Combes/Daldy lime works site R09\_2240;
- ID 00729 Te Marae o Hinekakea village site, including grave R10\_163;
- ID 01270 Mill site R11\_1633, site of water-powered mill, including water race and dam; and

---

<sup>16</sup> Plan Change 7, which was notified on 16 November 2017, proposed to add 49 new historic heritage places to Schedule 14.1. The decision on Plan Change 7 was publicly notified on 21 March 2019.

<sup>17</sup> AUP Policy B5.2.2(3)

<sup>18</sup> The Methodology is a non-regulatory method of achieving the objectives and policies of the AUP. It provides guidance on the process of evaluating the significance of historic heritage places against the criteria set out in the RPS.

- ID 01587 Te Kōpua Kai a Hiku/Panmure Basin, including Mokoia pā site, terrace/midden, and middens Midden R11\_98, R11\_1255, R11\_1377, R11\_1384, R11\_1385, R11\_2158 R11\_2263, R11\_2264, R11\_2265, R11\_2266.

In general, places identified predominantly for their archaeological or Māori heritage values are subject to a different work programme within the Heritage Unit and will be included in future plan change processes, where appropriate. However, for these four places, there is considered to be either significant risk posed to the place and/or implementation issues arising from the errors known to exist in Schedule 14.1 relating to the place.

### **Review of historic heritage places**

Schedule 14.1 contains a number of known errors. Many of these were identified through a systematic review of Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps undertaken by Heritage Unit staff. The purpose of the review was to ensure that the text and maps for scheduled historic heritage places align, and that the information for each place was correct and up-to-date. During the review period, additional research has been undertaken for some places, in particular places that are category A\*. The outcome of this research has also resulted in some information needing to be updated in Schedule 14.1.

Some errors in Schedule 14.1 and the Plan maps have been identified by other Council staff on an ad hoc basis, for example when staff are undertaking site visits to provide advice on resource consent applications relating to scheduled historic heritage places.

For a limited number of places included in PPCX, the owner has contacted Council to advise that there may be an error in Schedule 14.1 or the Plan maps for their property, or has asked Council to review the scheduled historic heritage place to determine whether it meets the criteria and thresholds for inclusion in Schedule 14.1.

The errors and inconsistencies that have been identified include:

- the extent of place (mapped in the Plan maps) is incorrect, or there is no extent of place mapped in the Plan maps;
- the name of the place is not historically correct;
- the address and/or legal description is incorrect;
- there is no primary feature identified;
- exclusions in Schedule 14.1 are not identified or are incorrect;
- a place has duplicate entries within the schedule;
- the place may not meet the RPS criteria and thresholds for scheduling; and
- minor amendments are required for grammar, sense and consistency.

As part of this review, a principle of “refining management” was introduced. This is defined as ensuring the management of a historic heritage place is appropriate to the values and significance of that place.

To refine management, once a place was identified as containing an error, the place was then subject to further review. This is specific to each place, but has involved:

- for category A\* places, a review to determine whether a place is category A or category B;
- for places suspected of not having significant historic heritage values, a review to determine whether the place meets the criteria and thresholds for scheduling in the RPS (i.e. whether the place has sufficient historic heritage value to be included Schedule 14.1);
- identification of a primary feature;
- correction/updating of any other column, including name, legal description, exclusions, and heritage values, as required; and/or
- amending or, where required, defining the mapped extent of place.

Where possible, errors were corrected through the clause 20A process under the Act<sup>19</sup>. The majority of Clause 20A errors were corrected through an update to the AUP on 20 June 2017. If errors did not meet the Clause 20A test they were considered for inclusion within a plan change. Errors relating to 145 historic heritage places were amended through PPC10. Errors that were not addressed through that process, and errors that have been identified since, were considered for inclusion in PPCX.

### **Places subject to errors not included within PCX**

Not all places with known errors are included within PPCX. These errors will be reviewed and a future plan change may be notified in order to correct these errors. Furthermore, it is expected that errors will continue to be identified. If so, these places are also likely to be the subject of a future plan change.

## **5.2 Consultation undertaken**

In accordance with clause 3 of Schedule 1 of the Act, during the preparation of a proposed policy statement or plan, the local authority shall consult with:

- a) the Minister for the Environment; and*
- b) those other Ministers of the Crown who may be affected by the policy statement or plan; and*
- c) local authorities who may be so affected; and*
- d) the tangata whenua of the area who may be so affected, through iwi authorities; and*
- e) any customary marine title group in the area.*

A local authority may consult anyone else during the preparation of a proposed policy statement or plan. A letter was sent on 4 March 2019 to the Minister for the Environment, Minister of Conservation, local authorities whose jurisdiction adjoins Auckland Council, and Heritage New Zealand. [insert details of responses received].

<sup>19</sup> Clause 20A of Schedule 1 of the Act allows Council to amend, without using the process in the schedule, an operative policy statement or plan to correct any minor errors

## Consultation with iwi authorities

In accordance with clause 3B of Schedule 1 of the Act, for the purposes of clause 3(1)(d), a local authority is to be treated as having consulted with iwi authorities in relation to those whose details are entered in the record kept under section 35A, if the local authority—

- (a) considers ways in which it may foster the development of their capacity to respond to an invitation to consult; and*
- (b) establishes and maintains processes to provide opportunities for those iwi authorities to consult it; and*
- (c) consults with those iwi authorities; and*
- (d) enables those iwi authorities to identify resource management issues of concern to them; and*
- (e) indicates how those issues have been or are to be addressed.*

In addition to the above, recent legislation changes to the Act introduced the following sections in relation to iwi authorities:

Section 32(4A):

*(4A) If the proposal is a proposed policy statement, plan, or change prepared in accordance with any of the processes provided for in Schedule 1, the evaluation report must—*

- (a) summarise all advice concerning the proposal received from iwi authorities under the relevant provisions of Schedule 1; and*
- (b) summarise the response to the advice, including any provisions of the proposal that are intended to give effect to the advice.*

Schedule 1

*4A Further pre-notification requirements concerning iwi authorities*

*(1) Before notifying a proposed policy statement or plan, a local authority must—*

*(a) provide a copy of the relevant draft proposed policy statement or plan to the iwi authorities consulted under clause 3(1)(d); and*

*(b) have particular regard to any advice received on a draft proposed policy statement or plan from those iwi authorities.*

*(2) When a local authority provides a copy of the relevant draft proposed policy statement or plan in accordance with subclause (1), it must allow adequate time and opportunity for the iwi authorities to consider the draft and provide advice on it.*

In accordance with Schedule 1 clause 4A, a draft of the plan change and draft section 32 report was sent to all iwi authorities of the Auckland region on 1 March 2019. **[insert details of any feedback received]**

## Consultation with Local Boards

Memos were sent to the relevant local boards on 11 March 2019 to inform them of PPCX. The letters provided an explanation of the proposed plan change and included a list of historic heritage places proposed to be amended by the plan change relevant to each local board area. The letters also provided specific information about the deletion of any scheduled historic heritage places proposed for each local board area.

Council staff, along with staff from Panuku, attended a meeting with Henderson-Massey Local Board on 12 February 2019, in order to update the local board about the proposed inclusion of ID 00262 Waitakere Civic Centre in PPCX. [insert details of any feedback received]

## Consultation with other parties

The Heritage Advisory Panel was advised of PPCX at its 26 February 2019 meeting. No feedback was received on the plan change.

On 5 March 2019, emails were sent to the following Auckland Council groups or organisations: Parks, Community Facilities, Community Services, Auckland Transport and Panuku, to advise them of the proposed plan change, and identify places subject to PPCX that are in their ownership or management. [insert details of any feedback received]

## Ministry of Education

On 11 March 2019, letters were sent to the owners of the xx properties proposed to be deleted from Schedule 14.1 as part of the PPCX. The letters advised the owners that their property was proposed for inclusion in the plan change, and what the process for involvement in the plan change is, should it be approved for notification. The letters also advised that specific places may not be included in PPCX, should the Planning Committee wish to remove them.

Engagement with other owners and/or occupiers has occurred where they have identified a potential error and/or as part of liaison with owners to access properties for site visits. In some instances this has resulted in ongoing communication between Council staff and the particular owners/occupiers.

## 6 Evaluation of provisions

This part of the report evaluates the provisions contained within PPCX, being an overview of the proposed amendments.

### 6.1 Overview of the amendments

Schedule 14.1 contains the following columns, which include information about each scheduled historic heritage place:

- ID
- Place Name and/or Description

- Verified Location
- Verified Legal Description
- Category
- Primary Feature
- Heritage Values
- Extent of Place
- Exclusions
- Additional Rules for Archaeological Sites or Features
- Place of Māori Interest or Significance

The inclusion of a historic heritage place in Schedule 14.1 means the provisions of the Historic Heritage Overlay apply to that place. This is also known as the scheduling of a place.

The Historic Heritage Overlay is based on a proportionate management approach, whereby activities anticipated to have a greater effect on a historic heritage place in Schedule 14.1 are subject to more rigorous management. The identification of an extent of place, primary feature(s), and exclusions is the basis of this management approach, ensuring the management of a historic heritage place is specific to its features, and therefore to the values and significance of that particular place.

The identification of information for each column in Schedule 14.1 for a historic heritage place requires correct and up-to-date information. It is reasonable to expect that the information held by Council on places may increase/change over time, along with the understanding of places and how they should be protected and managed.

The process of refining management (as outlined in section 5.1) responds to these changes in information and in understanding. It aims to ensure that unnecessary consent activity is not generated, and that a property can be subject to reasonable use, while also continuing to protect historic heritage places from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.

## **6.2 Amendments to Schedule 14.1**

There are no amendments proposed to the column 'ID'.

### **6.2.1 Amendments to 'Place Name and/or Description' column**

PPCX proposes amendments to the names of 25 places. These amendments are predominantly to make the name of the place more historically correct. In some cases the proposed amendment is to ensure the name of a place is more consistent with the identification of similar places in Schedule 14.1. Some of the amendments proposed to this column are to correct spelling and grammatical errors.

### **6.2.2 Amendments to 'Verified Location' and 'Verified Legal Description' columns**

PPCX proposes amendments to the address (known as the 'Verified Location' in Schedule 14.1) for 12 places. Amendments to the 'Verified Legal Description' are proposed for 31 places.

Amendments to the address and/or legal description of a historic heritage place are predominantly for two reasons:

- to ensure the address and legal description align with the extent of place identified within the Plan maps; and
- to ensure the address and legal description aligns with the Council's property information, and therefore this information is searchable within the Council's systems, for both landowners and Council staff.

Some of the amendments to the Verified Legal Description column are to add the legal description for a place in Schedule 14.1, because the schedule does not include one.

### **6.2.3 Amendments to 'Category' column, including A\***

PPCX proposes amendments to the 'Category' column for seven places. Schedule 14.1 identifies the category of significance for historic heritage places. Chapter B5 of the AUP outlines the three categories of historic heritage place in Schedule 14.1<sup>20</sup>:

- Category A: historic heritage places that are of outstanding significance well beyond their immediate environs;
- Category A\*: historic heritage places identified in previous district plans which are yet to be evaluated and assessed for their significance; and
- Category B: historic heritage places that are of considerable significance to a locality or beyond.

PPCX includes six category A\* places. The AUP makes it clear that category A\* is an interim category until each place can be reviewed.<sup>21</sup> As part of the preparation of the plan change, these places have been reviewed to assess their significance. The review of category A\* places undertaken as part of PPCX have resulted in the following proposed categories:

#### *Category A*

- ID 01447 Nathan Homestead and gardens; and
- ID 01466 St Saviour's Chapel and Papatoetoe Orphan's Home and School (former).

#### *Category B*

- ID 01053 Earnoch;
- ID 01127 Commercial building;
- ID 01330 Meadowbrook; and
- ID 01453 Dutch prefabricated house.

#### *Dilworth Terrace Houses*

There is one other place in PPCX where the category is proposed to be changed. The amendment of the category for Dilworth Terrace Houses (ID 01634) from B to A is the result of this place having an historic heritage evaluation prepared in 2018 as part of Council's

---

<sup>20</sup> AUP B5.2.2(4)

<sup>21</sup> Chapter D17.1 Background

response to an appeal relating to the Dilworth Terraces Houses viewshaft.<sup>22</sup> The viewshaft was included in the PAUP for the purpose of managing the scale of development to protect the view of the Dilworth Terrace houses from the eastern end of Quay Street. Strand Holdings Limited lodged an appeal to the High Court for a judicial review of the Independent Hearing Panel's recommendation and the Council's decision to relocate the viewpoint of the Dilworth Terrace Houses Viewshaft from Quay Street to The Strand. An appeal on the viewshaft by Strand Holdings resulted in Council reconsidering the most appropriate location for the viewshaft.

Advice on how to proceed with the appeal and the possible alternative location of the viewshaft was reported to Council's Planning Committee in February 2018. One of the resolutions arising from that meeting was that the Planning Committee agrees to investigate changing the status of the Dilworth Terrace Houses from category B to category A in the Historic Heritage Schedule.<sup>23</sup>

Council staff have reviewed the 2018 historic heritage evaluation for the terrace houses and agrees that the category for this place should be amended from category B to category A, in conjunction with the identification of an appropriate primary feature and exclusions for the place in Schedule 14.1.

#### **6.2.4 Amendments to 'Primary Feature' column**

The primary feature forms the fundamental basis for scheduling a historic heritage place<sup>24</sup>, and Schedule 14.1 includes a column for the identification of the primary feature or features. PPCX proposes the identification or amendment of primary features for 55 places.

Of these, 52 are for category B places. The identification of a primary feature for a category B place was introduced during the PAUP hearings. For this reason, most category B places do not yet have a primary feature identified in Schedule 14.1. The provisions of the Historic Heritage Overlay require that if the primary features of a category B place is not identified, all features within the extent of place are considered primary when implementing the rules<sup>25</sup>.

PPCX proposes to amend the primary feature column for two category A\* places, as a result of the review of these places. These reviews have resulted in additional information about the places which is considered to require the amendment of the primary feature column.

PPCX also proposes to add a primary feature for ID 01634 Dilworth Terrace Houses as this place does not currently have a primary feature identified. As outlined in section 6.2.3 above, this category B place is proposed to be amended to category A.

The identification of a primary feature is a key part of the proportionate management approach of the Historic Heritage Overlay.

---

<sup>22</sup> Dilworth Terrace Houses Historic Heritage Evaluation prepared for Auckland Council by Plan.Heritage, 16 February 2018

<sup>23</sup> PLA/2018/10

<sup>24</sup> D17 Introduction

<sup>25</sup> AUP D17.1 Background

### **6.2.5 Amendments to ‘Heritage Values’ column**

Heritage values, also known in the AUP as ‘criteria’<sup>26</sup>, are the identified values for a place, and are included in Schedule 14.1 where they have been evaluated to be considerable or greater. The values are identified for each historic heritage place in Schedule 14.1 and are referenced with the following letters: A: historical; B: social; C: Mana Whenua; D: knowledge; E: technology; F: physical attributes; G: aesthetic; H: context.

PPCX proposes amendments to the ‘Heritage Values’ column for 12 places. For six of these places, the amendments are the result of the A\* review that has been undertaken for the place. For four of these places, the amendments to the heritage values are to reflect the historic values identified in recent historic heritage evaluations or identified from recent research about the place<sup>27</sup>. For the remaining two places, the amendments to the heritage values are to correct errors introduced when the places were added to the PAUP<sup>28</sup>.

### **6.2.6 Amendments to ‘Extent of Place’ column**

Policy B5.2.2(2) of the RPS requires the location and physical extent of each historic heritage place to be identified. This area, known as the ‘extent of place’, contains the historic heritage values of the place and, where appropriate, any area that is relevant to an understanding of the function, meaning and relationships of the historic heritage values of the place.

PPCX proposes amendments to the extent of place in the Plan maps for 48 places (see section 6.3 below).

PPCX proposes amendments to the ‘Extent of Place’ column in Schedule 14.1 for two places. For these places, no extent of place has been mapped for the place in the Plan maps but PPCX is proposing to add an extent of place. For places in Schedule 14.1 that do not have an extent of place mapped in the Plan maps, the Extent of Place column usually includes the following: ‘To be defined#’. The # links to the provisions of AUP D17 Historic Heritage Overlay, and provides for the rules in Tables D17.4.1 and D17.4.2 to apply to all land and water within 50m of the feature annotated with #. This reference is proposed to be amended to ‘Refer to planning maps’ in Schedule 14.1 for the two places, as PPCX is proposing to map the extent of place for each place in the Plan maps.

### **6.2.7 Amendments to ‘Exclusions’ column**

Some historic heritage places have identified exclusions in Schedule 14.1, for example the interiors of buildings or accessory buildings. Features listed as exclusions do not contribute to, or may detract from the values for which the historic heritage place has been scheduled or, particularly with the interiors of buildings, may not have been evaluated<sup>29</sup>. Activities affecting features identified as exclusions in Schedule are either permitted, or require

---

<sup>26</sup> AUP B5.2.2(1)

<sup>27</sup> ID 00729 Te Marae o Hinekakea village site, including grave R10\_163; ID 01270 Mill site R11\_1633; ID 01587 Wai Makoia, including pa site and middens R11\_2158; and ID 01634 Dilworth Terrace Houses

<sup>28</sup> ID 02494 Mann House and ID 02495 Lush House

<sup>29</sup> AUP D17.1 Background

consent as controlled activities, in order to manage the affect such activities may have on the historic heritage values of the place overall<sup>30</sup>.

PPCX proposes amendments to exclusions for 40 places, which consist of:

- amendments to add exclusions, where other features that do not contribute to the heritage values of the place or detract from these values have been identified;
- changes to the wording of existing exclusions, including where the exclusion is incorrect, unclear, or is inconsistent with how similar features have been identified in Schedule 14.1; and
- the deletion of specific exclusions, including where an amended extent of place no longer covers the identified exclusion, or where the interior has been assessed as having heritage value.

The identification of exclusions is a key part of the proportionate management approach of the Historic Heritage Overlay.

### **6.2.8 Amendments to ‘Additional Rules for Archaeological Sites or Features’ column**

Scheduled historic heritage places that are archaeological sites, or contain archaeological sites or features that contribute to the significance of the place, are identified in Schedule 14.1 by the inclusion of the word ‘Yes’ in the ‘Additional Rules for Archaeological Sites or Features’ column<sup>31</sup>. Places identified in this column are subject to additional rules to manage activities that have the potential to adversely affect archaeological values, such as land disturbance.

PPCX proposes amendments to exclusions for one place; ID 01330 Meadowbrook, as the A\* review of this place identified that the place, which was constructed around 1880, has two wells, from which artefacts have already been extracted.

### **6.2.9 Amendments to ‘Place of Māori Interest or Significance’ column**

Schedule 14.1 identifies scheduled historic heritage places that are sites or places of significance to Mana Whenua (by the inclusion of ‘Yes’ in the ‘Place of Māori Interest or Significance’ column). These places may also be subject to D21 Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua Overlay.

As outlined above, in general places identified predominantly for their archaeological or Māori heritage values are subject to a different work programme within the Heritage Unit and will be the subject of other future plan change processes. However, PPCX proposes a change to the ‘Place of Māori Interest or Significance’ column in Schedule 14.1 for one place: Mill site R11\_1633 at the Botanic Gardens Regional Park (ID 01270), due to an error during the rollover of the place from the legacy district plan to the PAUP. This error resulted in the place being wrongly identified as a place of Māori interest or significance. A review of the information relating to this place has confirmed it is a European-era mill site, and is not known to be a place of interest or significance to Māori.

---

<sup>30</sup> AUP Table D17.4.1, Table D17.4.2, and Table D17.4.3

<sup>31</sup> AUP D17.1 Background

### 6.3 Amendments to the Plan maps (extent of place)

A number of mapping errors were introduced through the creation of Schedule 14.1 during the PAUP process. These errors include the extents of place in the Plan maps for some places that are too big, too small, or are located on the wrong property. In some cases, no extent of place was mapped in the Plan maps and the scheduled historic heritage place was not marked at all or marked by a dot only. Mapping errors can reduce the protection and management of historic heritage places, or result in the application of the Historic Heritage Overlay rules where they are not required (i.e. outside the area containing the historic heritage values of a place), resulting in the generation of unnecessary consenting activity.

Amendments have been made in the Plan maps for 48 places in Schedule 14.1.

The identification of an extent of place is a key part of the proportionate management approach of the Historic Heritage Overlay.

### 6.4 Amendments to delete places

Council's Heritage Unit Strategic Vision identifies reviewing Schedule 14.1 as a priority, aligned with the 10-year target of ensuring Schedule 14.1 is robust. PPCX proposes to delete 11 places from Schedule 14.1, including:

- two places that were damaged by fire and subsequently demolished via resource consent; and
- nine places that do not have sufficient historic heritage value to be included in Schedule 14.1.

#### *Places that have been demolished*

Two of the places proposed for deletion no longer exist. These are:

- ID 00499 Waiwera Bath House, which was damaged by fire and demolished via a resource consent, which was issued on 11 May 2016, and
- ID 01437 Residence at 79 Coronation Road, Mangere Bridge, which was damaged by fire and subsequently demolished by authority of a resource consent issued on 22 May 2001. Resource consent to relocate the existing dwelling onto 79 Coronation Road was issued in 2006.

#### *Places that do not have sufficient historic heritage value*

As outlined earlier in this report, each historic heritage place included in Schedule 14.1 has, as part of a previous process, been evaluated for its historic heritage significance in accordance with the criteria and thresholds in B5.2.2(3) of the AUP RPS:

- (3) *Include a place with historic heritage value in Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic heritage if:*
  - a. *the place has considerable or outstanding value in relation to one or more of the evaluation criteria in Policy B5.2.2(1); and*
  - b. *the place has considerable or outstanding overall significance to the locality or greater geographic area.*

As part of the preparation of PPCX, 11 historic heritage places were reviewed to determine whether they continue to meet the RPS criteria and thresholds for scheduling. These places were identified for review following:

- historic heritage monitoring projects;
- a resource consent application relating to the historic heritage place; or
- a request from the owner of the property.

Nine of the historic heritage places that were reviewed were found not to meet the criteria and thresholds in the RPS. These places are:

- ID 00050 Residence, 62 Ferry Parade, Herald Island;
- ID 00107 Residence, 651 West Coast Road, Oratia;
- ID 00176 Residence, 33 Akehurst Avenue, New Lynn;
- ID 00709 Residence, 141 Park Estate Road, Hingaia;
- ID 00711 Vela House, 10 Hinau Road, Hingaia;
- ID 01057 Porthcurnow East, 14 Muritai Road, Milford;
- ID 01461 Residence, 1 Beihlers Road, Weymouth;
- ID 01462 Residence, 19 William Avenue, Manurewa; and
- ID 01463 Residence, 11 Alfriston Road, Manurewa.

#### *Duplicate place*

In addition to the 11 places proposed for deletion in PPCX, it is proposed to remove one place from Schedule 14.1 because it is a duplicate. This place, ID 02745 No Deposit Piano Company Building, is currently included in Schedule 14.1 twice, as both ID 02745 and as ID 02728 Citizens Advice Bureau (former). This error was introduced during the PAUP. To correct this error, PPCX proposes to remove ID 02745 from Schedule 14.1 and delete the associated extent of place from the Plan maps. Amendments are proposed to ID 02728 to ensure the information in Schedule 14.1 for the place is correct, including the amendment of the name to 'No Deposit Piano Company Building'.

## **7 Conclusion**

PPCX seeks to amend 73 historic heritage places in Schedule 14.1 of the AUP. The purpose of the proposed plan change is to ensure the historic heritage places in Schedule 14.1 are identified with correct and up-to-date information. This in turn will ensure the provisions of the AUP Historic Heritage Overlay apply appropriately to these places and therefore assist in their protection and management.

The main conclusions of the evaluation under Part 2 and Section 32 of the Act are summarised below:

1. PPCX is consistent with the purpose of sustainable management in Section 5 and the principles within Sections 6, 7, and 8, and within Part 2 of the Act.

2. PPCX assists the Council in carrying out its functions set out in Sections 30 and 31 of the Act.
3. Pursuant to Section 75(3)(c) of the Act, PPCX is consistent with the objectives and policies of the Auckland Regional Policy Statement
4. The evaluation undertaken in accordance with Section 32 concluded:
  - i. The use of the existing objectives of the AUP would be the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.
  - ii. The amendment of 73 historic heritage places identified in Schedule 14.1 is the most appropriate means of achieving the objectives identified in section 3 of this report.

<b>Conclusion</b>	This part of the report concludes that the proposed plan change is the most efficient, effective and appropriate means of addressing the resource management issues identified.
-------------------	---

Draft