

## Attachment 6: Chapter B: Regional Policy Statement

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Anomaly	Terminology Error	B5 Built Heritage and Character	C1	NA	The chapter title does not reflect the chapter content. The title is limited to "built" heritage, while the content includes consideration of archaeological sites, gardens, and shipwrecks, amongst other historic heritage places.	Amend the title of the chapter to "Built Historic Heritage and Character".	The title of the chapter will accurately reflect the content of the chapter.	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. These changes are: - section heading of Built Heritage and Character in Chapter D: Overlays in the table of contents, GIS Viewer layer titles and GIS viewer map legend, and - additional referencing amendments in B8.6 Coastal environment - Explanation and principal reasons for adoption, Table 11.4 Monitoring and environmental results anticipated - Built heritage (B5), and D17.8.2 Historic heritage overlay - Assessment criteria.	Proposed recommendation shown in Attachment 32  Consequential changes shown in Attachment 34
Technical	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	B7 Toitū te whenua, toitū te taiao – Natural resources	C1	B7.2.2 Policies (3) and (4)	<p>There is inconsistency in terms used within the RPS Chapter B7.2 - Indigenous biodiversity provisions of the AUP.</p> <p>Objective B7.2(1) refers to the 'Coastal Marine Area', however in Policy B7.2(3) the term 'Coastal environment' is used instead of 'Coastal Marine Area', and this is repeated in the new Policy B7.2(4) of the AUP.</p> <p>The use of the terms 'coastal environment' is inconsistent with the words stated in Objective B7.2(1), where areas of indigenous biodiversity are to be protected on land, in freshwater or in the coastal marine area (and so will be protected in one of these three ways). The use of 'Coastal Marine Area' in the objective is specific and suggests that the provisions/chapter does not relate to areas landward of Mean High Water Springs (MHWS). The use of 'coastal environment' in the policies does not reflect the above intent.</p> <p>The PAUP IHP recommendations version made these changes and Council accepted the changes in the PAUP Decisions version, now carried through into the AUP.</p> <p>The terms 'coastal environment' in policies B7.2(3) and B7.2(4) of the AUP should be replaced with the correct term of 'coastal marine area' stated in Objective B7.2(1). This will make the policies consistent with the objectives of RPS B7.2 of the AUP.</p>	Replace the term 'coastal environment' with 'coastal marine area' in policies B7.2.2. (3) and (4).	<p>The change of terms ensures the policies correctly references and gives effect to RPS Objective B7.2(1), which specifically references to 'Coastal Marine Area'.</p> <p>This makes it clear that the provisions do not relate to areas landward of Mean High Water Springs (MHWS) and ensures that landward area is not assessed against SEA-M factors.</p>	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 7: Chapter D: Overlays

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C1: Low/ few number of changes Low effect	D12: Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Overlay	D12.6.4.19 Subdivision of any site within the area bounded by Holdens Road, Forest Hill Road, Pine Avenue and Parrs Cross Road	An incorrect map (Figure D12.10.2) is referenced in Standards D12.6.4.19.  Standards in D12.6.4.19 relate to Holdens Road, Forest Hill Road, Pine Avenue and Parrs Road.  Figure D12.10.2 refers to Swanson South, which is not within the Holdens Road to Parrs Road area outlined above.  Therefore the reference to Figure D12.10.2 is incorrect.	<b>Recommendation is:</b> To remove incorrect reference, which is: • to remove the reference to Figure 12.10.2 Overlay Subdivision Plan 2 within D12.6.4.19  This will also require: • subsequent renumbering of the rest of the standards (2) to (5) in D12.6.4.19	This incorrect reference requires the any subdivision within Holdens Road, Forest Hill Road, Pine Avenue and Parrs Cross Road, to be subject to additional standards that relate to Swanson South (Foothills).  As these areas are not related in the AUP, this may result in confusion about which standards apply with which areas.	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. The changes are consequential re-numbering of standards D12.6.4.19 (2) to (5) in D12: Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Overlay.	Attachment 31
Technical	Duplication	C3: High number of changes Low effect	D12: Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Overlay	Figure D12.10.10 - Overlay Subdivision Plan 7c - Bush Living (Ranges)	D12.10.9 and D12.10.10- Overlay Subdivision Plan 7c- Bush Living (Ranges), are duplicate figures.  This issue was first noted in the PAUP IHP Recommendations Version, before it was carried over to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part).	<b>Recommendation is:</b> To remove Figure D12.10.10 to avoid duplication.  This also includes: • an update to the numbering of Figures D12.10.11 to D12.10.19 • to update the figure references in the Chapter D12	The duplication of Figures D12.10.9 and D12.10.10 is potentially confusing to users of the AUP.  There is no change to the policies or provisions of D12, and therefore the change remains appropriate to the plan objectives.  The change is mainly a technical one, which requires re-numbering of subsequent figures from D12.10.11 to D12.10.19; and updating figure references in text sections of Chapter D12.	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. In removing Figure D12.10.10, the consequential change is re-numbering subsequent figures (i.e. D12.10.11- D12.10.19). Also, there is a need to renumber the references in the relevant text sections of Chapter D12.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendment to diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C2: Low/ few number of changes High effect	D12: Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Overlay	Figure D12.10.2: Overlay Subdivision Plan 2- Swanson South (Foothills)	On the diagram D12.10.2, the site at 54 Coulter Road allows for two further subdivided sites to occur.  However, the subdivision consent has already been issued for this site. Therefore, this site cannot be further subdivided, as the subdivision right has already been exercised	<b>Recommendation is:</b> To delete references to subdivision at the 54 Coulter Road site.  This includes amending Figure D12.10.12 as follows: • remove the reference to '2' • remove the grey boundary around the site • remove the enhancement area in yellow	Figure D12.10.2 outlines areas with subdivision rights in the area. As a subdivision consent has already been granted for a site on the figure, any references to further subdivision potential should be removed.  Without the change, the site could be further subdivided, which would be in conflict with the policies and provisions for that area.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Clarification or Explanation	C4: High number of changes High effect	D14: Volcanic Viewshafts and Height Sensitive Areas Overlay	D14.6 Standards	The issue lies with the interpretation of standard D14.6.3 (a) (iii), which results in heights that could undermine the policy intent of D14 (Volcanic Viewshafts and Height Sensitive Overlays).  Standard D14.6.3 (a) (iii) seeks to ensure that the permitted height for a new building sits between the highest roof points of the neighbouring buildings. However, the calculation of this permitted height is not apparent.  If ground level is used as a reference point for the height calculation, the permitted height of the new building could be higher than that neighbouring buildings. The reason for this is that the ground level of the neighbouring property could be much lower than the site upon which the new building is constructed.	<b>Recommendation is:</b> To amend D14.6 as follows: • to add the following to D14.6.1.1 <i>(1) In applying these standards, ...except if using standards D14.6.3(1)(a)(ii) and D14.6.3(1)(a)(iii) where the maximum height is restricted by another method.</i>  • to add the following to D14.6.3.1 <i>(1) Buildings on sites that have a contiguous boundary with a site with a volcanic feature.... (a) the lowest of... (i) the height defined on the height sensitive area planning maps or otherwise 9m, -or and (ii) the average height above sea level (RL) of the two nearest buildings (other than accessory buildings) on adjoining sites where those sites also have a contiguous boundary with the volcanic feature, provided that such buildings are both higher than the average contiguous boundary of the application site with the volcanic feature; or</i>	The history of the rule through the PAUP Notified Version through to the PAUP IHP Recommendation Version, is clear that the intention of the rule is to allow new buildings to reach a permitted height that sits between the highest roof points of the neighbouring buildings. This is to ensure that new buildings are only restricted in accordance with the neighbouring buildings that are already impacting on the views to the maunga (volcanic feature).  However, the issue lies with the measurement of the permitted height. If the ground level height at which highest roof point is measured, is lower than which the new building will be constructed on, then the new building will be taller than its neighbouring building. This is not the intention of the rule in light of its context. The impact of allowing this rule to remain is that new buildings could further encroach on the views of the maunga (volcanic feature).  The recommended change is in line with the PAUP Notified Version and Council's evidence to use the 'average of the levels' of the highest points of the roofs of the nearest two buildings to determine the height of the new building. This would need to be determined using the RL of the average of the highest points of the roof of the nearest two buildings.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Clarification or Explanation	C2: Low/ few number of changes High effect	D17: Historic Heritage Overlay	D17.4.1 Activity table (A2)	Clarification is required for the activity status of the demolition or destruction of less than 30% of a feature within a scheduled historic heritage place.  Activity table D17.4.1 expressly provides for demolition or destruction of 30% or more by volume or footprint (whichever is the greater) of any feature, being Rules A1 and A2. In the same table, Rule A9 – Modification and restoration – provides for modifications to features, except where provided for in another rule in this overlay. The intent was that Rule A9 would capture modification activities involving demolition and/or destruction not provided for under Rule A1 and A2. This would make such an activity restricted discretionary, unless the feature was identified as an exclusion.  Through the implementation of these provisions it has become apparent that greater clarity is necessary. Namely, that an activity involving the demolition and/or destruction of less than 30% of a feature within the extent of place of a scheduled historic heritage place is managed under Rule A9.	<b>Recommendation is:</b> To add a note in (A2) of Activity Table D17.4.1, that says:  <i>"Note: Demolition or destruction of less than 30%, by volume or footprint (whichever is greater) of any feature, is considered under 'Modification and Restoration' – Activity (A9), in this table (D17.4.1)"</i>	Any work on a scheduled historic feature that is less than 30% by volume or footprint can be considered a modification and are subject to activity status in the Modification and Restoration section.  At present, this is not clarified in the Activity Table D17.4.1 and there is a gap in the protections for scheduled historic heritage features.  The addition of the note into A2 clarifies the activity status for users of the AUP and ensures a level of protection for scheduled historic heritage features.  Also by clarifying the activity status it better aligns to the objectives and policies for D17, to protect scheduled historic heritage features from inappropriate modifications and destruction, but also better aligns to the Regional Policy Statement B5: Built Heritage and Character.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Clarification or Explanation	C2: Low/ few number of changes High effect	D17: Historic Heritage Overlay	D17.4.1 Activity table (A8) D17.4.3 Activity table (A32)	Inconsistency in definition. The activity tables currently use the terms "...biosecurity measures, tree works..." which are erroneous terms and contradicts the provisions in another part of the AUP.  Originally, the PAUP Notified Version stated "pest plant removal, biosecurity tree works" to align with definitions in the notified version.  PAUP IHP recommendations version altered this to "pest plant removal, biosecurity measures and tree works". However, 'biosecurity measures and tree works' are not defined in the AUP, but 'biosecurity tree works' is a specific type of activity that is defined in E15 Vegetation management and biosecurity and is a definition included in J1 Definitions.	<b>Recommendation is:</b> To replace <i>Biosecurity measures and tree works</i> , with 'biosecurity tree works' in: • Activity table D17.4.1 (A8) • Activity table D17.4.3 (A32)  This also includes: • a change in the title of D17.6.4.	In order to use more general terms in the plan, the PAUP IHP recommendations version of the plan had used the term 'biosecurity measures and tree works'.  However, this change had the effect of altering the meaning of biosecurity tree works. 'Tree works' is a broader term that can refer to 'Biosecurity, emergency tree works' etc. Tree works, as a broad term is not defined in the AUP but 'biosecurity tree works' is defined in J1 Definitions. 'Biosecurity tree works' is a specific term that outlines work required for pest protection and biosecurity reasons.  This recommended change ensures the wording of the rule aligns with the definition in the AUP and aligns to rules in E15 Vegetation management and biosecurity. The recommended change provides clarity in relation to the type of tree works allowed as a permitted activity in the Historic Heritage Overlay.	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. The changes are in D17 overlay provisions.	Attachment 31
Technical	Clarification or Explanation	C1: Low/ few number of changes Low effect	D17: Historic Heritage Overlay	D17.4.3 Activity table- Activities in Historic Heritage Areas [dp]	The use of 'Temporary activities' in the title in D17.4.3 Activity table- i.e. Signs, ancillary and temporary activities" is misleading to the purpose of the section in the activity table.  Removing 'temporary activities' in the title- helps clarify that the rules relates to 'temporary structures and signs' and not the activities themselves.  Removing 'ancillary structures' clarifies that the rules contained in the table relate to 'temporary structures and signs' only.	<b>Recommendation is</b> To remove <i>'temporary activities'</i> in D17.4.3 Activity table title as follows- • title of Section for A35 to A38- <u>Signs, ancillary structures and temporary structures and signs</u> .	The words 'temporary activities' is superfluous and misleading to the purpose of the section in the activity table.  The rules in the activity table relates to temporary structures and signs, rather than temporary activities. Activity status for temporary activities is covered in chapter E40 of the AUP. Therefore, the title is misleading, as it suggests there are rules and standards that relate to temporary activities.  This change alters the title to better reflect its purpose in the activity table.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31

## Attachment 7: Chapter D: Overlays

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C2: Low/ few number of changes High effect	D17: Historic Heritage Overlay	D17.6.6 Temporary buildings and structures and signs, including those accessory to a temporary activity	Standard D17.6.6(1)(b) misses some text, which results in this standard being inconsistent with other standards for the same activity, being signs within a scheduled historic heritage place.  This standard refers only to "affixed" signs, while the other standards (such as D17.6.7) refer to a greater range of signage including, "attached, painted, fixed, or projected" signs.	<i>Recommendation is to:</i> Add the following text to standard D17.6.6(1)(b)-  " <i>(b) the building, structure or sign being attached, painted, fixed, or projected to any existing building, structure or feature within the scheduled historic heritage place, other than a building, structure or feature identified in the exclusions column in Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage.....</i> "	The missing text (i.e. attached, painted, fixed or projected) would result in more permissive standards for temporary signs or structures than for other standards for signs.  Adding the text back into the standard creates consistency with similar signage standards and also ensures the appropriate management of signs within scheduled historic heritage places.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendment to diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C2: Low/ few number of changes High effect	D18: Special Character Areas Overlay- Residential and Business	D18.4.1: Activity tables- Special Character Areas Overlay- Residential (A1)	This issue relates to Activity (A1) in Activity table D18.4.1.  In the PAUP Notified Version the word 'maintenance' was used alongside restoration and repair to a building in a Special Character Area Overlay. However, this was omitted at the PAUP IHP recommendations Version and concomitantly in the AUP (operative in part)	<i>Recommendation is:</i> • to include the word 'maintenance' into A1 of the D18.4.1 Activity Table as follows:  " <i>Restoration, maintenance and repair to a building on all sites in the .....</i> "	The objectives and policies in this section (i.e. D18: Special Character Overlays), permits the maintenance, repair and restoration of buildings. However, 'maintenance' is not carried through into the provisions  Adding 'Maintenance' into the activity status further clarifies the intent of the provisions.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Clarification or Explanation	C4: High number of changes High effect	D18: Special Character Areas Overlay- Residential and Business	D18.4.1: Activity tables- Special Character Areas Overlay- Residential (A3)	The issue is that it is not clear that all parts of the following Special Character Overlay areas are subject to demolition controls: Birkenhead Point; Devonport and Stanley Point; and Northcote Point. The maps in Schedule 15 that show these special character areas indicate that those parts of the areas that are Area A, Area B and Area C are subject to the demolition controls but the other parts of the areas are not. Area A, Area B and Area C that are shown relate to density controls in the Subdivision Chapter of the AUP, and this is not clear in the Schedule 15 maps. All sites within these special character areas should be subject to demolition controls, as they were under Plan Change 33.  This mistake occurred from the PAUP IHP recommendations versions, as the incorrect maps were referenced at the time.	<i>Recommendation is:</i> • to include the following into Activity table D18.4.1 (A3): <u>Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential: North Shore- Birkenhead Point</u> <u>Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential: North Shore- Devonport and Stanley Point;</u> and <u>Special Character Areas Overlay- Residential: North Shore- Northcote Point;</u>  • to update Figures in Schedule 15, that is 15.1.7.5.1; 15.1.7.6.1 and 15.1.7.7.1, to draw a boundary around the areas subject to the 'total and substantial demolition control'.	The Special Character Areas Overlay seek to provide an appropriate level of protection to manage total or substantial demolition of buildings.  Areas in the Special Character Areas Overlay - North Shore - Birkenhead Point, Devonport and Stanley Point, and Northcote Point have been identified as Area A, Area B and Area C. These areas are the residential parts of the special character overlay and there are rules relating to density controls on these sites in the subdivision chapter of the AUP. There are some business-zoned sites in the North Shore special character overlay areas and these are not shown as Area A, B or C in the maps in Schedule 15. The legend on the maps in Schedule 15 indicates that it is only Areas A, B and C that are subject to the demolition controls in D18. This was not the intention, and this error occurred when the PAUP IHP recommended changes to the maps.	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. It is recommended that references are added to the legends on Maps 15.1.7.5.1, 15.1.7.6.1, and 15.1.7.7.1 that refer to where the rules relating to Area A, Area B and Area C are located (Table E38.8.2.6.1). It is also recommended that a reference is added to Table E38.8.2.6.1 to advise where the maps showing these areas are located (i.e. Schedule 15).	Proposed recommendation shown in Attachment 31.  Consequential changes shown in Attachment 34.
Technical	Clarification or Explanation	C2: Low/ few number of changes High effect	D18: Special Character Areas Overlay- Residential and Business	D18.8.2.2: Special Character Areas Overlay- Business	This issue relates to inconsistent terms used in Activity table D18.4.2 and its associated standards in D18.8.2.2.  While Activity table D18.4.2 provides activity status for alterations to buildings, there aren't any corresponding standards or assessment criteria for alterations.  Alterations were included in the PAUP Notified Version, and subsequently omitted in the PAUP IHP recommendations Version and the AUP (operative in part).	<i>Recommendation is:</i> • to include alterations to the assessment criteria for 'additions to character defining buildings', as follows: " <i>D18.8.2.2(2) For additions and alterations to a character defining building, ...</i> " • to subsequently update the text in D18.8.2.2(2) (a)(i) to (ix) to reflect 'additions and alterations'.	The omission of alterations is an error, the Activity table provides for this activity, however, the corresponding assessment criteria has omitted the word.  Adding alterations into the assessment criteria enhances clarity in the AUP. It is apparent what assessment is associated with the activity.  Alterations, like additions to Special Character Overlay- Business are considered a restricted discretionary activity in Activity table D18.4.2  In the PAUP Notified version the alterations and additions had to be assessed against the same assessment criteria. The assessment criteria is relevant to both additions and alterations. Therefore, the recommendation to add 'alterations' to assessment criteria D18.8.2.2, is appropriate.	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. There are consequential changes in the text in D18 (D18.8.2.2(a) (i) to (ix)).	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendment to diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C2: Low/ few number of changes High effect	D19: Auckland War Memorial Museum Viewshaft Overlay	D19.6.1.1 Height limit surface 1 D19.6.1.2 Height limit surface 2 D19.6.1.3 Height limit surface 3	Currently, Figure D19.6.1.1 is an outdated version of the height limit surface, that was used in Council evidence. Council closing statement updated this figure so as to show the full extent of the height limit.  The AUP (operative in part) uses the outdated version of Figure D19.6.1.1.  The IHP GIS Viewer, included the amended extent of the overlay, and not the outdated version.  Therefore, it is a clear mistake between the different versions of the AUP.	<i>Recommendation is:</i> • to amend D19.6.1.1 Height limit surface 1, to the figure that was used in Council's closing statement • to amend D19.6.1.2 Height limit surface 2, to the figure that was used in Council's closing statement • to amend D19.6.1.3 Height limit surface 3, to use the New Zealand Transverse Mercator coordinate dataset.	Updating Figure D19.6.1.1 to that which was used in Council's closing statement will show the full extent of the height limit, which will be clearer for users of the AUP. There is no change in the actual height limit surface.  Consequently, the D19.6.1.2 and D19.6.1.3 will need to be updated as well. D19.6.1.3 does not use the NZ Transverse Mercator and will need to be updated to be accurate.  Illustrating the full extent of the height limit will promote clarity in the AUP.	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. There are consequential changes to the subsequent figures - D19.6.1.2 and D19.6.1.3.	Attachment 31

## Attachment 8: Chapter E: Auckland-wide

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Anomaly	Nonsensical outcomes	C2	E7 Taking, using, damming and diversion of water and drilling	E7.4.1 Activity Table	Under heading Take and use of groundwater, Activity (A24) the column for Wetland Management Areas Overlay is blank. This appears to be an error, rather than intentional.  This is throughout all versions of the plan. The Panel's report is silent on this matter.	Insert 'Discretionary' in the last column 'Wetland Management Areas Overlay' for row (A24).	No geothermal areas in Auckland are within a Wetland Management Area. However if circumstances changed, it is considered of benefit to insert an activity status in the AUP. Based on comments below, this activity status should be Discretionary. The insertion of an activity status will have no effect on current activities given that no geothermal areas currently exist within a Wetland Management Area, however could affect future use. In summary, insert 'Discretionary' in the last column 'Wetland Management Areas Overlay' for row (A24).	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	E7 Taking, using, damming and diversion of water and drilling	E7.6.1.4	The thresholds in permitted activity standard E7.6.1.4 (relating to the take and use of groundwater) do not align with the thresholds in the activity table.  Error throughout all versions of the plan. Not picked up in Council's track changes or panel's recommendation.  The figure in the activity table is correct. This aligns with provision 6.5.31 of the ARC: ALW Plan. Drafting error to be corrected.	The daily volume should be 20m3/day. It is not consistent with the Table E7.4.1 Activity Table (A15). Change 5m3 to 20m3'.	This clarification of the provisions will improve the usability of the plan.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	E11 Land disturbance – Regional	E11.4. Note 1	Note 1 defines the Sediment Control Protection Area, which includes 50 m landward of the edge of a watercourse. However, 'watercourse' is not defined in the Unitary Plan or the RMA and so is potentially open to interpretation. However, it is reasonably anticipated that this to rivers, streams and lakes, but not ephemeral streams or overland flow paths (which are all defined by the Plan or the RMA). Panel's report is silent on this matter.	Amend as follows: <b>E11.4 Note 1</b> Sediment Control Protection Area is defined as: ... (b) 50m landward of the edge of a <del>watercourse, lake, river or stream</del> , or the <del>edge</del> of a wetland of 1000m2 or more.	The requested change clarifies the application of this rule. Note that the ARP-SC plan definition for 'watercourse' would not have extended to include intermittent streams, however this was not included in the UP, therefore the explanation / definition of Sediment Control Protection Area is unclear.  This definition for Sediment Control Protection Area is not in Chapter J: Definitions, although sediment control is defined as "Measures to prevent or minimise the discharge of sediment that has been eroded".  This clarification is required to for the correct implementation of the plan.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical Matter	Amendments to diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C4	E12 Land disturbance – District	E12.4.2 (Table)	Land disturbance provisions for the Special Character overlay – Isthmus C area have been omitted from Chapter E12 of the Plan.  The equivalent provisions for land disturbance within the Special Character overlay – Isthmus C area were included in activity table E26.6.3.1 for infrastructure providers, therefore it is likely that the absence in the Auckland-wide provisions of Chapter E12 was due to a drafting error. The plan has not been updated to include the rebuttal evidence of Robert Brassey.  The recommended change will have the effect of making earthworks (A32) Greater than 5m3 up to 250m3 and (A33) Greater than 250m3, in the Special Character – Isthmus C area a Discretionary activity, rather than Restricted Discretionary, as it is now in the AUP-Operative in part.	That a new column is added to activity table E12.4.2, called 'Special Character Areas Overlay - Residential, Isthmus C' with (A32) and (A33) being Discretionary Activities within this overlay, and all other Activities to be N/A.	Land disturbance provisions for the Special Character overlay – Isthmus C area were recommended by the panel to be incorporated to the activity tables, and need to be reinstated to give the correct guidance for land disturbance in this overlay. This change clarifies the intended policy direction within this overlay.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Anomaly	Nonsensical outcomes	C2	E12 Land disturbance – District	E12.4.2 (Table)	The reported error stated that all "2" notation in Table E12.4.2 was in error. However, this notation indicates that for permitted activities within archaeological sites, additional restricted discretionary activity rules apply.  Activities A25, A26, A27, A28 and A31 are P except where archaeological controls apply – in which case they will be RD. Therefore, the 2 notation is to be kept. This is consistent with the mark-up attached as Council rebuttal evidence for Topic 041-earthworks hearing.  Activities A29 and A32 in the Historic Heritage column have included a notation "2" next to the activity status which is unnecessary. This appears to be added in error, as the case team position had an asterisk which was struck through.	That the "2" notation is removed from activities A29 and A32 only in activity table E12.4.2. This will have a neutral effect.	Note 2 indicates Restricted discretionary activity for additional rules for archaeological sites or features apply as listed in Schedule 14 Historic Heritage Schedule, Statements and Map. It cannot be applied to permitted activities (A29&A32)  No other options available.  This change allows for the additional rules for archaeological sites or features apply as listed in Schedule 14 to be applied to the correct activity.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical Matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C2	E15 Vegetation management and biodiversity	E15.4.2 Activity table and tree trimming standards	There is no permitted activity standard for tree trimming in a Significant Ecological Area. This appears to be a drafting error.  For Topic 023 (Significant Ecological Areas and Vegetation Management) the closing statement has the tree trimming standard (2.2) on page 17, there is no explanation given for its removal in the Panel's report. The Standard should be reinstated.	That through a plan change process the standard for this activity that was in Council's version be added as the permitted activity standard for tree trimming, as below: <b>E.15.6.8 Tree Trimming.</b> <u>(1) The maximum branch diameter must not exceed 50mm.</u> <u>(2) No more than 10 per cent of live growth of the tree is removed in any one calendar year.</u> <u>(3) Trimming must meet best accepted arboricultural practice.</u> <u>(4) The trimming must retain the natural shape, form and branch habit of the tree.</u>  Add as E15.6.8 so that reumbering is not required	There was a PA standard relating to tree trimming in an SEA in Council's evidence. The Panel agreed to the rule for this activity and it appears that the standard with this activity was omitted as a drafting error.  This should be amended as it does not change the activity status but improves the usability of the plan for resource consent monitoring and compliance purposes.  The reintroduction of this standard is required to give guidance on how tree trimming is to occur.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	E15 vegetation management and biodiversity	E15.4.1 (Table)	The list of zones contained in activities A20-A21 inclusive in Activity table E15.4.1 does not include all the relevant zones.  The Waitakere Ranges Zone and Waitakere Foothills Zone were new zones proposed by Council at Hearings to reflect the uniqueness of the area. This was supported by Panel (Topic 075 para 3), but has been left out of the recommendations version in error.  As activities A20-A21 relate to rural zones in close proximity to the coast, the 'Rural – Waitakere Ranges' zone should be added to this list. (Note that the 'Rural – Waitakere Foothills' zone does not extend down to the coastal edge).	(A20) Vegetation alteration or removal of greater than 25m2 of contiguous vegetation, or tree alteration or tree removal of any indigenous tree over 3m in height within 50m of mean high water springs in the Rural – Rural Conservation Zone, Rural – Rural Production Zone, Rural – Rural Coastal Zone, Rural – Rural Conservation Zone, Rural – Countryside Living Zone, Rural – Waitakere Ranges Zone, or Future Urban Zone RD  (A21) Vegetation alteration or removal of greater than 25m2 of contiguous vegetation, or tree alteration or tree removal of any indigenous tree over 3m in height within 20m of mean high water springs in all zones other than in a Rural – Rural Production Zone, Rural – Mixed Rural Zone, Rural – Rural Coastal Zone, Rural – Rural Conservation Zone, Rural – Countryside Living Zone, Rural – Waitakere Ranges Zone, or Future Urban Zone RD	The new Rural - Waitakere Ranges Zone is described as mirroring 'the provisions of the Rural – Rural Conservation Zone and provides limited opportunity for growth and development. Adding this zone to those listed in A20 and A21 will manage vegetation in rural zones near the coast consistently.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31

## Attachment 8: Chapter E: Auckland-wide

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical Matter	Amendments to diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C2	E15 vegetation management and biodiversity	E15.4.1 (Table)	The provision for a general permitted activity for vegetation alteration or removal not otherwise listed in the table has been erroneously deleted in different versions of the plan.  This is considered to be a drafting error that results in outcomes that were not intended, particularly when the default rule for activities not provided for in a discretionary activity under Chapter C.  This issue was registered to Council's internal 'Interpretation process'. The Interpretations process ensures that interpretation and implementation of rules in the AUP are applied correctly and consistently. An interpretation guidance note was prepared on this matter for the Resource Consents department. This proposed amendment will remedy the error and reflect the correct application of rules, currently managed by the interpretation guidance note. When this proposed amendment is implemented, the interpretation guidance note will become void.	Insert new heading after A23 activity: <u>All zones and areas</u>  (A44) <u>Vegetation alteration or removal not otherwise provided for, and not subject to any standard listed in E15.6.2</u>	The General permitted activity rule was intended to apply in the Activity Table, as the Panel was supportive of using permitted activity to provide for reasonable maintenance without requiring a resource consent within the identified sensitive environments; and no requirements for vegetation management rules requiring resource consent outside of the identified sensitive environments (outside the RUG, coastal environment; and riparian / wetland margins) (refer to para 3.2 Panel report for Topic 023).  This clarifies that all other activities involving vegetation alteration and removal outside the identified sensitive environments, do not require resource consent, so that the unwarranted assessment of such does not occur.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical Matter	Amendments to diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C4	E15 vegetation management and biodiversity	E15.4.1 (Table)	Some of the provisions have been deleted from the Auckland-wide Activity table E15.4.1; chiefly 2. Headings in table E15.4.1 which specified where the provisions were to apply, between the notified and recommendations version of the plan.  There is nothing in the Panel's report to suggest a rationale for the removal of these sub-headings. These headings should be reinstated.  This issue was registered to Council's internal 'Interpretation process'. The Interpretations process ensures that interpretation and implementation of rules in the AUP are applied correctly and consistently. An interpretation guidance note was prepared on this matter for the Resource Consents department. This proposed amendment will remedy the error and reflect the correct application of rules, currently managed by the interpretation guidance note. When this proposed amendment is implemented, the interpretation guidance note will become void.	Replace headings in table E15.4.1, as indicated below: [preceding Activities (A1) – (A9) inclusive] <u>All zones/ areas mentioned above.</u>  Relocate the row for Activity (A23) to follow (A9)  [preceding Activity (A10): ] <u>All zones outside the RUG</u>  [preceding Activities (A11) – (A19) inclusive] <u>Riparian areas</u>  [preceding Activities (A20) – (A22) inclusive] <u>Coastal areas</u>	Headings were included in Council's version to clarify where rules applied. In the Panel's drafting these were omitted but result in unintended consequences, such as permitted activity standards applying where they were not intended, and effectively introducing a general tree protection rule, rather than it only applying in certain sensitive areas.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	E15 vegetation management and biodiversity	E15.6.2 Veg management rules for SEA tree trimming	Tree trimming is a permitted activity in Activity table E15.4.2, but there are no standards for this activity. The standards for tree trimming were contained in the PAUP Notified Version and in Council closing statement position.	Reinstate the Permitted activity standard in AC's closing statement as follows: <u>E15.6.2 Tree Trimming within Special Ecological Areas</u> <u>(1) The maximum branch diameter must not exceed 50mm at severance</u> <u>(2) No more than 10 per cent of live growth of the tree may be removed in any one calendar year;</u> <u>(3) The works must meet best arboricultural practice;</u> <u>(4) The trimming or alteration must retain the natural shape, form and branch habit of the tree.</u>	The change will create certainty in terms of what standards are permitted for tree trimming or alterations.  The absence of standards can create differential outcomes for this permitted activity.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	E15 Vegetation Management and Biodiversity	E15.8.2(1)	Standards Proposed PA control H4.3.2.4 - Vegetation alteration or removal located within the 100-year floodplain "has been erroneously added to the PA standards for "Vegetation alteration or removal for routine operation and repair of existing tracks, lawns, gardens..." at E15.6.4 This should be a separate standard.	**Proposed change for E15.8.2(1) (a)(ii) the extent to which the proposal for vegetation alteration or removal has taken into account relevant objectives and policies in Chapter 87.2 Indigenous biodiversity, E15 Vegetation Management and biodiversity B4, Natural heritage, Chapter E18 Natural character of the coastal environment and E19 Natural features and natural landscapes in the coastal environment	Assessment criteria for matters of Restricted Discretion Proposed PA matter H4.3 (quarry zones) Offsetting is referenced in the RPS, Overlay and Auckland-wide Policies for vegetation management. The specific RD matters for clearance within a quarry zone have been deleted from the Plan and the default RD, matters of discretion and assessment criteria do not anticipate consideration of offsets.  This change adds greater clarity to the plan.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Anomaly	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C2	E16 Trees in open space	E16.4 Trees in open space	The intro text for E16.4 should be consistent with E17 and E26 and identify that asset owner approval must be obtained. As asset owner approval must be obtained whether this is stated in the plan or not, this is a very low priority error.	Add the following into the explanation for E16.4 Activity Table as a second bullet point: <u>all activities obtain the approval of the Tree Asset Manager, in respect of open space zones, owned by the Council, is the Auckland Council Parks Department.</u>	This follows similar words written in E17 and E26 under the activity table section	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	E25 Noise and vibration	E25.6 Standards	There is an absence of any noise insulation provisions for residential units in the Industrial Zones in the UP-DV. Workers accommodation (bedrooms for permanent residential activity) are permitted in the Industrial Zones but the rules in E25 miss out reference to these zones. This is an oversight that needs to be amended.  This is aligned with Council's position, supported by the Panel, that noise levels should take into account whether a building is occupied or not (Topic 040, Lighting, noise and vibration, para 3.6): "The Council's practice is to require noise to be measured at such buildings on the basis that they are "able to be occupied." Workers accommodation in industrial zones are able to be occupied and therefore should be included in this rule.	Addition of "...and the Industrial Zones" to rule E25.6.10, and to add Industrial Zones in the middle row of the requirements in Table E25.6.10 beneath Business – Mixed Use Zone.	It is appropriate that workers accommodation permitted in the industrial zones be subject to a noise insulation standard otherwise there is a likelihood that without noise insulation, they would be subject to intolerable noise levels.  No other options available, aligned with the regional policy statement.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Nonsensical outcomes	C2	E25 Noise and vibration	E25.6 Standards	E.25.6.27(2) The 6.00pm to 7.30am max noise level is louder than the daytime max noise limit. In E25.6.7.2, the times listed are incorrect and 6am should read 6pm for weekdays and Saturdays - this is a clear drafting error.	Table E25.6.7.2 (Construction noise levels for noise affecting any other activity) - max noise level for 7.30am-6pm is 75dB but for 6pm-7.30am is 80dB. This means you can make more noise at night than during the day  Table E25.6.7.1 (Construction noise levels for activities sensitive to noise except City Centre and Metro centre zones). For weekdays max noise levels are: 6.30am-7.30am = 60dB 7.30am-6pm = 75dB 6pm-8pm = 70dB 8pm-6.30am = 45dB  The same change is also required for the Saturday times in the same table.	These changes are needed so that the provisions make sense, and can be implemented as intended.  No other options available, aligned with the regional policy statement.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	E26 Infrastructure	E26 Infrastructure	The following alterations are recommended to correct a minor error in E26 so that it reflects the corresponding provisions in the E16 and E17 activity tables. This was a transitional error.	Table E26.4.3.1 Activity table - Network utilities and electricity generation - Trees in roads and open space zones and the Notable Trees Overlay  (A91) Tree alteration or removal of <u>any tree</u> less than 4m in height <u>or less than one tree</u> 400mm in girth  (A92) Tree alteration or removal of <u>any tree</u> greater than 4m in height <u>and greater than one tree</u> 400mm in girth	Misalignment, changes made for consistency.  No other options available, aligned with the regional policy statement.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 8: Chapter E: Auckland-wide

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical Matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C4	E26 Infrastructure	E26.2.3.1 Activity table - Network utilities and electricity generation - all zones and roads	In E26 Infrastructure line items (A65) and (A66) state that an activity is non-complying if the respective electricity and magnetic field and radiofrequency standards are not complied with (E26.2.5.2(6) and (7)). However the respective standards only apply in zoned areas, because they are located in E26.2.5.2 Activities within zones in Table E26.2.3.1 Activity table. The standards do not technically apply to roads, although they should.  Add standards E26.2.5.2(6) and (7) into E26.2.5.1 Activities within roads and unformed roads in Table E26.2.3.1 Activity table. Reference to these new standards can then be added to (A65) and (A66) so that they are non-complying activities as well.	Corrections: Amend (A65) Any activity that does not comply with Standard E26.2.5.2(6) and E26.2.5.1 (6) Amend (A66) Any activity that does not comply with Standard E26.2.5.2(7) and E26.2.5.1(7)  Add new standards to E26.2.5.1, Activities within roads and unformed roads in Table E26.2.3.1 Activity table  (6) Electricity transmission and distribution (Electric and magnetic fields): (a) network utilities that emit electric and magnetic field emissions must comply with the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection Guidelines for limiting exposure to time-varying electric and magnetic fields (IARC – 100MHz Health Physics, 2010 – 89(1), 818-836) and recommendations from the World Health Organisation monograph Environmental Health Criteria (No 238, June 2007).  (7) Radio Frequency Fields (RF fields): (a) network utilities should not result in radio-frequency fields produced by the network utility exceeding the maximum exposure level of the general public in the New Zealand Standard for Radiofrequency Fields Part 1: Maximum Exposure Levels 3 kHz to 300GHz (NZS 2772-1:1999) measured at all places reasonably accessible to the general public.	The standards need to be added to the activities within roads and unformed road activity table.  This will ensure that the electricity and magnetic field and radiofrequency standards apply in roads as well.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	E26 Infrastructure	E26.2.5.3	The agreed version enable existing antenna to be increased in width by 20%. The AUP decision version restrict width to existing width. The outcome is no ability to upgrade the antenna. This appears to be an editing/formatting issue.	The following amendment is required:  (i) the replacement of an existing antenna with a new antenna provided that:  (i) the new antenna does not exceed the maximum dimension of the existing antenna by more than 20 percent and  (ii) where the antenna is a dish antenna the diameter of the new antenna must not increase by more than 20 percent; and  (iii) the overall height of the facility to which the antenna is attached either does not increase or that any height increase is as a result of the antenna size increase only.	In simplifying the above rule, IHP lost the intention of the rule, which was to provide for 20% increase both for existing antenna (i.e. regular ones) and dish antenna	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	E26 Infrastructure	E26.4 Network utilities and electricity generation - all zones and roads	Incorrect reference: E26.2.5.1, Activities within roads and unformed roads in Table E26.2.3.1 Activity table (1) Temporary network utilities: ... (b) the site must be reinstated in accordance with conditions specified in the National Code of Practice for Utility Operators' Access to Transport Corridors (2011).  AT Comments: This rule includes an incorrect reference to National Code of Practice for Utility Operators' Access to Transport Corridors (2011). Please change the wording to '(2015)' or 'the latest edition of the National Code of Practice for Utility Operators' Access to Transport Corridors' and any relevant local conditions.	Change wording to read E26.25.1 (1) Temporary network utilities: ... (b) the site must be reinstated in accordance with conditions specified in the latest edition of the National Code of Practice for Utility Operators' Access to Transport Corridors <del>(2011)</del>	The change means that the plan will always reflect the current practice document.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C4	E26 Infrastructure	E26.4.5.1, Trees in roads and open space zones  E26.4.5.3. Notable trees - tree trimming or alteration	The following alterations are recommended to correct a discrepancy in E26.4.5.1 so that it aligns with the corresponding provisions in E16 and E17 (including assessment criterion E26.4.7.2(1)(e)) regarding reference to 'best arboricultural practice'.  The following alterations are recommended to correct an error in E26.4.5.3 so that it reflects the corresponding provision in D13, and aligns with assessment criterion E26.4.7.2(2)(e)	E26.4.5.1. Trees in roads and open space zones - tree trimming or alteration  (1) Tree trimming or alteration of trees in streets and open space zones must comply with the following standards:  (b) no more than 20 per cent of live growth of the tree must be removed in accordance with best arboricultural practice, which can be increased to 30 per cent under the direct supervision of a suitably qualified arborist and if there is an agreed tree management plan in place for trimming between 20 – 30 per cent.  E26.4.5.3. Notable trees - tree trimming or alteration  (1) Tree trimming or alteration of notable trees must meet the following standards: (a) the maximum branch diameter must not exceed 50mm at severance; (b) must not result in the removal of more than 20 per cent of live growth of the tree in any one calendar year; and (c) the trimming must retain the natural shape, form and branch habit of the tree; and (d) the works must meet best arboricultural practice.	Re-structuring by separating the provisions relating to Trees in roads and public open space zones into two chapters; E16 Trees in open space zones and E17 Trees in roads. This facilitates the creation of a combined chapter containing all the rules relating to infrastructure (E26) and ensures clarity of purpose. The rules from D13 Notable Trees Overlay, E16 Trees in open space zones and E17 Trees in roads have been replicated in E26.  Therefore, for consistency, the words should be inserted into the E26 rules.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C4	E27 Transport	E27.6.4.3.2 Activity Table Vehicle crossing and vehicle access widths	Correction to Sections E27.8.1(9) and E27.8.2(8)  The matters of discretion and assessment criteria for activities that infringe the standards for design of parking and loading areas or access refers only to Standard E27.6.3, even though this standard only relates to the design of parking and loading areas, while Standard E27.6.4 relates to access.  There are no direct assessment criteria related to infringing access widths as an RDA.  This is a drafting/cross referencing error that is present in all versions of the plan. The Panel is silent on the matter.	E27.8.1, Matters of discretion (9) any activity or development which infringes the standards for design of parking and loading areas or access under Standard E27.6.3, <del>or the standards for design, number and location of vehicle crossings and access under Standards E27.6.4.2, E27.6.4.3 and E27.6.4.4.</del>  E27.8.2, Assessment criteria (9) any activity or development which infringes the standards for design of parking and loading areas or access under <del>Standard E27.6.3 or the standards for design, number and location of vehicle crossings and access under Standards E27.6.4.2, E27.6.4.3 and E27.6.4.4.</del>	E27.8.1(9) Matters for discretion states "any activity or development which infringes the standards for design of parking and loading areas or access under Standard E27.6.3." However the standards for access are in E27.6.4, and there are no other matters that specifically refer to infringe of the access standards. Therefore E27.8.1(9) and E27.8.2(8) need to include reference to the relevant sections in E27.6.4 as well.  The referencing of other Business zones in the transport rules is misleading and inconsistent with the policy direction contained in the relevant zones (e.g. H9.2, Objective (8), H9.3, Policy (18) and H10.2, Objective (9), H10.3 Policy (18)). The proposed amendments can therefore be viewed as correcting Business zone references in the Auckland-wide Transport provisions to ensure consistency with the relevant zone policies (as an administrative plan change).	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 8: Chapter E: Auckland-wide

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical Matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C2	E27 Transport	E27.6.4.4.1 Activity Table	Table E27.6.4.4.1 specifies the maximum gradient for vehicle access, with vehicle access servicing residential activities being no more than 1 in 5. However, Table E38.8.1.2.1 (in the Subdivision – Urban chapter) provides for a maximum gradient of 1 in 4 where an access services a single rear site within a residential zone. The requirement for access as part of a subdivision to comply with E27.6.4.4.1 Transport results in access provided for by Table E38.8.1.2.1 unable to comply with Table E27.6.4.4.1.  Error in transfer from Council's evidence (Topic 043 and 044: Additional closing statement p 30) as the Panel's report does not suggest otherwise	The suggested amendment is to add in specific activities to the transport section to define the 1 to 4 for access into rear residential sites and leave 1 to 5 for residential. Table E27.6.4.4.1 Gradient of vehicle access Access type Maximum gradient (T159) vehicle access serving residential 1 in 5 (20 per cent) (T160) vehicle access serving rear residential 1 in 4 (25 per cent) (T161) Vehicle access used by heavy vehicles 1 in 8 (12.5 per cent) (T162) Vehicle access serving all other activities 1 in 6 (16.7 per cent)	To incorporate the maximum gradient allowed in the subdivision section of the Plan. This clears up any confusion.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C4	E27 Transport	E27.4.1 Activity table	Incorrect reference: E27.4.1 Activity Table Formatting, reference to activity tables, and standard reference need to be reviewed in detail.  Adds the H8 - Business City Centre Zone Deletes the Local Centre, Neighbourhood Centre, General Business and Business Park Zones  So that vehicle access restrictions are applied in the relevant zones, cross referencing error.	(A6) should read: Use of an existing vehicle crossing where a Vehicle Access Restriction applies under Standard E27.6.4.1(1) to service the establishment of a new activity, a change of activity type, the expansion or intensification of an existing activity or where a building(s) is constructed, or additions to buildings that are not permitted activities in • Table H8.4.1 Activity table; • Table H9.4.1 Activity table; or • Table H10.4.1 Activity table; or • Table H11.4.1 Activity table; • Table H12.4.1 Activity table; • Table H13.4.1 Activity table; • Table H14.4.1 Activity table; or • Table H16.4.1 Activity table.	The access control referred to in (A6) relates to the VAR – General Control (shown on planning maps in the City Centre Zone) and Key Retail Frontage control as shown on the planning maps.  These VAR controls apply to the City Centre, Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre and Mixed Use Zones (refer to Policies 21 & 24). Unless the extent of these site specific controls has been extended to other business zones, the activity table should be amended to only include the relevant zones where these VARs are applied.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Amendments to diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C2	E27 Transport	E27.6.1 New development thresholds	A new development threshold Retail (Non-drive through) has been omitted from Table E27.6.1.1.  This is not in the recommendations version in error. Clause 4.2 of the IHP's recommendation for Topics 043 and 044 (page 7-8) recommends the preferred evidence of the joint statement of evidence from the Key Retail Group dated 16 June 2015, paragraph 3.7, pages 7-8. The trip generation threshold is increased from 1000m2 to 1667m2 for retail activities (non-drive through).	Insert new activity (T160) under retail as <u>Retail Activities</u> , <u>non-drive through</u> the threshold of <u>1667m<sup>2</sup> GFA</u> into the table.	To reflect the Panel's decision to adopt the evidence of the Key Retail Group.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	E27 Transport	Table E27.6.2.4 Parking rates – area 2 and Table E27.6.2.3 Parking rates-area 1	The intention of the minimum parking rate for places of assembly is that the capacity of the main assembly area should be considered only. This is unclear in the current wording of Activities T21 and T62 of this chapter.	(T62) in Table E27.6.2.4 Parking rates – area 2 should read: "...lobby spaces which are <u>do not have a separately-use from the primary place of assembly</u> shall be disregarded"	The new wording provides greater clarity on the intention of the rule, and reflects how the plan should be correctly applied.	There is a consequential change in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. This change is to activity T21 in table E27.6.2.3. (T21) in Table E27.6.2.3 Parking rates-area 1 should read: "lobby spaces which are <u>do not have a separately-use from the primary place of assembly shall be disregarded</u> ".	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Amendments to diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C2	E27 Transport	Table E27.6.4.3.2 Vehicle crossing and vehicle access widths (T151)	Part of the standard relating to the minimum formed access width was inadvertently omitted.  Not in plan from recommendation version. Error in transfer from Council's evidence (Topic 043 and 044: Additional closing statement p 37) as the Panel's report does not suggest otherwise  This issue was registered to Council's internal 'Interpretation process'. The Interpretations process ensures that interpretation and implementation of rules in the AUP, are applied correctly and consistently. An interpretation guidance note was prepared on this matter for the Resource Consents department. This proposed amendment will remedy the error and reflect the correct application of rules, currently managed by the interpretation guidance note. When this proposed amendment is implemented, the interpretation guidance note will become void.	(T151) Serves 10 or more car parking spaces <u>or six or more dwellings</u>	Part of the standard has been omitted and should be added back in. The words were in Council's closing statement, so the plan can be implemented as intended, giving effect to the RPS.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clear mistake between different versions of the Plan (text only)	C2	E27 Transport	Table E27.6.4.4.1 Gradient of vehicle access (T157)	Error in transfer of correct standard from Council track changes. Suggested solution 'Access type Maximum gradient (T157) Vehicle access serving residential 1 in 4 (25 per cent)  Error in transfer from Council's evidence (Topic 043 and 044: Additional closing statement p 30) as the Panel's report does not suggest otherwise.  This issue was registered to Council's internal 'Interpretation process'. The Interpretations process ensures that interpretation and implementation of rules in the AUP, are applied correctly and consistently. An interpretation guidance note was prepared on this matter for the Resource Consents department. This proposed amendment will remedy the error and reflect the correct application of rules, currently managed by the interpretation guidance note. When this proposed amendment is implemented, the interpretation guidance note will become void.	(T157) needs to be amended to differentiate between the maximum allowable gradients for rear (1 in 4) and other residential (1 in 5) sites.  See error 1128, where the track change is incorporated into the activity table.	To incorporate the maximum gradient allowed in the subdivision section of the Plan. This clears up any confusion.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clear mistake between different versions of the Plan (text only)	C2	E31 Hazardous substances	E31.4.3 Activity Table	Activity Table E31.4.3 has an error in that it fails to include the Airport zone.  • Activity Tables in E31.4 provide for various zones, except for the Airports and Airfields zone. This is an error, as Airports are hazardous facilities due to the nature of their activities. • Council's hazardous substances expert, Norbert Schaffner, has confirmed that this is an error, and Airports and Airfields zone should be included in one of the Activity Tables in E31.4. • In the Council's track changes version to the IHP, Airports zone (now Airports and Airfields zone) was included alongside the Light and Heavy Industry zones, Defence zone, Quarry zone and Minor Port zone. • The provisions relating to the above zones are now located in Activity Table E31.4.3. Norbert has confirmed that the Airport and Airfields zone should be added to the list of zones in Activity Table E31.4.3	Amend the header in Table E31.4.3 Activity Table – Hazardous facilities that store or use the listed hazardous substances, as follows:  Business – Light Industry Zone; Business – Heavy Industry Zone; Coastal – Defence Zone, <u>Special Purpose – Airports, and Airfields Zone</u> , and Special Purpose – Quarry Zone"	Clear oversight that requires correcting	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	E38 Subdivision – Urban	E38 Esplanade reserves and strips policy 25(e)	E38 policy 25(e) concerning when to avoid reducing the width of an esplanade reserve is incorrect. It reads '(e) any scheduled historic heritage places and sites and places of significance to Mana Whenua will be adversely affected.'  When the Panel reformatted the policies within E38 a typo has occurred. Page 13 of the Council's final track changes for subdivision make it clear that the waiving of the requirement to provide an esplanade reserve or strip is only intended to occur where any historic or cultural heritage places or sites of cultural value are not adversely affected. E38 policies 25 and 26 are poorly drafted. It is unclear whether all, some or only one of the policy criteria need to be satisfied.	It should say that (e) any scheduled historic heritage places and sites and places of significance to Mana Whenua will <u>not</u> be adversely affected. The policy should be the same as E39 policy 22(e), which is an identical policy, and correct.	Incorrect wording that reverses the intent of the policy. Change the wording of the exception as indicated.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	E38 Subdivision – Urban	E38 policies 25 and 26	In E38, policies 25 and 26 have the word 'or' between the penultimate and final sub-policy. This is causing interpretation difficulties for consents as it is not clear whether for the policy to be satisfied, do all the criteria need to be met or does only one of the sub-policies need to be met. These policies should be amended to say 'any of the following' to make the intention completely clear. This aligns with Council's final track changes (see page 13). It is not necessary to add 'all' as suggested by resource consents as 'any' is broad enough to encompass 'all'.	(25) Avoid reducing the width of esplanade reserve or strip, or the waiving of the requirement to provide an esplanade reserve or strip, except where <u>any</u> of the following apply:  (26) Require esplanade reserves rather than esplanade strips unless <u>any</u> of the following apply:	E38 policy 25 and 26 are amended to state 'any of the following' to make the intention of the policy completely clear.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 8: Chapter E: Auckland-wide

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current Issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	E38 Subdivision - Urban	E38.8.2.6	Standard E38.8.2.6 and Table E38.8.2.6.1 specifies the minimum net site area for sites identified in the Special Character Areas Overlay. However, Table E38.8.2.6.1 does not include all of the Special Character Areas, and does not indicate what minimum net site area should apply in those areas not listed in the table.	E38.8.2.6 is amended to clearly specify that where the Special Character Area is not included within Table E38.8.2.6.1 the minimum net site area of the underlying zone applies.  E38.8.2.6. Subdivision of sites identified in the Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential and Business  (1) Proposed sites identified in the Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential and Business must comply with the minimum net site area in Table E38.8.2.6.1 Special Character Overlay – Residential and Business subdivision controls.  (2) Proposed sites identified in the Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential and Business that are not listed in Table E38.8.2.6.1 must comply with the relevant minimum net site area for that site's zone in Table E38.8.2.3.1. Minimum net site area for subdivisions involving parent sites of less than 1 hectare.	The minimum net site areas included within Table E38.8.2.6.1 are a roll over of legacy provisions. Some of the special character areas did not have a minimum net site area within the legacy plan, or they are new character areas where the subdivision potential is determined by the underlying zone.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical Matter	Duplication	C2	E39 Subdivision - Rural	E39 Subdivision - Rural	There is a (reported) doubling up (i.e. straight repetition) of the objectives in E39 Rural Subdivision (E39.2 Objectives). Objective 8 and 15 are word for word the same.	They are not the same. Objective 15 specifies rural areas where Objective 8 does not.  Recommend deleting number 15 and leaving number 8. Suggest Objective (8) reads "Subdivision maintains or enhances the natural features and landscapes that contribute to the character and amenity values of the areas."	There is no need to specify rural areas, given the topic of the Chapter, and the fact that the underlying character of the FUZ is likely to change.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	E39 Subdivision - Rural	E39 Subdivision - Rural	An activity was intended to be added to Activity Table E39.4.2 Subdivision in rural zones as follows:  Any Transferable Rural Site Subdivision where the receiver site is not located in the Countryside Living zone. NC  This activity was for clarification purposes (as it is a Non-complying activity in any case under "any other subdivision not provided for" but the lawyers thought we should make it crystal clear).	Add the new activity (A38) as underlined to the activity table.  <u>Any Transferable Rural Site Subdivision where the receiver site is not located in the Countryside Living zone. NC</u>	Adding the underlined activity as stated to the activity table, is not a policy shift, just a further clarification. Does not alter rights or entitlements from the decision provisions.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	E39 Subdivision - Rural	E39 Subdivision - Rural	The second row of the table E39.6.4.6.1 should read 5,001m <sup>2</sup> (not 1,000m <sup>2</sup> ). This is a typographical error when Council rejected IHP recommendations and kept it only to two standards in the table. There is a gap and jump between the standards. Currently one standard states minimum 5,000m <sup>2</sup> and the second states 1,000m <sup>2</sup> -1,999ha, when in fact it should be 5,001m <sup>2</sup> -1,999ha. The amendment will clarify how to assess applications.	Change <del>4,000m<sup>2</sup></del> to 5,001m <sup>2</sup> in Table E39.6.4.6.1 (third row). There is also a space in the title of the table that needs to be deleted: Table E39.6-4-6.1	Typo error but one that would affect how the plan is applied. This amendment is necessary to improve the plan usability.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C4	E39 Subdivision - Rural	E39.4	Correction to Section E39.4 Section E39.4 includes the comment "For all other subdivision refer to E38 Subdivision – Urban".  However, the only previously mentioned subdivision in that section is subdivision within the National Grid Corridor Overlay. This is inconsistent with section E39.1, which specifies the zones to which this chapter relates (with all other zones subject to E38), and is otherwise not consistent with all other text within chapters E38 and E39.	Amend Section E39.4 as follows: Tables E39.4.1 to E38.4.5 specify the activity status of subdividing land pursuant to section 11 of the Resource Management Act 1981 within the following zones: - Rural - Rural Production Zone, Rural - Mixed Rural Zone, Rural - Rural Coastal Zone, Rural - Rural Conservation Zone and Rural - Countryside Living Zone; - Rural - Waitākere Foothills Zone and Rural - Waitākere Ranges Zone; - Future Urban Zone; and - Special Purpose - Quarry Zone.  For subdivision within the National Grid Corridor Overlay, the activity status for subdivision in the rural zones as listed in Tables E39.4.1 to E39.4.5 below will apply unless there are different provisions in D26 National Grid Corridor Overlay in which case the overlay provisions will take precedence. For all other subdivision refer to E38 Subdivision – Urban.	Clarification of what zones the chapter applies to is needed within the chapter description to improve the usability of the chapter.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32



## Attachment 9: Chapter H Zones

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Anomaly	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C3	H2 Rural and Coastal Settlement Zone H3 Single House Zone H4 Residential – Mixed Housing Suburban Zone H5 Residential – Mixed Housing Urban Zone H6 Residential – Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone	• Figure H2.6.6.2, • Figure H3.6.7.2, • Figure H4.6.6.2, • Figure H5.6.5.2, • Figure H6.6.6.2	The standard relating to this diagram refers to 'roof projections' in addition to gable ends and dormers. The label of these diagram only refers to 'gable ends and dormers' and is therefore incorrect.	Change the label of Figure H2.6.6.2, Figure H3.6.7.2, Figure H4.6.6.2, H5.6.5.2, H6.6.6.2 - to state: "Exceptions for gable ends, <del>and</del> dormers and <u>roof projections</u> ".	This is an anomaly as the standard (of e.g. H4.6.6 (6) refers to 'gable end, dormer or roof' - and the diagram does not reflect roof projections in the title.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Clarification or Explanation	C1	H3 Residential: Single House Zone	H3.5.1.(a) Notification	Integrated residential development has been listed as an activity that can be considered without public notification if it complies with the standards listed in H3.4.1 Activity table. This clause was included by the IHP who made integrated residential development a restricted discretionary activity within the single house zone. The Council has now changed this to a discretionary activity and therefore there are no longer development standards that have to be complied with.	Recommended that H3.5 Notification 1(a) to be deleted and consequential renumbering of clause below as per tracked plan change.	This is an error because there are no development standards that must be complied with listed in the activity table for this activity. This clause should have been deleted as part of the alternative solution.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C2	H7 Open Space Zones	H7.9.1 - A39	H7.9.1 Activity Table Rule A39 'New buildings that do not comply with one or more standards' in the Open Space – Community Zone (Section H7 Open Space zones) is a Permitted Activity.  This is a clear error/anomaly that has been carried through from the IHP version to the Operative in part version. This was corrected through Council's marked up decision version (refer Attachment A decisions report), however did not seem to carry through to the text.	In H7.9.1 Activity table, Rule A39, the activity 'New buildings that do not comply with one or more standards' should be Discretionary rather than Permitted Activity status under Community Zone.	To have buildings that do not comply with the standards as a permitted activity is not logical and defeats the purpose of the standards for the Community Zone. It is also inconsistent with the activity status for the same activity within other zones.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Clarification or Explanation	C1	H7 Open Space zones	H.7.11.3	The purpose statement for H7.11.3.1 Yards does not address the required riparian and coastal yard setback. This is inconsistent with other zones which have the same required riparian and coastal yard setback i.e. the Residential zones.	Recommend that the purpose statement for H7.11.3.1 Yards is amended to explain the purpose for the riparian and coastal yard setback to improve plan usability and for consistency with other zones (Deliverable 2).	The purpose statement for this standard provides an explanation for the front yard, side and rear yard setbacks. There is no explanation however, for the required riparian or coastal protection yard setback requirements. This is inconsistent with other zones where the purpose statement for the yard standard explains that it is necessary to set back buildings from streams and the coastal edge to maintain water quality and provide protection from natural hazards.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Clarification or Explanation	C3	H8 City Centre zone H9 Metropolitan Centre zone H10 Town Centre zone H11 Local Centre zone H12 Neighbourhood Centre zone H13 Mixed Use zone H14 General business zone H15 Business park zone	Figures H8.6.28.1, H9.6.9.1, H10.6.9.1, H11.6.7.1, H12.6.7.1, H13.6.8.1, H14.6.6.1, H15.6.6.1	Wind standard text has been omitted from the wind environmental control graph in the Business and centre zone diagrams (the technical criteria & equation that explain how the wind performance graph is derived).  This issue was registered to Council's internal 'Interpretation process'. The Interpretations process ensures that interpretation and implementation of rules in the AUP, are applied correctly and consistently. An interpretation guidance note was prepared on this matter for the Resource Consents department. This proposed amendment will remedy the error and reflect the correct application of rules, currently managed by the interpretation guidance note. When this proposed amendment is implemented, the interpretation guidance note will become void.	Insert the following explanation text after the Wind environment control graph in Figures H8.6.28.1, H9.6.9.1, H10.6.9.1, H11.6.7.1, H12.6.7.1, H13.6.8.1, H14.6.6.1, H15.6.6.1 (as per Proposed Plan Change text)	This text was included in Council's closing track changes for Topic 051-054 Centre Zones, Business park and industries zones, Business activities and Business Controls. The matter was discussed in the evidence of George Farrant on Topic 051-054 where he specifically requested that the text above be included in the City Centre zone as it had been omitted in error.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C2	H8 Business – City Centre Zone	H8 Business – City Centre Table H8.6.11.1 Bonus floor area	Table H8.6.11.1 Bonus floor area lists 'residential' as a bonus feature. There is a problem with this because the residential nesting table doesn't actually nest anything under residential, they are all separate activities and residential is just the name of the nesting table.  This issue was registered to Council's internal 'Interpretation process'. The Interpretations process ensures that interpretation and implementation of rules in the AUP, are applied correctly and consistently. An interpretation guidance note was prepared on this matter for the Resource Consents department. This proposed amendment will remedy the error and reflect the correct application of rules, currently managed by the interpretation guidance note. When this proposed amendment is implemented, the interpretation guidance note will become void.	Recommend that Table H8.6.11.1 is amended to delete the reference to "residential" and replace this with "dwellings and visitor accommodation". This amendment should occur through the administrative plan change (Deliverable 2).	In the PAUP, the bonus applied to dwellings only. Submissions were received seeking that a bonus should also be given for visitor accommodation. The evidence for Topic 050 City Centre, discusses this topic and recommends that visitor accommodation should also qualify for use of the bonus. It appears an error was made when translating this recommendation into the Plan and 'residential' was listed as the bonus whereas it should be 'dwellings and visitor accommodation'.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Clarification or Explanation	C2	H8 City Centre zone	H8.6.26 Verandahs	There is a misalignment between Standard H8.6.26.(5)(b) and H8.6.26.(5)(e) – Table H8.6.26.1 'for all other frontages'. The 600mm dimension in the table has no effect given the requirement that a verandah can be no closer than 700mm to the edge of the carriageway.  This issue was registered to Council's internal 'Interpretation process'. The Interpretations process ensures that interpretation and implementation of rules in the AUP, are applied correctly and consistently. An interpretation guidance note was prepared on this matter for the Resource Consents department. This proposed amendment will remedy the error and reflect the correct application of rules, currently managed by the interpretation guidance note. When this proposed amendment is implemented, the interpretation guidance note will become void.	The sixth row of Table H8.6.26.1 should be amended to 700mm to align with Standard H8.6.26(5)(b).	To improve useability of the Plan. The Central Area plan enabled verandahs be no closer than 500mm. There is no evidence to ascertain why this was changed from 500mm to 700m. Because of the change it contradicts the frontages activity in table H8.6.26.1 where 600mm is the standard for all other frontages. i.e because 600mm enable verandahs to place closer to the road carriageway edge.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Clarification or Explanation	C2	H8 City Centre zone	H8.6.28. Wind	Standard H8.6.28(1)(c) Wind. Clause (c) does not make sense. This rule was carried over from the Central Area Operative Plan but clause (c) has been changed. The correct standard is used in the Metropolitan Centre zone H9.6.9(1)(c) "an existing wind speed which exceeds the controls of Standard H9.6.9(1)(a) or Standard H9.6.9(1)(b) above to increase". This phrasing should be used in the City Centre zone (with city centre standard cross references).	Amend H8.6.28(1)(c) to read: "an existing wind speed which exceeds the controls below of Standard H8.6.28(1)(a) or Standard H8.6.28(1)(b) above to increase."	All other business centre zones have the equivalent standard for wind and do not have the error identified within the City Centre zone. The change to the provision provides clarity and corrects the reference to the appropriate provisions applicable. This also makes it consistent with the other business centre zones.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Nonsensical outcomes	C1	H8 Business – City Centre Zone	H8.8.2. Assessment criteria (1)(d)	There is a grammatical error where "or" has been used instead of "and" within the assessment criteria for the design and layout of dwellings, visitor accommodation and boarding houses within H8.8.2 (1)(d)(i) City Centre Zone.	Recommend that H8.8.2 (1)(d)(i) is amended to replace the "or" with "and" through the administrative plan change (Deliverable 2).	H8.8.2 (1)(d)(i) lists the assessment criteria for the design and layout of dwellings, visitor accommodation and boarding houses within the city centre zone. This list covers distinct design elements which all need to be considered and are not interchangeable. The use of "or" is therefore inappropriate and should be amended to state "and". This amendment is necessary to improve the plan usability.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C2	H8 Business – City Centre Zone	H8.8.2 (10)	H8.8.2(10) City Centre zone outlook space assessment criteria refers to "non-permanent accommodation" when the matter for discretion refers to "visitor accommodation". "Non-permanent accommodation" is a term used in the legacy plans.	Recommend that H8.8.2(10) is amended to delete the reference to "non-permanent accommodation" and replace this with "visitor accommodation" for consistency with the matter for discretion. This amendment should occur through the administrative plan change (Deliverable 2).	This amendment is necessary to improve the plan usability. The amendment will clarify how to assess applications and therefore needs to be included in a plan change as a technical matter.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C2	H10 Town Centre Zone	H10.6.1 Building Height	Clause (1) states that buildings must not exceed the heights shown in Table H10.6.1.1 for sites subject to the Height Variation Control on the planning maps. Table H10.6.1 only lists 5 different possible Height Variation Control heights, being 13m, 18m, 21m, 27m and exceeding 27m. However the planning maps show a height Variation Control of either 9m or 13m for different town centres.	It is recommended to amend Table H10.6.1.1 to capture heights less than 13m that apply to particular parts of town centres. This is considered a technical amendment which should be progressed through the administrative plan change.	Standard H10.6.1 Building height in the Town Centre zone is currently unworkable where the height applied to a town centre is less than 13m as this is not recognised within Table H10.6.1.1. This is a misalignment between the text and the maps which needs to be amended to improve the usability of the plan.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C1	H14 Business – General Business Zone	H14.6.2.3.	The diagram that is missing from the Chapter is provision standard and Diagram H14.6.2.3 Recession plane indicator for sites adjacent to an open space. This was present in the IHP Recommendations version of the Plan, but not the Council Decisions Version.	It is recommended to insert the provision standard and diagram H14.6.2.3 'Recession plane indicator for sites adjacent to open space zone' below Figure H14.6.2.2, as per the IHP Recommendations Version of the Plan. This will be a new Figure H14.6.2.3 into the AUP, and the new provision will be under H14.6.2(3).	The diagram and provision standard was mistakenly omitted from the Decisions Version of the Unitary Plan, however was present within the Recommendations Version. This gives effect to Table H14.6.2.1 Height in relation to boundary.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Clarification or Explanation	C1	H15 Business - Business Park Zone	H15.6.4 (1)	Standard H15.6.4 (1) Landscaping contains two standards within one and requires amendment for greater clarity. The maximum impervious area standard needs to be separated into its own standard / bullet point.	Provision to be re-worded as per attachment. The maximum impervious area standard is still incorporated into the existing rule but made more clear with a stand alone sub-clause .	The re-written standard is more legible and makes grammatical sense. Creating a new rule does not alter the environmental outcome, hence the retention of the maximum impervious rule, albeit a sub-clause for greater clarity.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Clarification or Explanation	C1	H19 Rural Zones	H19.10.3	The purpose statement for H19.10.3 Minimum yard setback requirements does not address the required riparian and coastal yard setback. This is inconsistent with other zones which have the same required riparian and coastal yard setback i.e. the Residential zones.	The purpose statement should be updated to reflect the rule. Recommend that the purpose statement for H19.10.3 Minimum yard setback requirements is amended to explain the purpose for the riparian and coastal yard setback to improve plan usability and for consistency with other zones (Deliverable 2).	The purpose statement for this standard provides an explanation for the front yard, side and rear yard setbacks. There is no explanation however, for the required riparian or coastal protection yard setback requirements. This is inconsistent with other zones where the purpose statement for the yard standard explains that it is necessary to set back buildings from streams and the coastal edge to maintain water quality and provide protection from natural hazards.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 9: Chapter H Zones

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C2	H20 Rural - Waitakere Foothills Zone	Activity Table H20.4.1 (A15)	In H20 Rural Waitakere Foothills Zone Activity table H20.4.1, row A15 has a blank box in the activity status. It should have 'D' to be consistent with the Waitakere Ranges zone row A15.	Recommened that row A15 should be 'D' as per tracked plan change.	The correct Activity Status is Discretionary which is consistent with similar provisions. i.e. A11 of Table H19.8.1 of Chapter H19 (rural) and A16 of Table H21.4.1 of Chaper 21 (Rural - Waitakere Ranges).	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Anomaly	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C1	H28 Quarry zone	Figure H28.6.2.1.1	The extent of the zone in the GIS Viewer was increased on the western boundary but the figure (H28.6.2.1.1) was not updated to reflect this.	Figure H28.6.2.1.1 Hunua quarry effects line area of 'Hunua Quarry' (shaded) needs to be amended so that the area shown as Hunua Quarry is the same extent as the Special Purpose Quarry zone in the GIS Viewer.	p.5 of Council's Closing remarks for topic 080f (special purpose: quarry zone) shows the agreed changes to the zone and buffer area, while p.24 shows the Quarry effects line unchanged. Consider that updating the diagram was forgotten and this is a drafting error.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 10: Chapter I: Precincts (Auckland-wide)

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	Minor - two changes to provide a link between related clauses	I101 Motor sport precinct	I101.6.2.1. All motorsport activities	The exception for weekday practices has been left out of the Clauses, ever since the precinct was incorporated into the recommendations version.  Change as underlined to the right. Need to add in the exclusion of weekday practices, which the legacy District Plan has.  The Panel's report for Topic 076 Major Recreation is silent on this matter. These exceptions are in Appendix B - Planning Maps, C01-09, of the Isthmus Plan.	<b>Recommendation:</b> (1) Between 1 October in one year and 31 May in the following year no motorised activities will occur on one week in every three weeks (except for weekday practices as detailed below).  (2) Between 1 June and 30 September no motorised activities will occur on one week in every two weeks (except for weekday practices as detailed below).  (3)...	This change to provide clarity and correct the provisions to reflect current use. A link between clause (1) and clause (3) of the noise standards.  There is no little change to the intent of the policy, it is clarifying the meaning of a provision.  This, therefore does not affect the direction of the RPS. Change appropriate for plan objectives. Clarification of a policy via a plan change - no other options available.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	Moderate - 1 change and 1 subsequent change to operation and lighting hours.	I101 Motor sport precinct	I101.6.2.1. All motorsport activities	Operation times need to be amended. I101.6.2.1. All motorsport activities. This error is in all versions of the plan. The IHP's report for Topic 076 Major Recreation is silent on this matter. These reflect the operation hours in Appendix B - Planning Maps, C01-09, of the Isthmus Plan.	<b>Recommendation:</b> (4) Weekday practice may take place between: (a) 12 noon 3pm and 8.00 8.30pm from 1 October to 31 May; and	This change is to provide clarity and correct the provisions to reflect current use of the precinct. Change does not alter the intent of the policy/application of the provisions, but rather providing clarity and correcting the provisions to reflect current practice already in place.	There is a consequential change to the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. This change is amending the practice times to enable an earlier start and finish, the hours of operation for floodlights must be no later than 8.00pm instead of 10.30pm.  I101.6.2.2. Lighting...(2) Hours of operation for floodlights must be no later than 8.00 10.30 pm daily except where agreed by Council for special national or international events for a maximum of six days per year.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	Minor - deletion of a clause that is not required.	I101 Motor sport precinct	I101.6.2.4. Auckland Speedway Riders Club motorsport activities	I101.6.2.4(3) is superfluous to requirements and appears to be added in mistake. In all versions of the Plan. It is not in the legacy plan. The wording of this provision does not even make sense. It should be deleted. The IHP's report for Topic 076 Major Recreation is silent on this matter.  It is not in the old Avondale Racecourse Precinct Rebuttal either, before this was merged into the motorsports precinct. It first appeared in AC's propped marked up version of the Motorsports Precinct and in subsequent evidence.	I101.6.2.4. Auckland Speedway Riders Club motorsport activities <del>Two two-day race meetings can occur a year between 12pm and 6pm on Saturday and Sunday.</del>	This change is to delete a clause that is not required. It is not in the legacy Auckland City Council District Plan rules.  Does not add anything to the provisions, or change the intent of the policy.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	Minor - 1 change to clarify policy	I101 Motor sport precinct	I101.6.2.4. Auckland Speedway Riders Club motorsport activities	I101.6.2.4. Auckland Speedway Riders Club motorsport activities Clause 7 does not adequately represent the way in which motor sports programmes are submitted to Council. The following recommendation reflected the current practice. It is not in the legacy plan provisions. The IHP's report for Topic 076 Major Recreation is silent on this matter.	<b>Recommendation:</b> I101.6.2.4. Auckland Speedway Riders Club motorsport activities  7) Auckland Speedway Riders Club may specify on the programme submitted to Council Power Sports Association who will submit to Auckland Council, a twilight meeting between 4pm and 9pm on a Wednesday, Thursday or Friday ...	This change is to reflect the actual practice whereby Powersports submits the programme to council, as advised by Council Planner A. Reidy after rebuttal evidence.  It is a clarification of a policy, but does not change its intent or meaning, or the intended direction of the plan (RPS).	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	Minor - this is a single change to correct a reference in a policy	I103 Waitematā Navigation Channel Precinct	I103.3 Policies Waitematā Navigation Channel precinct	When the Panel made their recommendations and changed the Coastal Zone provisions, an incorrect policy reference error was found.  In Chapter I Precincts I103.3 Policies, there is an accompanying explanation with reference to "D.5.1.3 Dredging Policy 4 of the Coastal - General Coastal Marine Zone." D.5.1.3 relates to Coastal zones under the PAUP NV not DV. In the AUP this policy is now F2.4.3(3).	<b>Recommendation:</b> 2. I103.3. Policies [rcp] The Coastal - General Coastal Marine Zone, Auckland wide and overlay policies apply in this precinct in addition to those specified above, with the exception of D.5.1.3 Dredging Policy 4 of the Coastal - General Coastal Marine Zone F2.4.3(3) Dredging Policy of F2 Coastal - General Coastal Marine Zone.	The reference in the AUP of 'D.5.1.3' was under the PAUP notified version. As the plan structure and references have been amended, This former reference does not apply and the correct policy under the AUP needs to be referenced. The new policy is under F2.4.3 Dredging Policy 3.  Correction of a cross reference - no other options available.  By correcting this error, the provision is giving effect to the appropriate policy of the RPS.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 11: Chapter I: Precincts (City centre)

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical Matter	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C1	I214 Wynyard Precinct	Table I214.6.2.2. Maximum office gross floor area 2	In the Wynyard Precinct, Standard/Table I214.6.2.2 (Maximum office Gross Floor Area (GFA) 2) there are two errors. The first error is that the table lists incorrect sub-precincts – in particular sub-precinct C should be sub-precinct D, sub-precinct D should be sub-precinct E, and sub-precinct E should be sub-precinct F.  For sub-precinct E, the permitted GFA is 34000m2 and the maximum additional GFA (as an RD activity) is 8500m2, giving a total of 43500m2, not 45,500m2 as stated. This is a simple adding error. The table needs to be changed to reflect the corrections below.  This error has existed since the unitary plan was notified where it appears incorrect details have been transferred from the Central Area District Plan.	Amend in Table I214.6.2.2: Sub-precinct G D Sub-precinct D E 45,000m <sup>2</sup> 43,500m <sup>2</sup> Sub-precinct-E F	Standard I214.6.2.2 cannot be implemented in its current form due to the incorrect precincts being referenced, and an incorrect maximum office GFA listed for precinct E.  This plan change will allow the precinct to be implemented as intended, therefore giving effect to the RPS.  Practice notes would need to have been administered if this was not included in this plan change.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C1	I214 Wynyard Precinct	I214.10.6 Wynyard: Precinct plan 6 - Indicative lanes and viewshafts	It is clearly intended that the viewshafts were meant to remain as the operative in part standard I214.6.12. Lanes and view shafts includes the following: ... (2) Where the lanes shown on Precinct plan 6 are also shown as view shafts on land, the minimum width must be 10m. (3) Where a view shaft on land is indicated alone, it must have a minimum width of 10m. ... This error will need to be amended through a plan change. The viewshafts shown on the precinct plan below need to be transferred to I214.10.6 Wynyard: Precinct plan 6 - Indicative lanes and viewshafts (other information shown on the plan below is no longer correct so do not replace the operative in part precinct plan entirely with the one below).	Viewshafts are to be read to precinct plan 6, in line with the policies of the precinct.  This effects how the precinct plans are implemented, and what development is deemed appropriate in the lanes.	Standards I214.6.12 (1) - (6) cannot be implemented as intended as they rely on the viewshafts being showed correctly in Precinct Plan 6. They are missing due to an oversight.  This plan change will allow the precinct to be implemented as intended, therefore giving effect to the plan objectives/RPS.  A plan change is required to fix this error. No other options are available.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C1	I214 Wynyard Precinct	I214.4.1 Activity table – land use (A23)	The first 'activity status' column (sub-precinct A and sub-precinct B) A23 has a second error. The activity status for Area 1 (to be changed to Sub-precinct A) should be RD, not NC. It appears that the intention was that it would be a non-complying activity to add more office on any site other than Lot 1 DP179403. Given the restriction in I214.6.2 (2) that means that the maximum restricted discretionary office GFA only applies to Lot 1 DP179403 there is no need for the non-complying activity status, because on all other sites development of office in exceedance of I214.6.2 (1) would be a non-complying activity under Rule 1214.4 (A56). The activity status of the rule should be restricted discretionary. This change will need to be made through a plan change.	(A23) Office activity that exceeds the maximum office activity gross floor area in I214.6.2(1) below, subject to compliance with the maximum office activity gross floor area in I214.6.2(2) below #...  Sub-precinct A and Sub-precinct B - RD (not Area 1 and 2) Sub-precinct F RD-NC	This error has also been carried through all versions of the unitary plan, however it will affect how the unitary plan is applied, and applications may be subjected to a more rigorous assessment than necessary. This will need to be corrected through a plan change (technical matter).  Throughout the activity table (I214.4.1), areas 1-6 are listed when the correct and corresponding terminology is Sub-precincts A-F. There is also another error in A23 for sub-precinct F, where two statuses are listed for the same activity. The correct activity status should be restricted discretionary, as that is the purpose of the rule.  These changes are required so that this standard can be implemented correctly, and that applications for office activity are assessed under the correct activity status.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I208 Port Precinct	Rules E25.6.14-E25.6.22 within the Port Precinct	The issue that we have identified is that by applying Noise Rules E25.6.14-E25.6.22 of the Unitary Plan to the Port Precinct, a conflict arises with the application of Port Precinct noise standard I208.6.1.1. For example, while specific noise levels are required to be achieved at the Outer Control Boundary of Precinct Plan 3, the application of E25.6.19 applies a second, more onerous standard on those residentially-zoned properties that are located within this area. Chapter C.1 of the Unitary Plan provides no clear guidance as to rule would apply in such circumstances, and as such, it appears that both sets of rules would technically apply despite the conflict.	Wording to read as follows: The Auckland-wide Lighting rules E24 and Noise rules E25.6.2 - <del>E25.6.13</del> ; <del>E25.6.23</del> - <del>E25.6.26</del> ; <del>E25.6.27</del> - <del>E25.6.29</del> and E25.6.31 - <del>E25.6.33</del> ; <del>E25.6.32</del> ; <del>E25.6.33</del> do not apply to land and the coastal marine area in the Port Precinct.	In Council's final closing remarks for Topic 040 (lighting, noise, vibration) as that was after 050 (City Centre). Council and POAL agreed that the Auckland wide lighting and noise rules do not apply and the Auckland-wide vibration rules do apply.  There is nothing in the Panel's reports for topic 040 or 050 that explains any disagreement with that position.  I agree that there appears to be an error in the decision version of the Port Precinct in not including E25.6.14 to E25.6.22 in the list of noise standards that do not apply. If E25.6.14 (coastal interface) and E25.6.19 (business interface) apply, it is difficult to see how the more specific rule in the Port precinct also applies. Several of the other rules relate to noise from rural zones or schools so they could not apply to noise in the Port precinct anyway.  The only Auckland-wide noise standards that should apply are E25.6.1 (general standards) and E25.6.30 (vibration).	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 12: Chapter I: Precincts (Central)

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Anomaly	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I318 Monte Cecilia Precinct	I.318.3.1. Policy	Policy incorrectly refers to a Character Statement. This error was included in the proposed plan. Character Statements are relevant to Special Character Areas. As Monte Cecilia is a Historic Heritage Area it is subject to a Statement of Significance.	Amend the policy to refer to the Monte Cecilia Statement of Significance.	The amendment corrects an error.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I319 MOTAT Precinct	I319.8.2(1)	Assessment criteria I319.8.2(1) considers "the extent to which the amount of light falling into habitable rooms of (suggested words missing) during the hours of darkness is minimised to control effects on indoor amenity and sleep disturbance". It is indicated that the criteria omits the phrase "established dwellings within a residential zone" in error.	Change Assessment criteria I319.8.2(1) to read: "(h) the extent to which the amount of light falling into habitable rooms of established dwellings within a residential zone during the hours of darkness is minimised to control effects on indoor amenity and sleep disturbance".	The addition of the wording "established dwellings within a residential zone" clarifies the clause Assessment criteria I319.8.2(1) and would align it with I319.6.2. Lighting including I319.6.2(5)(a). Although this phrase was not included in the AUPOP and was not included in the Auckland Council evidence to the IHP re the MOTAT precinct, the inclusion of these words makes the intent of the clause clear and is entirely consistent with the body of I319.6.2. where this phrase is used on a number of occasions.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I319 MOTAT Precinct	I319.6.2(5)(a)and (b) and I319.6.2(7)	Standard I319.6.2 relates to lighting and includes a number of inconsistent references to where illuminance limits are to be measured: Standard I319.6.2(5) (a) & (b) and Standard I319.6.2(7) includes a limit to be measured "at the boundary of any residentially zoned site containing a lawfully established dwelling". The phrase lawfully established dwelling does not have a definition in the AUPOP. It is recommended that this be changed to 'dwelling' as defined in the RMA.	Amend Standard I319.6.2(5)(a)and (b) and Standard I319.6.2(7) to from "lawfully established dwelling" to "dwelling"	The aim has been to provide a consistent approach through out the AUPOP. The phrase in the I319 MOTAT Precinct Standard I319.6.2(5) (a) & (b) and Standard I319.6.2(7) "lawfully established dwelling" is not supported by a definition in the AUPOP. Dwelling however is defined in the RMA. Retaining the current wording is like to cause confusion and create additional cost in determining whether a dwelling is lawfully established. It is therefore recommended to amend Standard I319.6.2(5)(a)and (b) and Standard I319.6.2(7) to from "lawfully established dwelling" to "dwelling".	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I319 MOTAT Precinct	I319.6.2. Lighting	The qualifying phrase "residentially zoned site" is omitted from Standard I319.6.2(5)(b) meaning that protection could be afforded to a dwelling in a non residential zone, for example a dwelling in a mixed use zone or a workers' dwelling. Standard I319.6.2(7) refers to the measurements at the windows of habitable rooms of a lawfully established dwelling within a residential zone (and at the boundary of any residentially zoned site where a dwelling does not yet exist).  Standard I319.6.2(5)(b) does not include the "within a residential zone" qualifier. However in reading the Ak Council evidence to the IHP it appears that this has been omitted in error. The AUPOP I319.6.2(5)(b) does not align with the Council's evidence and is inconsistent with the overall paragraph on Light in the AUPOP and the Council's evidence.	Add the following qualifier to: Standard I319.6.2(5)(b) "within a residential zone".	The qualifying phrase "residential zone" is omitted from Standard I319.6.2(5)(b) meaning that protection could be afforded to a dwelling in a non residential zone, for example a dwelling in a mixed use zone or a workers' dwelling. The question whether the protection from adverse lighting effects should only apply in a residential zone rather than to any dwelling could be reviewed as part of preparing the plan change.  The lack of consistency both within the relevant Motat Precinct (I319.6.2. Lighting) paragraph see I319.6.2(7) and the fact that it does not reflect the content of the Council's submission to the IHP indicates that is an anomaly can be corrected. The remedy is the addition of the following qualifier to Standard I319.6.2(5)(b) "within a residential zone". This aligns the sentence with the rest of the paragraph.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Amendments to diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C1	I323 Observatory Precinct	I323.10.1. Observatory Precinct: Precinct plan 1 – Maximum building height	There would appear to be an error in the AUPOP Observatory precinct plan key which states that the maximum building height for Area A is 3m. However the maximum building height standard states that the maximum height for Area A is 9m. <i>I323.6.1. Maximum building height - Buildings must not exceed 9m above the height of the existing ground level in (1) Area A as shown on Observatory Precinct: Precinct plan 1.</i> The IHP hearing report on this topic states that they support having a two-step height control. This consistent with rules I363.6.1 (1) & (2). In evidence to the IHP the Auckland Council planner states that in her opinion 'the notified precinct plan has been inaccurately copied from the Observatory concept plan contained in the legacy Isthmus Plan which identifies the maximum building height as 9m above existing ground level for Area A and 3m above existing ground level (Jan. 1993) for Area B.  The AUPOP Precinct plan 1 – Maximum building height, plan key states that the maximum building height for Area A is 3m, and 3m for Area B as well. The diagram should be amended maximum building height for Area A from 3m to 9m.	Observatory Precinct: Precinct plan 1 – Maximum building height - Amend Observatory Precinct: Precinct plan 1 key to change Area A height limit from 3m to 9m.	The AUPOP indicates an inconsistency between I323.6.1.(1) Maximum building height - Buildings must not exceed 9m above the height of the existing ground level and the key in the Observatory Precinct map key which indicates which 3 metres for the Area A height limit. This appears to be a carryover from the notified PAUP version of the Observatory Precinct plan. In there evidence on the Observatory Precinct plan to the IHP the Auckland Council planner states, 'the notified precinct plan has been inaccurately copied from the Observatory concept plan contained in the legacy Isthmus Plan which identifies the maximum building height as 9m above existing ground level for Area A and 3m above existing ground level (Jan. 1993) for Area B. In response to the evidence the IHP has included I323.6.1.(1) - however the mistake in the AUPOP Observatory precinct plan key.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Amendments to diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C1	I325 Ōkahu Marine precinct	I325 Ōkahu Marine precinct plan 1	There is an error in the AUPOP Ōkahu Marine precinct plan 1. The domain (label) on the plan Ōkahu Marine sub-precinct A [rcp/dp] should be Ōkahu Marine sub-precinct A [rcp/dp]. The domain (label) on the plan Ōkahu Marine sub-precinct B [dp] should be Ōkahu Marine sub-precinct B [rcp/dp].  The current AUPOP Ōkahu Marine precinct plan 1 is not aligned to the AUPOP Ōkahu Marine activities table or the PAUP activities table. It is also not an accurate description of the area covered which is both Coastal Marine Area and land. There is an error on pages 15-19 of the Council's recommendation report.	There is an error in the AUPOP Ōkahu Marine precinct plan 1. The domain (label) on the plan Ōkahu Marine sub-precinct A [rcp/dp] should be Ōkahu Marine sub-precinct A [rcp/dp]. The domain (label) on the plan Ōkahu Marine sub-precinct B [dp] should be Ōkahu Marine sub-precinct B [rcp/dp].	The AUPOP Ōkahu Marine precinct plan 1 contains an error in labelling and means that it does not align with the content of the AUPOP Ōkahu Marine precinct activities table or describe reality of the area which covers both the marine and land base environments and requires reference to both the rcp/dp. The domain (label) on the plan Ōkahu Marine sub-precinct A [rcp/dp] should be Ōkahu Marine sub-precinct A [rcp/dp] The domain (label) on the plan Ōkahu Marine sub-precinct B [dp] should be Ōkahu Marine sub-precinct B [rcp/dp]. This is an error first shown on pages 15-19 of the Council's recommendation report. Conversely, the PAUP Ōkahu Marine precinct Activities Table identifies the that sub-precinct A and B both incorporating the CMA (rcp) and Land area (dp) as with.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I332 Tamaki Precinct	I332.7 Assessment – controlled activities	Re I332 Tamaki Precinct as there are controlled activities in this the causes are redundant and need to be removed. I332.7 Assessment – controlled activities.  Remove the following two clauses: I332.7.1 Matters of control There are no controlled activities in this precinct. I332.7.2 Assessment criteria There are no controlled activities in this precinct  The AUPOP I332.7.1 and I332.7.2 are redundant and a mistake and the two clauses need to be removed. They can be replaced by: There are no controlled activities in this precinct.	The two clauses need to be removed. I332.7.1 <del>Matters of control</del> <del>There are no controlled activities in this precinct.</del> I332.7.2 <del>Assessment criteria</del> <del>There are no controlled activities in this precinct.</del> Add under I332.7 Assessment – controlled activities. There are no controlled activities in this precinct.	AUPOP I332 Tamaki Precinct As there are no controlled activities with the Tamaki precinct the addition of clauses in the AUPOP I332.7.1 and I332.7.2 is a mistake and redundant. The two clauses need to be removed. I332.7 Assessment – controlled activities I332.7.1 Matters of control There are no controlled activities in this precinct. I332.7.2 Assessment criteria There are no controlled activities in this precinct. Clauses I332.7.1 and I332.7.2 are to be replaced by There are no controlled activities in this precinct, which follows directly on from I332.7 Assessment – controlled activities.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Amendments to diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C2	I334 Wairaka Precinct	I334 Wairaka Precinct, Activity Table	I334 Wairaka Precinct, Activity Table - I334 errors in provisions: (A29) Connection of any roads to the Precinct with a public road: RD (A30) Direct vehicle connection between Laurel Street, Renton Road or Rhodes Avenue and the Special Purpose – Tertiary Education zone: NC (A30) is in contradiction to Matters of Discretion I334.8.1(3) 'Connections between the Precinct and Laurel Street, Renton Road or Rhodes Avenue with a public road' and Assessment Criteria I334.8.2(3) 'Connections between the Precinct and Laurel Street, Renton Road or Rhodes Avenue with a public road'.  These same roads are shown as discretionary and as for restricted discretionary activities vis-à-vis the assessment criteria. This indicates that (A30) is wrong and not required in the activities table.  Council evidence on this matter to the IHP appears to be silent on the matter and does not require NC activity status to manage these roads. Instead the roads in question can be included in (A29) Renton Road or Rhodes Avenue.	I334.8.1. Matters of discretion (3) Connections between the Precinct and Laurel Street, Renton Road or Rhodes Avenue with a public road: I334.8.2. Assessment criteria (3) Connections between the Precinct and Laurel Street, Renton Road or Rhodes Avenue with a public road:	AUPOP I334 Wairaka Precinct. Matters of Discretion I334.8.1(3) and Assessment Criteria I334.8.2(3) apply to restricted discretionary activities and do not align with the Activity Table specifically (A30) where the activity is listed as a NC. The Activity Table NC activity status was a result of mediation between the Council and Mt Albert residence concerned about access to the precinct from Laurel Street, Renton Road or Rhodes Avenue.  A30 is a NC activity and should not be listed re Matters of Discretion I334.8.1(3) and Assessment Criteria I334.8.2(3). The activity that should be listed under the matters of discretion I334.8.1 is A29: "Connection of any roads to the Precinct with a public road."  The corresponding assessment criteria I334.8.2.3 will need to change to align with the above. Remove I334.8.1. Matters of discretion - Laurel Street, Renton Road or Rhodes Avenue I334.8.2. Assessment criteria Laurel Street, Renton Road or Rhodes Avenue	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 12: Chapter I: Precincts (Central)

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	I334 Wairaka Precinct	Assessment Criteria I334.8.2.2(g)(i) and Assessment Criteria I334.8.2.3(c)(i)	<p>Assessment Criteria I334.8.2.2(g)(i) 'the extent to which parking buildings avoid fronting Carrington Road or Oakley Creek or have direct access from Laurel Street...'. Wording is slightly ambiguous and implies the emphasis is on having access when in fact it is to avoid the access, so suggest changes as follows: 'the extent to which parking buildings avoid fronting Carrington Road or Oakley Creek or <b>avoid having</b> direct access from Laurel Street...'</p> <p>Assessment Criteria I334.8.2.3(c)(i) 'the extent of any positive benefits arising from the proposed connection (excluding benefits related to diversion of traffic from Carrington Road) and the provision of walkway and cycleway access is not restricted'.</p> <p>This criteria does not make clear sense and it is proposed that an amendment is made as follows: 'the extent of any positive benefits arising from the proposed connection (excluding benefits related to diversion of traffic from Carrington Road) and <b>ensure</b> the provision of walkway and cycleway access is not restricted'.</p>	<p>Include in I334.8.2.2(g)(i) "<b>or avoid having</b> direct access from Laurel Street."</p> <p>Include Assessment Criteria I334.8.2.3(c)(i) ', and <b>ensure</b> the provision of walkway and cycleway access is not restricted'.</p>	<p>The proposed amendment is to add the words 'avoid having' in I334.8.2.2(g)(i) to provide clarity to the purpose of the standard. The amended text would then read as: 'the extent to which parking buildings avoid fronting Carrington Road or Oakley Creek or avoid having direct access from Laurel Street. Assessment Criteria I334.8.2.3(c)(i) does not make clear sense and it proposed that an amendment is made as follows: 'the extent of any positive benefits arising from the proposed connection (excluding benefits related to diversion of traffic from Carrington Road) and <b>ensure</b> the provision of walkway and cycleway access is not restricted'. This change supports the context of clause which aims to provide for future walkways and cycleways.</p>	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Amendments to diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C1	I334 Wairaka Precinct	I334.10.2 Wairaka: Precinct plan 2	<p>The map I334.10.2 Wairaka: Precinct plan 2 – Protected Trees is the incorrect plan. This plan identifies trees outside the precinct and not listed in the identified trees list on page 14 of the provisions. An updated plan was provided in Council's Closing remarks and Points of Clarification for the Wairaka Precinct (31 March 2016) with the plan shown on page 26 of 48. This AUPOP plan should be updated to reflect those induced in the provisions. There is a need to align the Wairaka Precinct Plan Map I334.10.2 with the Table I334.6.7.1 - Identified Trees. The table does not include trees identified as 4, 6 and 12 they are outside Wairaka: Precinct plan. The trees need to be removed from Protected Trees - and therefore should be removed Map I334.10.2 Wairaka: Precinct plan 2 – Protected Trees.</p>	<p>I334.10.2 Wairaka Precinct plan 2: needs to be changed to match AUP Table I334.6.7.1 - Identified Trees. An updated map is provided Council's Closing remarks in Points of Clarification for the Wairaka Precinct (31 March 2016). Remove trees.</p>	<p>There is a need to align the Wairaka Precinct Plan Map with the Table I334.6.7.1 - Identified Trees. The Table does not include trees 4, 6 and 12 they are outside the boundary of the precinct plan identified in Map I334.10.2 Wairaka: Precinct plan 2 – Protected Trees and therefore the precinct plan should be updated. Table I334.6.7.1 was adjusted in relation to Council's closing remarks however the updated map was not included in the AUPOP.</p> <p>An updated plan was provided in Council's Closing remarks and Points of Clarification for the Wairaka Precinct (31 March 2016). However, this map was not included in and AUPOP. This anomaly can be corrected as part of the administrative Plan Change.</p>	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 13: Chapter I: Precincts (South)

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C1	I402 Auckland Airport Precinct	I402.8.1(1)	Need to change - Matters of Discretion I402.8.1(1). The I402.6.19 - Standard - the Auckland-wide and overlay standards apply in this precinct unless specified. The standards apply to permitted activities, controlled activities and restricted discretionary activities. However, I402.10.1 (A44) refers to - Any building, structures and works or subdivision in Gateway Sub-precinct area A – F that is not in accordance with either one of or both of: I402.10.1 Auckland Airport: Precinct plan 1, or the subdivision Standard I402.6.19 Subdivision Gateway Subprecinct. That is activities not complying to the rule/s are also subject to matters of discretion. Matters of discretion I402.8.1(1) - therefore needs to be amended as follows to reflect activity allowed in A44. <b>Recommendation</b> I402.8.1 (1) "...which is not in accordance with I402.10.1 Auckland Airport Precinct plan 1 and / or not complying with Standard I402.6.19 Subdivision."	Recommendation I402.8.1 (1) "...which is not in accordance with I402.10.1 Auckland Airport Precinct plan 1 and / or not complying with Standard I402.6.19 Subdivision."	There is a need to change Matters of Discretion I402.8.1(1). The I402.6.19 - Standard states - the Auckland-wide and overlay standards apply in this precinct unless specified. The standards apply to permitted activities, controlled activities and restricted discretionary activities. However, I402.10.1 (A44) refers to - Any building, structures and works or subdivision in Gateway Sub-precinct area A – F that is not in accordance with either one of or both of: I402.10.1 Auckland Airport: Precinct plan 1, or the subdivision Standard I402.6.19 Subdivision Gateway Sub precinct. That is activities not complying to the rule's are also subject to matters of discretion. Matters of discretion I402.8.1(1) - needs to be amended to reflect activity of A44, that are not complying with the standard .	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C1	I402 Auckland Airport Precinct	I402.8.2(1)	There is a need to change I402.8.2(1) Accessment Criteria I402.6.19 - Standard - the Auckland-wide and overlay standards apply in this precinct unless specified. The standards apply to permitted activities, controlled activities and restricted discretionary activities. However, I402.10.1 (A44) refers to - Any building, structures and works or subdivision in Gateway Sub-precinct area A – F that is not in accordance with either one of or both of: I402.10.1 Auckland Airport: Precinct plan 1, or the subdivision Standard I402.6.19 Subdivision Gateway Subprecinct. That is activities not complying to the rule/s are also subject to Accessment Criteria. Accessment Criteria I402.8.2(1) - needs to be amended as follows to reflect activity of A44 and are not complying with the standard . <b>Recommendation</b> I402.8.2(1) "...which is not in accordance with I402.10.1 Auckland Airport Precinct plan 1 and / or not complying with Standard I402.6.19 Subdivision."	Recommendation I402.8.2(1) "...which is not in accordance with I402.10.1 Auckland Airport Precinct plan 1 and / or not complying with Standard I402.6.19 Subdivision"	There is a need to change I402.8.2(1) Accessment Criteria. The I402.6.19 - Standard - the Auckland-wide and overlay standards apply in this precinct unless specified. The standards apply to permitted activities, controlled activities and restricted discretionary activities. However, I402.10.1 (A44) refers to - Any building, structures and works or subdivision in Gateway Sub-precinct area A – F that is not in accordance with either one of or both of: I402.10.1 Auckland Airport: Precinct plan 1, or the subdivision Standard I402.6.19 Subdivision Gateway Subprecinct. That is activities not complying to the rule's are also subject to matters of Accessment Criteria. Accessment Criteria I402.8.2(1) - needs to be amended as follows to reflect activity of A44 and are not complying with the standard .	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C3	I403 Beachlands 1 Precinct		In the Beachlands 1 Precinct (I403) the - Landscape buffer area planting plan and planting schedule is missing from the precinct controls. This set of controls: "The Landscape buffer area planting plan and planting schedule" is included under the PAUP Beachlands 1 Precinct as Appendix 11.6.1. and was part of the Manukau City Council Plan Change 30. However the schedule was not included in the AUPOP. It is referred to in the landscape section of Beachlands 1 Precinct (I403). This schedule needs to be included part the AUPOP I403 Beachlands 1 Precinct. It is recommended that be added to the body of the precinct text. To attach as a further appendix is likely to cause confusion with the existing - Beachlands Design Guidelines appendix. The planting plan and planting schedule - to be referenced as 1403.10.3 The Beachlands 1 precinct also incorrectly refers to the Beachlands Design Guidelines in relation to landscape planting in three instances. Re Landscaping along Whitford-Maraetai Road provisions (26) and (27). I403.6.14. Landscape buffer area has consequential changes. <b>Recommendation:</b> Add I403.10.3. The Landscape buffer area planting plan and planting schedule.	Recommendation: Add I403.10.3. The Landscape buffer area planting plan and planting schedule.	In the Beachlands 1 Precinct (I403) the - Landscape buffer area planting plan and planting schedule is missing from the precinct controls. This set of controls: "The Landscape buffer area planting plan and planting schedule" is included under the PAUP Beachlands 1 Precinct as Appendix 11.6.1. and was part of the Manukau City Council Plan Change 30. However the schedule was not included in the AUPOP. It is however referred to in the landscape section of Beachlands 1 Precinct (I403). The schedule was not included in evidence to the panel but needs to be included to interpret the precinct controls. This schedule needs to be included part the AUPOP I403 Beachlands 1 Precinct.	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. These changes are as follows: I403.6.14. Landscape buffer area to be changed as follows (c) be planted in accordance with the landscape plan for the buffer area and the planting schedule contained in I403.11.1 Beachlands 1: Beachlands Village Design Guidelines to I403.10.3. The Landscape buffer area planting plan and planting schedule. Also need to be changed: Landscaping along Whitford-Maraetai Road provision (26) Require planting of the landscape buffer area with native and exotic species in accordance with I403.11.1 Beachlands 1: Beachlands Village Design Guidelines to I403.10.3. Landscape buffer area planting plan and planting schedule. and (27) Protect views from Whitford-Maraetai Road to the Hauraki Gulf by means of the view corridor through the landscape buffer area identified in I403.11.1 Beachlands 1: Beachlands Village Design Guidelines to I403.10.3 Landscape buffer area planting plan and planting schedule.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C3	I403 Beachlands 1 Precinct		Adjust the I403 (Beachlands 1 Precinct) and in particular - I403.10.1. Beachlands 1: Precinct plan 1, the boundary lines. Need for correction. The boundary of the precinct is incorrect in two sections and does not align with the land parcels or road as shown in the GIS precinct. Changes to the precinct boundary are: 1. Pulling back the Southern boundary so that it aligns with the property land parcels and the road. The precinct currently includes the road as is clearly out of alignment. 2. Extending the Eastern boundary (to the dashed line) so that it aligns with property boundaries and road. These changes would align the I403.10.1. Beachlands 1: Plan with the GIS precinct. On the eastern section there is also a consequential change required to extend landscape buffer area out to boundary.	Recommendation: Realign Southern and Eastern precinct boundaries to match land parcels and road boundaries. Consequential change required to extend landscape buffer area out to boundary.	Adjust the I403 (Beachlands 1 Precinct) the boundary of the precinct is incorrect in two places, and needs to be adjusted. This would align with the property boundaries and roads as shown in the GIS precinct. The Southern boundary needs to align with the property land parcel and the road. The Eastern boundary of the precinct needs to be clarified and aligned (shown by the dashed line) with property boundaries. Reasons for recommendation This will clarify the exact location of the precinct boundary, and will ensure that the boundaries are aligned with the precinct boundary in the GIS viewer.	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. The change required is to extend landscape buffer area out to boundary.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C1	I403. Beachlands 1 Precinct	Table I403.4.1 Activity table	I403 Beachlands 1 Precinct, Table I403.4.1 Activity table, the activities (A3) and (A4) as currently worded are the same. Activity A4 should be the one which has "servicing that is not connected to a public reticulated wastewater sytem". Therefore this should change by adding the word "not" as follows:  (A4) Any activity requiring wastewater servicing that is <u>not</u> connected to a public reticulated wastewater system", for which the correct activity status should be NC. This is to be amended through a plan change NC.  (A17) New buildings and any modifications to a building other than those listed above - This should be a permitted activity and hence activity status should be "P".	(A4) Any activity requiring wastewater servicing that is <u>not</u> connected to a public reticulated wastewater system", for which the correct activity status should be NC. This is to be amended through a plan change NC.  (A17) New buildings and any modifications to a building other than those listed above - This should be a permitted activity and hence activity status should be "P". Therefore insert "P" in activity status column.	The change is needed to make the distinction between activities (A3) and (A4). Accordingly the activity (A4) is changed to represent the activity requiring wastewater servicing that is not connected to a reticulated wastewater system. The corresponding activity status "NC" matches with hsi change.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clear mistake between different versions of the Plan (text only)	C2	I403. Beachlands 1 Precinct	Table I403.6.2.1 Yards	Minimum Depth for Front Yard is amended as follows: 8 8m except as follows:  8 6m for - sites adjoining Jack Lachlan Drive that are subject to standard I403.6.14 - yards adjoining a stormwater management area or public open space.  3m for - one yard only on a corner site - sites that adjoin a stormwater management area or public open space or a street.	Minimum Depth for Front Yard is amended as follows: 8 8m except as follows:  8 6m for - sites adjoining Jack Lachlan Drive that are subject to standard I403.6.14 - yards adjoining a stormwater management area or public open space.  3m for - one yard only on a corner site - sites that adjoin a stormwater management area or public open space or a street.	The legacy provisions makes it clear that there is a 6m front yard which could be reduced to 3m if the site adjoins a Stormwater Management Area (SWMA) or Public Open Space zone (POS) and a street-Rule 17.16.10.2(a)(i)(4). However the yard adjoining the SWMA or POS shall be a minimum of 6m- Rule 17.16.10.2(a)(i)(3). Note this is not the front yard.  The Unitary Plan requires a 6m front yard for front or corner sites if the site adjoins the SWMA or POS. However the SWMA and POS yard (6m) has been drafted in both the legacy and unitary plans on the assumption that there is a front yard requirement for the site. There could be the possibility of a rear site being created, in which case the front yard requirement would not apply. Any rear yard applied to a rear site would be subject to an 8m yard requirement.  Rule 17.16.10.2(a)(i)(3) in the legacy plan and its equivalent (Table I403.6.2.1) in the Unitary Plan should stand alone and should not be confused with the front yard requirement of 6m.  As it is currently drafted, the rule appears to link the front yard with the SWMA or POS yard. This rule should be redrafted for greater clarity as a stand alone yard rule and not be linked with the front yard requirement.  For sites that adjoin a SWMA or POS or a street, there is a 3m minimum front yard requirement.  The reduced 3m front yard requirement relates a sites situation with the possibility that it adjoins a SWMA or POS or a street.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 13: Chapter I: Precincts (South)

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C1	I404 Beachlands 2 Precinct		This error relates to the Beachlands 2 precinct (Local Centre). The Beachlands 2 precinct is based on the Beachlands Village Improvement Centre in the Manukau District Plan (CH.17.17). The Beachlands 2 precinct was introduced through the hearings to reflect Plan Change 30A to the legacy Manukau District Plan.  Table I404.4.1 Activity table - sets out the activities for the three sub-precincts. For (A10) trade suppliers there appears to be a reversal in the appropriate activity status between sub-precincts B & C. It should be RD in sub-precinct B, but is shown as NC. And should be NC in sub-precinct C, but is shown as RD. This would align with the evidence to the IHP and previous Manukau District Plan. <b>Recommendation</b> - that sub-precinct B be changed to RD and that for sub-precinct C be changed to NC.	Recommendation - that sub-precinct B be changed to RD and that for sub-precinct C be changed to NC.	This error relates to the Beachlands 2 precinct (Local Centre). The Beachlands 2 precinct is based on the Beachlands Village Improvement Centre in the Manukau District Plan (CH.17.17) and was introduced through the IHP hearings process. Table I404.4.1 Activity table - sets out the activities for the three sub-precincts. For (A10) trade suppliers there is reversal in the appropriate activity status between sub-precincts B & C based on the evidence to the IHP hearings and the Manukau District Plan Change 30 and Chapter 17.17 of the District Plan. It should be RD in sub-precinct B, but is shown as NC and it should be NC in sub-precinct C, but is shown as RD.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C2	I410 Drury South Industrial Precinct	Figure I410.6.2.1 Carpark Design	Under the I410.6.2. sub-precincts A - E, the section I410.6.2.8 refers to fully planted permeable carpark design layout detailed in Figure I410.6.2.1. However this design layout is wrong. This should be corrected as per the design layout - detail given in Diagram 6 of the I410 Drury South Industrial Precinct Appendix.	This should be corrected as per the design layout - detail given in Diagram 6 of the I410 Drury South Industrial Precinct Appendix.	The fully planted permeable carpark design layout detailed in Figure I410.6.2.1 should be corrected as per the design layout - detail given in Diagram 6 of the I410 Drury South Industrial Precinct Appendix.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C2	I410 Drury South Industrial Precinct Appendix	Attachment 5	In the I410 Drury South Industrial Precinct Appendix document, the Attachment 5 is missing. Insert the Attachment 5 as Appendix I410.11.1 - Attachment 5, namely, Streams and Wetland Rehabilitation Guidelines June 2013 - Boffa Miskell.	Insert the Attachment 5 as Appendix I410.11.1 - Attachment 5, namely, Streams and Wetland Rehabilitation Guidelines June 2013 - Boffa Miskell.	Insert the missing Attachment 5 as Appendix I410.11.1 - Attachment 5, namely, Streams and Wetland Rehabilitation Guidelines June 2013 - Boffa Miskell.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachments 32 and 34 (actual appendix)
Anomaly	Precinct Provisions	C4	I412 Flat Bush Precinct	Table I412.6.1.1.1 Density Requirement	The minimum and maximum density requirements of Precinct I-Table Table I412.6.1.1.1. do not align with the minimum and maximum lot sizes under I412.6.2.2.1 Minimum and average lot sizes Table I412.6.2.2.1. This is an error. The minimum density under Table I412.6.1.1.1 for Precinct I should read as NA. The term "(sqm per dwelling)" has been added to the Maximum density requirement for additional clarification.	Delete the Minimum density of 2000 under Table I412.6.1.1.1 for Precinct I and replace with NA	Sites within Precinct I are zoned as Large Lot and Countryside Living zone. The density requirement and the minimum and average lot sizes requirements do not align. The density provisions should only specify maximum density permitted for the zone and not the minimum density.	There are no consequential changes to other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C2	I417 Karaka North Precinct	I.417.5. Notification	In section I417.5. Notification, equestrian centre activity is provided only in Rural - Rural Coastal zone. However, Rural - Mixed Rural zone that is part of the Sub-precinct A and needs to be included along with Rural - Rural Coastal zone. This should be corrected as follows: (2) Any application for resource consent for any of the following activities will be considered without public or limited notification or the need to obtain the written approval from affected parties unless the Council decides that special circumstances exist under section 95A(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991: (a) restaurants in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone; and (b) equestrian Centre in the Rural - Mixed Rural or Rural - Rural Coastal Zones.	This should be corrected as follows: (2) Any application for resource consent for any of the following activities will be considered without public or limited notification or the need to obtain the written approval from affected parties unless the Council decides that special circumstances exist under section 95A(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991: (a) restaurants in the Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone; and (b) equestrian Centre in the Rural - Mixed Rural or Rural - Rural Coastal Zones.	The Activity, Equestrian Centre is within Sub-precinct A where both Rural - Mixed Rural and Rural - Rural Coastal zones exist. Therefore this correction is needed to include all the zoning within the Sub-precinct where Equestrian activity.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C1	I417 Karaka North Precinct	I.417.6.6. Minimum site size	There are more than one site size being referred to in the table. Change to notification requirement as given below. (1) The minimum site sizes for the Karaka North sub-precincts <del>is</del> set out in Table I417.6.6.1 Minimum site sizes below.	Change notification requirement as given below. (1) The minimum site sizes for the Karaka North sub-precincts <del>is</del> set out in Table I417.6.6.1 Minimum site sizes below.	As there are several site sizes in the table, this sentence is changed to reflect that.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C2	I417 Karaka North Precinct	I417.1. Precinct Description	I417.1. Precinct Description Last paragraph of the Precinct Description provides names of all the zones within the Karaka North Precinct. However Rural - Mixed Rural zone is missing, and therefore needs to be added.  1) I417.1. Precinct Description Last paragraph: The zoning of land within this precinct is Business - Local Centre Zone, Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone, Residential - Single House Zone, <u>Rural - Mixed Rural Zone</u> and Rural - Rural Coastal Zone.	I417.1. Precinct Description Last paragraph: The zoning of land within this precinct is Business - Local Centre Zone, Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone, Residential - Single House Zone, <u>Rural - Mixed Rural Zone</u> and Rural - Rural Coastal Zone.	This correction ensures that all the zones included in the Karaka North Precinct are included in the Precinct description.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C1	I417 Karaka North Precinct	I417.1. Activity table	In the second paragraph of the section I417.4. Activity table, add missing word spaces: Table I417.4.1.  Table I417.4.1 specifies the activity status of land use, development and subdivision activities in the Karaka North Precinct pursuant to section 9(3) of the Resource Management Act 1991.	In the second paragraph of the section I417.4. Activity table, add missing word spaces: Table I417.4.1.  Table I417.4.1 specifies the activity status of land use, development and subdivision activities in the Karaka North Precinct pursuant to section 9(3) of the Resource Management Act 1991.	This correction ensures that the numbering of Precincts follow the same format and style consistently throughout the AUP.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C2	I417 Karaka North Precinct	I417.7.1. Matters of control	All the zones within the precinct are correctly included the section I.417.7.1 Matters of control. This sections should be changed as follows:  (2) dwellings in the Residential - Single House, <del>and</del> Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zones; and dwellings in the <u>Rural - Mixed Rural, and</u> Rural - Rural Coastal Zones.	This sections should be changed as follows:  (2) dwellings in the Residential - Single House, <del>and</del> Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zones; and dwellings in the <u>Rural - Mixed Rural, and</u> Rural - Rural Coastal Zones.	This change is needed to ensure that all the zones within the Precinct are correctly included.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C2	I417 Karaka North Precinct	I417.7.2. Assessment criteria	All the zones within the precinct are correctly included the section I.417.7.2. Assessment criteria. This sections should be changed as follows:  (2) dwellings in the Residential - Single House, <del>and</del> Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zones; and dwellings in the <u>Rural - Mixed Rural, and</u> Rural - Rural Coastal Zones.	This sections should be changed as follows:  (2) dwellings in the Residential - Single House, <del>and</del> Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zones; and dwellings in the <u>Rural - Mixed Rural, and</u> Rural - Rural Coastal Zones.	This change is needed to ensure that all the zones within the Precinct are correctly included.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C2	I417 Karaka North Precinct	I417.8.1 Matters of discretion	The section I417.8.1 Matters of discretion deals with equestrian centre activity which is provided for in both zones, Rural - Mixed Rural and Rural - Rural Coastal. Accordingly, this section should be changed as follows: (2) equestrian centre in the <u>Rural - Mixed Rural or</u> Rural - Rural Coastal Zones.	This section should be changed as follows: (2) equestrian centre in the <u>Rural - Mixed Rural or</u> Rural - Rural Coastal Zones.	Equestrian Centre is an activity within Sub-precinct A where both Rural - Mixed Rural and Rural - Rural Coastal zones exist. Therefore this correction is needed to include all the zoning within the Sub-precinct where Equestrian activity is provided for.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C2	I417 Karaka North Precinct	I417.8.2 Assessment criteria	The section I417.8.2 Matters of discretion deals with equestrian centre activity which is provided for in both zones, Rural - Mixed Rural and Rural - Rural Coastal. Accordingly, this section should be changed as follows: (2) equestrian centre in the <u>Rural - Mixed Rural or</u> Rural - Rural Coastal Zones.	This section should be changed as follows: (2) equestrian centre in the <u>Rural - Mixed Rural or</u> Rural - Rural Coastal Zones.	Equestrian Centre is an activity within Sub-precinct A where both Rural - Mixed Rural and Rural - Rural Coastal zones exist. Therefore this correction is needed to include all the zoning within the Sub-precinct where Equestrian activity is provided for.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C1	I417 Karaka North Precinct	Table I417.4.1 Activity table	A blank in Table I417.4.1 Activity table below means that the provisions of the overlays, zone of Auckland-wide apply.  A blank in Table I417.1.1 Activity table below means that <del>the provisions of the overlays, zone of Auckland-wide</del> the zone, overlay or Auckland-wide provisions apply.	This should be corrected as follows:  A blank in Table I417.1.1 Activity table below means that <del>the provisions of the overlays, zone of Auckland-wide</del> the zone, overlay or Auckland-wide provisions apply.	This correction ensures that the presentation follow the same style and structure in sentences consistently throughout the AUP.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32



## Attachment 13: Chapter I: Precincts (South)

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C2	I417 Karaka North Precinct	Table I417.4.1 Activity table	In the Table I417.4.1 Activity Table, the Activity (A3) is defined as Dwellings outside the Rural Amenity Area or the Rural Character Area in the Karaka North Precinct Plan 1. This area is within the Sub-precinct A which has both the Rural - Mixed Rural or Rural - Rural Coastal Zones within the sub-precinct. Hence it is necessary that both zones are included.  This should be corrected as follows: (A3) Within the Rural - Mixed Rural or Rural - Rural Coastal Zones. Dwellings in the Rural - Rural Coastal outside the Rural Amenity Area or the Rural Character Area identified in identified in Karaka North: Precinct Plan 1	This should be corrected as follows: (A3) Within the Rural - Mixed Rural or Rural - Rural Coastal Zones. Dwellings in the Rural - Rural Coastal outside the Rural Amenity Area or the Rural Character Area identified in identified in Karaka North: Precinct Plan 1	Both Rural - Mixed Rural and Rural - Rural Coastal zones are provided for within the Sub-precinct A. Therefore, it is necessary to refer to both these zones when the Activity A3 is defined.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C2	I417 Karaka North Precinct	Table I417.4.1 Activity table	In the Table I417.4.1 Activity Table, the Activity (A7) Equestrian Centre in the Rural - Mixed Rural or Rural - Rural Coastal Zones has an error. Sub precinct A has both Rural - Mixed Rural, and Rural - Rural Coastal Zone and therefore both zones should be mentioned in the activity.  This should be corrected as follows: (A7) Equestrian Centre in the Rural - Mixed Rural or Rural - Rural Coastal Zone	This should be corrected as follows: (A7) Equestrian Centre in the Rural - Mixed Rural or Rural - Rural Coastal Zone	The Activity, Equestrian Centre is within Sub-precinct A where both Rural - Mixed Rural and Rural - Rural Coastal zones exist. Therefore this correction enable avoiding potential confusion.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C2	I418 Kingseat Precinct	I418.8.2 Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criterion 16 Subdivision is incorrect. Assessment criterion 16(a) should refer all criteria I418.8.2(1) to I418.8.2(15). Therefore this should be amended as follows:  (16) Subdivision (a) In addition to considering the relevant assessment criteria I418.8.2(1) - (14) (15) above the Council will.....	This should be amended as follows:  (16) Subdivision (a) In addition to considering the relevant assessment criteria I418.8.2(1) - (14) (15) above the Council will.....	Assessment criterion I418.8.2 (16)(a) only refers to previous criteria I418.8.2(1) to I418.8.2(11) by mistake. This should include criteria upto I418.8.2(15). This is a clear mistake that should be corrected.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C2	I418 Kingseat Precinct	I418.8.2 Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criterion 16 Subdivision is incorrect. Assessment criterion 16(a) should refer all criteria I418.8.2(1) to I418.8.2(15). Therefore this should be amended as follows:  (16) Subdivision (a) In addition to considering the relevant assessment criteria I418.8.2(1) - (14) (16) above the Council will.....	This should be amended as follows:  (16) Subdivision (a) In addition to considering the relevant assessment criteria I418.8.2(1) - (14) (16) above the Council will.....	Assessment criterion I418.8.2 (16)(a) only refers to previous criteria I418.8.2(1) to I418.8.2(11) by mistake. This should include criteria upto I418.8.2(16). This is a clear mistake that should be corrected.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C2	I418 Kingseat Precinct	I418.8.2 Assessment Criteria	Assessment criterion 19(b) refers to "any scheduled building, structure, area or tree". Therefore this clearly relates to criteria 11(c)(i) which has reference to scheduled building, structure or area.  Hence amend criterion I418.8.2 (19) (b) as follows: (19) (b) With reference to provision I418.8.2(19)(a) above and consideration of any scheduled building, structure, area or tree, assessment criteria in section I418.8.2(11)(c)(i) are relevant.	Amend criterion I418.8.2 (19) (b) as follows: (19) (b) With reference to provision I418.8.2(19)(a) above and consideration of any scheduled building, structure, area or tree, assessment criteria in section I418.8.2(11)(c)(i) are relevant.	Assessment criterion 19(b) refers to "any scheduled building, structure, area or tree". Therefore this clearly relates to criteria 11(c)(i) which has reference to scheduled building, structure or area.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C1	I429. Pararékau and Kōpuahingahinga Islands Precinct	I429.9.1 Landscape Plan	I429.9.1 Landscape Plan (1) should also refer to Pararekau Island. And "includes" should be plural.  I429. Pararékau and Kōpuahingahinga Islands Precinct  I429.9.1 Landscape Plan  (1) Applications for subdivision must provide a landscape plan for those parts of Pararekau and Kōpuahingahinga Islands and includes:	The missing words "Pararékau and" should be added as follows:  I429.9.1 Landscape Plan  (1) Applications for subdivision must provide a landscape plan for those parts of Pararekau and Kōpuahingahinga Islands and includes:	The Precinct I429 is about two islands, namely, Pararékau and Kōpuahingahinga. Therefore the missing words "Pararékau and" should be added.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C1	I430 Patamahoe Precinct	I430.6.4, I430.6.5, I430.6.6, I430.6.9, I430.6.10, I430.6.11, I430.6.12	A number of standards and assessment criteria only apply to sub-precincts B, C and D, as set out in Council's evidence, which was accepted by the panel. However this was not carried through to the AUP.	Amend text as follows:  I430.6. Standards The overlay, zone... I430.6.4. Vehicle parking and access in sub-precincts B, C and D ... I430.6.5. On-site stormwater mitigation in sub-precincts B, C and D ... I430.6.6. Interface with Kingseat Road - all sites fronting Kingseat Road in sub-precincts B, C and D ... I430.6.9. Landscape buffer in sub-precincts B, C and D ... I430.6.10. Public open space in sub-precincts B, C and D ... I430.6.11. Staging in sub-precincts B, C and D ... I430.6.12. Stormwater management in sub-precincts B, C and D	The proposed amendment identifies and clarifies where particular standards and assessment criteria apply in the precinct.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C1	I430 Patamahoe Precinct	I430.8, I430.8.1	Incorrect grammar is used within I430.8. Within I430.8.1 Policy (2)(e) provides additional stormwater assessment criteria for Sub-precincts B, C & D and do not follow on from the other policies under clause (2) which addresses subdivision and infringements in general. Needs to be a separate assessment criteria for greater standing.	Amend text as shown in track changes related to I430.8, I430.8.1 (track changes do not fit into cell).	The proposed amendments correct a grammatical error, and provide greater clarity and standing for the assessment criteria.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clear mistake between different versions of the Plan (text only)	C2	I431. Pine Harbour Precinct	I431.6. Standards	The 'Northern Terraces' under the Operative plan, the equivalent of 'Pine Harbour Precinct B overlay' under the PAUP provides for new dwellings as a controlled activity. The development standards for buildings under Rule 17.15.9.3.2 (legacy plan) apply to both permitted and controlled activities. In PAUP process, dwellings were considered as RDA and not Controlled Activity. Therefore, I431.6. Standards should be changed to "All activities listed as permitted or restricted discretionary" instead of "All activities listed as permitted".  I431.6. Standards The Auckland-wide and zone standards apply in this precinct unless specified below. All activities listed as permitted or restricted discretionary in Tables I431.4.1, I431.4.2 and I431.4.3 must comply with the following permitted activity standards. I431.6.1. Development within the precinct (1) All development within the precinct must be in general accordance with Pine Harbour: Precinct plan 1.	I431.6. Standards The Auckland-wide and zone standards apply in this precinct unless specified below. All activities listed as permitted or restricted discretionary in Tables I431.4.1, I431.4.2 and I431.4.3 must comply with the following permitted activity standards. I431.6.1. Development within the precinct (1) All development within the precinct must be in general accordance with Pine Harbour: Precinct plan 1.	I431.6. Standards should apply to permitted and restricted discretionary activities. The omission of restricted discretionary activities is an error that should be corrected.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 13: Chapter I: Precincts (South)

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical matter	Clear mistake between different versions of the Plan (text only)	C2	I431. Pine Harbour Precinct	I431.6.6. Site depth	In the Pine harbour Precinct, I431.6.6. Site depth is also incorrectly stated as it does not specifically refer to sub Precincts B and C.  I431.6.6. Site depth The minimum site depth in <u>Sub-precincts B and C</u> must meet one of the following: (a) 22m if garages are located fronting the street; or (b) 30m if garages do not front onto the street and are accessed from rear lane.	The correction should be as follows:  I431.6.6. Site depth The minimum site depth in <u>Sub-precincts B and C</u> must meet one of the following: (a) 22m if garages are located fronting the street; or (b) 30m if garages do not front onto the street and are accessed from rear lane.	From the Legacy Plan, it is clear that lot widths and depths and front setbacks have been set for the Northern Terraces and Gateway Integrated Housing Precincts which are likely to be developed for terrace housing or duplexes respectively. These controls will ensure each lot is of an adequate size while at the same time controlling, in part, potential adverse effects on adjoining sites or the streetscape.  It is clear that the standard is meant to be exclusive to Sub-precincts B and C, and has been transferred incorrectly from the legacy plan. However, in its current form it would be applied to all precincts and would affect development in other precincts, and therefore needs to be corrected.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clear mistake between different versions of the Plan (text only)	C2	I431. Pine Harbour Precinct	I431.6.8 Maximum building coverage	Incorrect sub-precinct name, site area and building coverage included for sub-precincts in the Pine Harbour Precinct.  Standard I431.6.8(2) should be max building coverage of 50%, not 65% for sites greater than 200m2 not for sites greater than 500m2. This would be consistent with legacy plan provisions. The site size thresholds would also then align with clause (1). Standard I413.6.8(4) should be for sub-precinct C, not sub-precinct B and should be for sites greater than 300m2, not for sites less than 300m2. This would be consistent with Legacy plan and would align with corresponding clause (3) which is for sub-precinct C and for sites less than 300m2.  I431. Pine Harbour Precinct I431.6.8 Maximum building coverage (1) For sub-precinct B, the maximum building coverage is 65 per cent of net site area for sites less than 200m2. (2) For sub-precinct B, the maximum building coverage is <del>65</del> 50 per cent of net site area for sites greater than <del>200</del> 300m2. (3) For sub-precinct C, the maximum building coverage is 50 per cent of net site area for sites less than 300m2. (4) For sub-precinct <del>BC</del> , the maximum building coverage is 40 per cent of net site area for sites greater than 300m2. (5) For sub-precincts D and E, the maximum building coverage is 75 per cent of net site area. (6) For sub-precinct F, the maximum building coverage is 80 per cent of net site area. (7) For sub-precinct G, the maximum building coverage is 50 per cent of the precinct area.	I431. Pine Harbour Precinct I431.6.8 Maximum building coverage (1) For sub-precinct B, the maximum building coverage is 65 per cent of net site area for sites less than 200m2. (2) For sub-precinct B, the maximum building coverage is <del>65</del> 50 per cent of net site area for sites greater than <del>200</del> 300m2. (3) For sub-precinct C, the maximum building coverage is 50 per cent of net site area for sites less than 300m2. (4) For sub-precinct <del>BC</del> , the maximum building coverage is 40 per cent of net site area for sites greater than 300m2. (5) For sub-precincts D and E, the maximum building coverage is 75 per cent of net site area. (6) For sub-precinct F, the maximum building coverage is 80 per cent of net site area. (7) For sub-precinct G, the maximum building coverage is 50 per cent of the precinct area.	These errors create inconsistency between the legacy plan and Unitary Plan. Therefore these need to be corrected.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C1	I432 Puhinui Precinct	1432.5 Puhinui Precinct	I432.5 Notification be amended as follows (additions underlined): (1) Any application for resource consent for an activity listed in Table 1432.4.1 Activity table <u>or Table 1432.4.2 Activity table above</u> . This reflects the presence of two Activity tables that impact on resource consents. Recommendation add or Table 1432.4.2 Activity table above.	Recommendation add or Table 1432.4.2 Activity table above	1432.5 Notification be amended as follows (additions underlined): (1) Any application for resource consent for an activity listed in Table 1432.4.1 Activity table or Table 1432.4.2 Activity table above. This reflects the presence of two Activity tables that impact on resource consent	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C1	I432 Puhinui Precinct	I432.8.2 Assessment Criteria (5) (b)	Change the use of the capital V for I432.8.2 Assessment Criteria (5) (b) Visual effects is grammatically wrong and does not align with the previous use in the precinct. <b>Recommendation</b> change as follows Assessment criteria. (5) for urupā (a) effects on groundwater: (i) whether an urupā would cause leachate emergence or contamination to groundwater; and (b) <u>visual</u> effects on neighbouring sites or open spaces used for recreation:	<b>Recommendation</b> change as follows Assessment criteria. (5) for urupā (a) effects on groundwater: (i) whether an urupā would cause leachate emergence or contamination to groundwater; and (b) <u>visual</u> effects on neighbouring sites or open spaces used for recreation:	The use of the capital V for (b) visual effects is grammatically wrong and does not align with the previous usage. This needs to be changed to a small v.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C1	I432 Puhinui Precinct	Re I432.8 Assessment	Re I432.8 Assessment - restricted discretionary actives. This change has been made to align with the assessment in 1432.8.2 Assessment criteria The Assessment Criteria I432.8.2. 6(d) identifies whether the reduction of the Puhinui Road yard will compromise the future development of a rapid transit corridor along the southern boundary. However it has not been determined which side of the boundary the rapid transit corridor will be developed. <b>Recommendation</b> to read 6(d) whether the reduction of the Puhinui Road yard will compromise the future development of a rapid transit corridor. <u>Remove: along the southern boundary.</u>	Recommendation to read 6(d) whether the reduction of the Puhinui Road yard will compromise the future development of a rapid transit corridor. Remove: along the southern boundary.	I432.8 Assessment - restricted discretionary actives. This change has been made to align with the assessment in 1432.8.2 Assessment criteria The Assessment Criteria I432.8.2. 6(d) identifies whether the reduction of the Puhinui Road yard will compromise the future development of a rapid transit corridor along the southern boundary. However it has not been determined which side of the boundary the rapid transit corridor will be developed.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C1	I432 Puhinui Precinct	Re I432.8 Assessment Criteria	Re: I432.8.2 (2) Assessment criteria. There is no standard I432.6.1.4 as indicated in as part of the Assessment Criteria text. Re: I432.8.2(2) b - for road infrastructure. This needs to be changed as there is no standard I432.6.1.4 as indicated, and should be changed to I432.6.1.2.3. This changes needs to occur under I432.8.2(2) b. and is referred to on three separate occasions. (See consequential changes). Where I432.6.1.2(2) is referred to currently this clause is to read Standard I432.6.1.2(2) and I432.6.1.2(3) as shown below. Reference to (b) standard I432.6.1.2(3) and I432.6.1.2(4). Road Infrastructure (Traffic Generation) (Traffic Generation) be deleted as indicated in appropriate clause. I432.8.2. (2) Assessment criteria(b) standard I432.6.1.2(3) and I432.6.1.2(4) Road Infrastructure (Traffic Generation):	Recommendation 1432.8.2. (2) Assessment criteria. (2) for road infrastructure The assessment criteria within I432.8.2(1)(g) - Maori cultural landscape values above also applies to road infrastructure. (b) standard I432.6.1.2(2) and I432.6.1.2(3) Road Infrastructure (i) whether traffic generated by the development will adversely affect the safe and efficient operation of the road network; (ii) whether compliance with Standard I432.6.1.2(2) and I432.6.1.2(3) is demonstrated by: • an assessment of the traffic generation of the proposal including all modes of transport that would support the land uses proposed; • an assessment of the performance of the local network as a result of the development showing compliance with performance criteria in Standard I432.6.1.2(2) and I432.6.1.2(3); Recommendation delete I432.6.1.2 (4) and see consequential changes. Road Infrastructure (Traffic Generation) (Traffic Generation) be deleted as indicated in appropriate clause. I432.8.2. (2) Assessment criteria(b) standard I432.6.1.2(3) and I432.6.1.2(4) Road Infrastructure (Traffic Generation):	1432.8.2.(2) Assessment criteria. There is no standard I432.6.1.4 as indicated in as part of the Assessment Criteria text. For (2) for road infrastructure this needs to be changed I432.6.1.2(3) and the clauses to read Standard I432.6.1.2(2) and I432.6.1.2(3). That is I432.6.1.2(2) replaces I432.6.1.2(3) where appropriate and I432.6.1.2(3) replaces I432.6.1.4 where appropriate. this provides for a consequential change.	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. These changes are as follows:  The assessment criteria within I432.8.2(1)(g) - Maori cultural landscape values above also applies to road infrastructure. this requires a consequential change as follows.  (b) standard I432.6.1.2(2) and I432.6.1.2(3) Road Infrastructure (i) whether traffic generated by the development will adversely affect the safe and efficient operation of the road network; (ii) whether compliance with Standard I432.6.1.2(2) and I432.6.1.2(3) is demonstrated by: • an assessment of the traffic generation of the proposal including all modes of transport that would support the land uses proposed; • an assessment of the performance of the local network as a result of the development showing compliance with performance criteria in Standard I432.6.1.2(3) and I432.6.1.2(3); This requires removal of I432.6.1.4	Attachment 32

## Attachment 13: Chapter I: Precincts (South)

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C2	I433 Pukekohe Hill Precinct	I433.6.4. Stormwater soakage	(1) Pre-treated water must be diverted to a soakage system. The soakage system must comprise all of the following:  (a) soak holes, drilled to a sufficient depth to encounter permeable rock or soils, constructed with a selected backfill and tested to demonstrate the ability to dispose of the runoff volume;  (b) soakage trenches constructed with selected backfill and with sufficient volume to store the designed runoff and trench volume must be calculated at a rate of 6m <sup>3</sup> /100m <sup>2</sup> of impervious area based on a sand porosity of 0.3  (c) infiltration ponds constructed with sufficient volume to store the designed runoff and tested to demonstrate the ability to dispose of the runoff volume; and <del>(e) trench volume must be calculated at a rate of 6m<sup>3</sup>/100m<sup>2</sup> of impervious area based on a sand porosity of 0.3; and</del>  (d) (e) Standard I433.6.4 does not apply to Sub-precinct D.	The assessment criteria within I432.8.2(1)(g) - Maori cultural landscape values above also applies to road infrastructure.	The stormwater soakage standards is originated from the lagacy council District Plan, namely the Franklin District Council District Plan. The amendment is needed to correct the standard accordingly.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Nonsensical outcomes	C2	I433 Pukekohe Hill Precinct	I433.6.6.Standards	There is no reference to parent sites of 1 hetare or greater in Table I433.4.1 above these I433.6.Standards. This means there is no precinct specific exception for subdivisions of vacant sites involving parents sites of 1 hectare or greater. Therefore the last bullet point is an error, and needs to be deleted.  • Remove reference to standard E38.8.3.1 Vacant sites subdivisions.....parent sites of 1 hectare or greater  I433.6. Standards The standards applicable to the zone and Auckland-wide apply in this precinct, except for the following: • Standard H3.6.9 Maximum impervious area; • Standard H3.6.10 Building coverage; • Standard E38.8.2.3 Vacant sites subdivisions involving parent sites of less than 1 hectare; and <del>• Standard E38.8.3.1 Vacant sites subdivisions involving parent sites of 1 hectare or greater.</del>	(b) standard I432.6.1.2(2) and I432.6.1.2(3) Road Infrastructure	There is no reference to parent sites of 1 hetare or greater in Table I433.4.1 above these I433.6.Standards. This means there is no precinct specific exception for subdivisions of vacant sites involving parents sites of 1 hectare or greater. Therefore the last bullet point is an error, and needs to be deleted.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C1	I434 Pukekohe Park Precinct	I434.6.1 Motorsport activities noise	Duration of the daily use of the track is specified in I434.6.1(2). Time duration for Catrgory B days is provided for under (2)(a) and (2)(b) as between 7am and 7pm and 8am and 6pm respectively. This appears to be a drafting error as Category B days are referred to twice. These relate to two different options, one from the Council's position and the other being the resident group's position. To be consistent with the recommendation report and to avoid confusion, clause (2)(b) should be deleted.	(i) whether traffic generated by the development will adversely affect the safe and efficient operation of the road network;	Time duration for category B days is given twice. These two are not the same and cause confusion. Therefore the version in (2)(b) should be deleted leaving (2)(a) which represents the position of the Residents Group.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Clarification or explanation	C1	I434 Pukekohe Park Precinct	I434.6.3. General noise	The intention of this section is to define a general notional boundary noise control limit of 55dB and 45dB (the details of which are given in table I434.6.3.1). The clause I434.6.3(1) appears to set noise limits for activities other than motorsport and the Public Address (PA) system, as it refers to "any activity". However this needs more clarity in order to avoid potential misinterpretation. It is suggested to amend the clause as follows:  I434.6.3(1) The noise rating level from any activity (other than activities provided for in rules I434.6.1 and I434.6.2) as measured at any notional boundary must not exceed the noise limits in Table I434.6.3.1.	(ii) whether compliance with Standard I432.6.1.2(2) and I432.6.1.2(3) is demonstrated by:	Even though section I434.6.3 General noise is intended to provide noise standards for activities other than motorsport and Public Address system, this has not been clearly stated. In order to avoid potential misinterpretation, this amendment is suggested.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical matter	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C4	I437 Runciman Precinct	I437.10. Precinct plans	I437.10.2 Runciman Precinct: Precinct plan 2 - reserves and connections is a diagram showing Trail Destination Point, Paper Roads, Indicative route of trail, Road Network, DoC Reserve, Council Reserve and Parcel Boundaries. However, this diagram has omitted the Indicative route of trail. The same diagram was in the former Franklin District Council District Plan with Indicative route of trail. This is an error that needs to be corrected by replacing the diagram with Indicative route of trail.	• an assessment of the traffic generation of the proposal including all modes of transport that would support the land uses proposed;	The diagram is without Indicative route of trail even though the legend shows that information is part of the Precinct plan 2 - reserves and connections. This needs to be corrected.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C1	I438 Takanini Precinct	I438.1. Precinct Description	With the removal of 5.4ha of Walters Road land from the precinct, the total precinct area is now incorrect. However the total area of the precinct was incorrect to begin with. Accordingly, the total area needs to be updated.	• an assessment of the performance of the local network as a result of the development showing compliance with performance criteria in Standard I432.6.1.2(2) and I432.6.1.2(3);	The proposed amendment corrects the total land area of the precinct.	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. The land area of the relevant sub-precincts needs to be revised.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C1	I438 Takanini Precinct	I438.10.1. Takanini Precinct: Precinct plan 1	Takanini Precinct: Precinct plan 1 refers to an outdated road network, refers to indicative roads in the eastern pat of sub-precinct D which is incorrect, and omits the 'restricted access to road frontages' annotation. These are mapping errors have arisen from inconsistencies in the translation of the Kirikiri Structure Plan into the Takanini Precinct.	Recommendation delete I432.6.1.2 (4) and see consequential changes	The proposed amendments correct omissions and unnecessary inclusions in Takanini Precinct: Precinct plan 1.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 14: Chapter I: Precincts (North)

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical Matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C1	I509 Greenhith Precinct	I509.4.1 Activity Table; I509.6 Standards; I509.6.2 Yards (table); Table I509.6.5.1 Minimum net site area (table)	Various ambiguities exist due to the transfer of Council's evidence recommendations to the Independent Hearings Panel's decision version of the PAUP, which in turn were adopted in full by the Council for its final decision version of the PAUP.  The changes required are minor administrative matters that clear away the uncertainties and maintain full integrity with the IHP adopted precinct provisions. It is noted that the changes are in turn entirely consistent with the legacy operative (North Shore) provisions, from which the precinct was originally formed.	Amend text as follows (refer Word document for detail):  1. Modify the Precinct activity table to remove ambiguity as to activity status of urban subdivision, by referring simply to Chapter E38, rather than duplicating certain of the forms of subdivision in the precinct.  2. Modify "I509.6 Standards" to - a) separate the 'subdivision' from the 'development' provisions; b) clarify the non-precinct Unitary Plan provisions that apply in each case, for subdivision and development respectively; c) add the (missing) heading 'Development'; d) state under Yards the actual distances required for 'sites over 4000' (10m and 6m) so that the reader does not need to refer to another section of the Plan; e) insert words in place of a blank space in Table I509.6.5 (Minimum net site area) for 'over 1ha' to remove the present ambiguity as to what the special requirements are (there are not any). f) make necessary minor text changes associated with the above.	The proposed amendments remove ambiguities and uncertainties and restore integrity with the decisions intended, and with the former legacy Plan provisions from which the precinct was generated.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I510 Gulf Harbour Marina Precinct	Table I510.4.1 Activity table – use on land and associated occupation of the common marine and coastal area	The subject activity was track changed from C to NC in Council evidence. The Independent Hearing's Panel accepted Council's evidence, however the NC status was not carried through the plan versions.	Amend text as follows:  'I510. Gulf Harbour Marina Precinct' 'Table I510.4.1 Activity table – use on land and associated occupation of the common marine and coastal area' 'Industry' '(A12) Manufacture of vessels and boating/marine equipment... (Column) Sub-precinct B (land)... C NC	The proposed amendment identifies the correct activity status for the Manufacture of vessels and boating/marine equipment.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I516 Kumeū Precinct	I516.6.2. (2)	Inconsistency between Council evidence and the PAUP Decision Version, resulting in the repetition of a standard within I516.6.2 Maximum retail/commercial gross floor area.	Amend text as follows:  I516. Kumeū Precinct  I516.6.2. Maximum retail/commercial gross floor area (1) The total gross floor area of the following activities must not exceed 20,000m <sup>2</sup> in the Kumeū Precinct. <del>(2) Trade suppliers are exempt from this standard.</del>	The proposed amendment improves the readability of the AUP by removing a repetition of a standard	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I516 Kumeū Precinct	I516.6.4. Yards (1)(b)(i)	Absence of wording 'car park or' in I516.6.2(2), creating a misalignment between Council evidence and the PAUP Decision Version.	Amend text as follows:  I516. Kumeū Precinct  I516.6.4. Yards (1)(b)(i) 2 metres in Sub-precincts A and B where the front of a site or part of the site frontage is occupied by a car park or car park building.	The proposed amendment ensures that I516.6.4. Yards captures both car park occurrences, as intended by Council evidence.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	I516 Kumeū Precinct	I516.8.1. Matters of discretion (7)(ii)	Reference to '5 or more dwellings' in the context of the Residential – Mixed Housing Urban zone is inconsistent with the use of '3 or more dwellings' in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) Chapter H5 text around the Residential – Mixed Housing Urban zone	Amend text as follows:  I516. Kumeū Precinct I516.8.1. Matters of discretion (7)(ii) the matters of discretion in Residential – Mixed Housing Urban Zone H5.8.1(2) for dwellings apply to applications for <del>35</del> or more dwellings per site in Sub-precinct C;	The proposed amendment provides consistency in the use of '3 or more dwellings' in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part).	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	I516 Kumeū Precinct	I516.8.2. Assessment criteria (7)(b)	Reference to '5 or more dwellings' in the context of the Residential – Mixed Housing Urban zone is inconsistent with the use of '3 or more dwellings' in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) Chapter H5 text around the Residential – Mixed Housing Urban zone	Amend text as follows:  I516. Kumeū Precinct I516.8.2. Assessment criteria (7)(b) ) the assessment criteria in Residential – Mixed Housing Urban Zone H5.8.2(2) for dwellings apply to applications for <del>35</del> or more dwellings per site in Sub-precinct C;	The proposed amendment provides consistency in the use of '3 or more dwellings' in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part).	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	I519 Long Bay	I519.6.5 (2)	There is an incorrect height in relation to boundary reference within the Long Bay precinct due to drafting error. In the IHP report, the height in relation to boundary table was amended to remove reference to sub-precincts A, B & D. However the panel did not update the referencing within I519.6.5 (2), which continues to refer to sub-precincts A, B & D.	Amend text as follows:  I519. Long Bay Precinct I519.6.5. Height in relation to boundary (2) Development that does not comply with Standard I519.6.5(1) above is a restricted discretionary activity where located in Sub-precincts <del>A, B, and D</del> E to I	The proposed amendment improves the clarity of the Height in relation to boundary standard by removing incorrect references.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I530 Orewa 2 Precinct	I530.6.5. (2)	Within I530.6.5. Yards, standard (3) is nonsensical as a standalone clause, it should be read in conjunction with (2). This aligns with how this standard was written and interpreted in the associated Special 33 Zone in the Auckland Council District Plan Operative Rodney Section 2011.	Amend text as follows:  I530 Orewa 2 Precinct I530.6.5. Yards (2) In the case of rear sites between 450m <sup>2</sup> and 650m <sup>2</sup> only one yard of a minimum of 6m will be required. All other yards are deemed to be side yards, only one of which will be required to be a minimum of 3m. <del>(3) All other yards are deemed to be side yards, only one of which will be required to be a minimum of 3m.</del>	The proposed amendment improves the readability and interpretation of the AUP by joining two criterion together.	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. The change is to amend numbering within I530.6.5. Yards, as relevant.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	I532. Pinewoods Precinct	Table 1532.4.1 Activity table	Activity status is missing for 'Dwellings'. The intended activity status is Permitted.	Amend text as follows:  I532. Pinewoods Precinct Table 1532.4.1 Activity table (A2) Dwellings <u>P</u>	The proposed amendment ensures there is no ambiguity as to the activity status for dwellings in the Pinewoods Precinct.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 14: Chapter I: Precincts (North)

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	I537 Silverdale 3 Precinct	I537.10.1 Silverdale 3: Precinct plan 1 ( <i>sitting within the key</i> )	In the key of Precinct Plan 1, reference is made to the clause as it was in the Auckland Council District Plan Operative Rodney Section 2011, this needs to be updated. The same clause reference also needs to be reworded to align with the correct phrasing.	Amend text as follows:  I537 Silverdale 3 Precinct I537.10.1 Silverdale 3: Precinct plan 1 ( <i>sitting within the key</i> )  Indicative Roads ( <i>may be varied by more than 20m, see clause standard I537.6.23-3 may be removed</i> ) Indicative Roads ( <i>see clause standard I537.6.23-3</i> )	The proposed amendment corrects the reference made to the Auckland Council District Plan Operative Rodney Section 2011, instead replacing it with the appropriate Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) reference.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C2	I537 Silverdale 3 Precinct	I537.6.2(2)	The wording is incorrect as a spillover from removing reference to framework plans. The rule was intended to enable certain identified indicative roads to be moved by more than 20m following the preparation of a Framework plan. With the removal of the requirement for a framework plan it is still appropriate to enable the movement of the roads by more than 20m as the alignment could vary after detailed design is carried out. Other rules still require the indicative roads to connect to identified points on the existing network.	Amend text as follows: I537 Silverdale 3 Precinct I537.6.2. Indicative Roads (2) With the exception of Standard I537.6.2(1) above the alignment of those indicative roads specifically identified on I537.10.1 Silverdale 3: Precinct plan 1 may be varied by more than 20m.	The proposed amendment corrects referencing within the text as a result of the removal of framework plans.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I537 Silverdale 3 Precinct	Notes relating to Table I537.4.1 Silverdale 3 Precinct (all of precinct)	In the IHP report, the panel proposed that the text surrounding background studies/statistics be shifted to a 'note' that sits under the main activity table, instead of sitting within the land use controls. The panel has extracted the relevant text and placed it in the 'note', however some text has not been extracted, and therefore has not carried over into the AUP.	Amend text as follows: I537 Silverdale 3 Precinct Table I537.4.1 Silverdale 3 Precinct (all of precinct)  Note for Vehicle movement in the PM peak:  Activity A2 is based on traffic analysis and modelling demonstrating that this level of development within this precinct can occur without collectively generating more than 136 vehicle trips from this precinct on to east Coast Road and the Hibiscus Coast Highway in any one hour of the PM Peak (4pm to 6pm week days).  This rule Activity A3 is based on traffic analysis and modelling demonstrating that this level of development can occur within this precinct without collectively generating more than 227 vehicle trips onto East Coast Road and the Hibiscus Coast Highway from this precinct in any one hour of the PM Peak (4pm to 6pm week days). Hibiscus Coast Bus Station is a public transport interchange on land with legal title: Section 1 SO 469067.  This standard Activity A4 is based on traffic analysis and modelling demonstrating that subject to the above	The proposed amendment incorporates text that was previously omitted, providing a more comprehensive note for vehicle movement in the afternoon peak.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C2	I537 Silverdale 3 Precinct	Table I537.4.2, I537.2. Standards	The reference in the precinct activity table to "retail except as set out in this table" being non complying means that activities under the nesting table for "retail" have been inadvertently made non complying. The "retail except as set out in this table" was only intended to capture retail activities A22, A23, and A 24 in the General Business zone and not all the nested activities under retail. The industry activity is also affected by the nesting table.  The Standards limit their application to the activities listed in the precinct Activity Table. Activities in the underlying zone that were intended to be caught by the standards in the precinct are therefore not caught - and the proposed amendment intends to fix this.	That text within Table I537.4.2 be amended as per attachment.	The proposed amendment corrects the status of activities in Table I537.4.2, and additionally corrects how I537.2. Standards apply.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I541 Te Arai North Precinct	I541.8.2.1. (21)	Text has been incorrectly placed as a criterion when it is considered to be a note only. In Council evidence the relevant sentence does not sit as a criterion, but a note. However in the PAUP IHP recommendations Version the sentence is shown to be criterion.	Amend text as follows (and adjust indent where necessary):  I541. Te Arai North Precinct I541.8.2. Assessment criteria I541.8.2.1. Subdivision for the creation of up to 43 new house sites in addition to the 3 sites existing at 30 September 2013  (21) Note: In circumstances where one or more of the above criteria are not met, the proposal may be considered inappropriate and the Council in its discretion may refuse consent, or grant consent to a lesser number of sites, and/or to a different design of subdivision.	The proposed amendment corrects an oversight, therefore providing clarity that specific text is to be read as a note and not a criterion.	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. The change is to renumber criteria within I541.8.2.1. Subdivision for the creation of up to 43 new house sites in addition to the 3 sites existing at 30 September 2013 as appropriate.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I541 Te Arai North Precinct	I541.8.2.1. (3)	Text has been incorrectly placed as a criterion when it is considered to be a note only. In Council evidence the relevant sentence does not sit as a criterion, but a note. However in the PAUP IHP recommendations Version the sentence is shown to be criterion.	Amend text as follows (and adjust indent where necessary):  I541. Te Arai North Precinct I541.8.2. Assessment criteria I541.8.2.1. Subdivision for the creation of up to 43 new house sites in addition to the 3 sites existing at 30 September 2013  (1) The adequacy of measures proposed to ban cats and dogs and other inappropriate domestic pets.  (2) The extent to which proposed measures to protect shorebirds, lizards and threatened plant species, during earthworks and the construction period and thereafter are adequate and appropriate.  (3) Note: Where the measures in (1) – (2) are not provided, the subdivision will be considered inappropriate.	The proposed amendment corrects an oversight, therefore providing clarity that specific text is to be read as a note and not a criterion.	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. The change is to renumber criteria within I541.8.2.1. Subdivision for the creation of up to 43 new house sites in addition to the 3 sites existing at 30 September 2013 as appropriate.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 14: Chapter I: Precincts (North)

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I541 Te Arai North Precinct	I541.8.2.1. (9)	<p>Incorrect wording has been identified – 'for should be replaced by 'or'. A subsequent error has been identified in the same paragraph, being the deletion of a word.</p> <p>The PAUP IHP recommendations Version splits what was a paragraph in Council's evidence into two separate criterion.</p> <p>In doing so, 'or' has been translated into 'for' in criterion (9), which is not consistent with the use of 'or' in (8), and has subsequently been carried through into the PAUP Decision Version. This is considered an oversight in the translation of the Council's evidence.</p>	<p>Amend text as follows:</p> <p>I541. Te Arai North Precinct I541.8.2. Assessment criteria I541.8.2.1. Subdivision for the creation of up to 43 new house sites in addition to the 3 sites existing at 30 September 2013</p> <p>(9) Whether sites viewed from <del>excluding</del> any areas of reserve proposed to be vested for regional park allow specified building areas for future buildings to be integrated into the landscape as far as practical to avoid adverse visual amenity effects or where avoidance is not practicable, whether effects will be remedied or mitigated. Where this is not achievable, the specified building area/s will be considered inappropriate.</p>	The proposed amendment ensures criterion 9 of I541.8.2.1. is interpreted correctly.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I545 Waiwera Precinct	I545.8.1. Matters of discretion, I545.8.2. Assessment criteria, Table I545.4.1 Activity table sub-precincts A and B	In Table I545.4.1 Activity table sub-precincts A and B (A21) 'Food and beverage greater than 500m2 gross floor area with the sub-precinct' is a restricted discretionary activity. However this activity has been omitted from the matters of discretion and assessment criteria for restricted discretionary activities. This is considered an oversight.	<p>Amend text as follows:</p> <p>I545. Waiwera Precinct I545.8.1. Matters of discretion (5) Conference facilities, <u>food and beverage facilities</u> and healthcare facilities greater than 500m2 in Sub precincts A and B:</p> <p>I545.8.2. Assessment criteria (5) Conference facilities, <u>food and beverage facilities</u> and healthcare facilities greater than 500m2 in Sub precincts A and B:</p>	The proposed amendment incorporates food and beverage facilities in the matters of discretion, and assessment criteria, correcting an omission.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Nonsensical outcomes	C1	I547 Wēiti Precinct	Table I547.4.1	Within table I547.4.1, visitor accommodation (A3) is a prohibited activity in sub-precinct A. Activity (A4) refers to activity not complying with the visitor accommodation standards as being non-complying. However this is redundant, as the activity itself, visitor accommodation in sub-precinct A is prohibited. Accordingly the activity outlined in (A4) should also read as prohibited under sub-precinct A.	<p>Amend text as follows:</p> <p>I547. Wēiti Precinct Table I547.4.1 Activity table (A4) Any activity that does not comply with Standard I547.6.3.1 Visitor accommodation --&gt; Sub-precinct A --&gt; NSP</p>	The proposed amendment corrects an inconsistency found within table I547.4.1.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 15: Chapter I: Precincts - West

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature / degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C1	1605 Hobsonville Point Precinct	1605.6 Standards	There are standards referred to the introductory paragraph of the precinct that do not exist.	Amend as follows:  1605.6. Standards ... All subdivision that is a controlled, restricted discretionary or discretionary activity must comply with the standards 1605.6.3, 1605.6.5.8, 1605.6.8, and 1605.6.9.1., <del>1605.6.9.2, 1605.6.10 and 1605.6.10.1.</del>	There are no such standards.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C1	1605 Hobsonville Point Precinct	1605.6.9. Subdivision - Landing Sub-precinct (Sub-precinct F)	Standard 1605.6.9 subdivision – Landing Sub-precinct (Sub Precinct F): introductory clause states that the underlying residential zones subdivision standards apply. It should read underlying mixed use zone.	Amend as follows:  1605.6.9. Subdivision - Landing Sub-precinct (Sub-precinct F) (1) The subdivision standards for the Landing Sub-precinct (Sub-precinct F) are those applying to the underlying <u>residential-Business - Mixed use</u> zones and listed...	The land underlying sub precinct F is zoned Business - Mixed Use	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C1	1605 Hobsonville Point Precinct	1605.8.2.9. Infrastructure	Assessment criterion 8 under 1605.8.2.9 Infrastructure states that catchment wide stormwater management facilities such as wetlands and treatment ponds should only be used as the final form of treatment, not the primary one. This should be removed.	Delete (8) under 1605.8.2.9. Infrastructure <del>(8) Catchment wide stormwater management facilities, such as wetlands and treatment ponds should only be used as a final form of treatment, not the primary form.</del>	There was agreement with Council officers that this be removed, and it fell away as a matter of contention. In earlier versions of provisions it is shown as struck out. It has somehow made its way back in (in error) through the editing process.  Evidence in chief and track changes shows that AC requested this provision to be retained. However, after direct discussions with Hobsonville Land Company Limited AC agreed to remove the provision as discussed in my rebuttal evidence and associated track changes of the provisions.	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. The changes is to the numbering of provisions in 1605.8.2.9 Infrastructure as a result of the proposed amendment. The provision numbers change from 9-12 to 8-11.	Attachment 32
Technical	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C1	1605 Hobsonville Point Precinct	Table H1.6.4.9.2 Apartments and Table 1605-6-5-7-2 Apartments	Table 1605.6.4.4.1 Maximum impervious area, building coverage and landscaping – asterix in max impervious area (Buckley sub-precinct) doesn't relate to anything – originally it referred to the definitions which are now notes (after activity table on page 8).  Table H1.6.4.9.2 Apartments and Table 1605-6-5-7-2 Apartments – asterix next to 1500L (3 Bedrooms) doesn't relate to anything – have checked legacy and notified and the <u>comprehensive development plans – seems to be an error and can be removed</u>	Rename Table <del>H1.6.4.9.2</del> 1605.6.4.8.2 Apartments.  Remove asterik next to 1500L in Table <del>H1.6.4.9.2</del> 1605.6.4.8.2 Apartments and Table 1605-6-5-7-2 Apartments.	Asterisks are orphaned and should not be there – they no longer refer to anything. There was a note under the table in earlier iterations that they referred to but this has since been relocated. Their removal was overlooked at some stage.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C1	1605 Hobsonville Point Precinct	Table 1605.4.1. Activity Table - Sub-precincts A-E (Residential Zones)	Reference to 'five or more dwellings' in the context of the Residential – Mixed Housing Urban zone is inconsistent with the use of '3 or more dwellings' in the AUP Chapter H5 text around the Residential – Mixed Housing Urban zone  "1605.4.1 activity table refers to the use (versus the building) 5 or more houses as a permitted activity. This I think should read three or more rather than five or more, as up to 2 in the underlying zone are permitted. The intention is to make all use permitted, but as it stands 3-4 houses requires consent, and any more or less does not – this does not make sense".	Amend in Table 1605.4.1 Activity Table – Sub-precincts A-E (Residential Zones) , Activity A16 as follows:  <del>Five</del> Three or more dwellings per site within the Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone	This activity was not included in Ms J Harts evidence (081d Ak Cncl - West - Precincts (Hobsonville Point) - (J Hart) - Planning - REBUTTAL – LATE), but came about through the Independent Hearings Panel recommendations.  The activity itself refers to the Independent Hearings Panel recommendation that five or more dwellings per site be a restricted discretionary activity within the Residential – Mixed Housing Urban Zone Auckland-wide. Accordingly, the precinct refers back to this standard.  This Independent Hearings Panel recommendation was not accepted by Council (five or more dwellings being restricted discretionary), and the AUP reverted back to the three or more dwellings as being a restricted discretionary activity for the Residential – Mixed Housing Urban Zone. However, a consequential amendment to the Hobsonville Point precinct to update this reference was not undertaken.  Accordingly, it is considered that error E_514 is a technical matter to be corrected through a plan change.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C1	1605 Hobsonville Point Precinct	Table 1605.4.2 Activity table - Sub-Precinct F (Mixed Use Zone)	Note 5 under 1605.4.1 Activity table defines "frontage" and states it has the same meaning as under rules 1605.6.7.2. This cross reference is incorrect. The person who raised the error suggested that is should be updated to 1605.6.6.2. However, 1605.6.6.2 is for Yard control and not a definition of 'frontage'. Can't find definition of frontage in precinct. Suggest that it is deleted and so the general definition for frontage in Chapter J applies.	Delete the first sentence in Note 5 under Table 1605.4.2 Activity table – Sub-precinct F (Mixed Use Zone)  Note 5 <del>"Frontage" has the same meaning as in Rule 1605.6.7.2.</del>	As there is no	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Clarification or Explanation	C1	1605 Hobsonville Point Precinct	Table 1605.6.4.5.1 Outdoor living space	5. Table 1605.6.4.5.1: refers to small houses but the term is not defined. Earlier iterations of the rules had the definitions all in one place, now there are set out under specific rules. The intention is that the same definition apply as is noted under standard 1605.6.4.7 note (1). There should either be a cross reference to this note, or the small house definition should be noted under the table 1605.6.4.5.1.	Insert the following text under Table 1605.6.4.5.1 Outdoor living space:  * Refer to definition of 'small house' in Note 1 for Table 1605.6.4.7.1 Outlook space and building separation		There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Clarification or Explanation	C1	1610 Redhills Precinct	1610.4 Activity table	Section 1610.4 specifies that Table 1610.4.1 relates only to activities within the THAB zone between Dunlop Road and Don Buck Road. However, this table includes activities that are intended to apply to the whole of the precinct, such as subdivision in accordance with the precinct plan. No other activity table is provided.  More clarity is sought in the wording of 1610.4. Activity table. The description needs to refer to the two tables separately because the first one refers to land use activity and latter is for subdivision. Amend text as indicates.	Amend text as follows:  Table 1610.4.1 specifies the activity status of land use, <del>development and the provision of wastewater disposal and water supply associated with subdivision</del> activities in the Redhills Precinct. <del>Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone adjacent to Fred Taylor Drive between Dunlop Road and the Don Buck Road roundabout pursuant to sections 9(3) and 14 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</del>  <u>Activities (A1) to (A8) inclusive apply to the Residential – Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone adjacent to Fred Taylor Drive</u>	The proposed amendment seeks to clarify the applicability of Table 1610.4.1, it is clearer and easier to understand.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Amendments to Diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C1	1615 Westgate Precinct	1615.10.1 Westgate Precinct plan 1 and 1615.8.2(2)(k) Assessment Criteria	The Community Facility shown on the precinct plan is no longer required. This was indicative only.	Delete 'community facility' from the key and corresponding blue hatched map annotation on 1615.10.1. Westgate Precinct plan 1.  And amend 1615.8.2 Assessment Criteria (2)(k) to read as follows:  (k) Whether community facilities are located <u>in a place positions shown on the Westgate Precinct Precinct plan 1 or a location nearby</u> that offers visual prominence and is easily accessible for pedestrians and public transport users;	Council and the submitter supported removing this in their evidence but this did not happen in the IHP recommendation of Decisions versions	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. These changes are: Amend 1615.8.2 Assessment Criteria (2)(k) to read as follows:  (k) Whether community facilities are located <u>in a place positions shown on the Westgate Precinct Precinct plan 1 or a location nearby</u> that offers visual prominence and is easily accessible for pedestrians and public transport users;	Attachment 32

Attachment 15: Chapter I: Precincts - West

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature / degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I615 Westgate Precinct	I615.4 Activity table	In the PAUP Decisions Version and AUP, there are no activities for sub-precinct G which trigger resource consent and therefore the important restricted discretionary matters for assessment and assessment criteria for subdivision in sub-precinct G can't actually be considered. There are restricted discretionary assessment criteria for subdivision that require consideration of future road alignment, but there are no activities for sub-precinct G that would trigger requirement for consent. The precinct description also describes what is in precinct plans 1 and 2. This description doesn't align with what is in the precinct plans.  Recommend adding a new activity table for sub-precinct G managing two activities focused on vehicle access to Fred Taylor Drive and Roads and pedestrian linkages.	Insert a new table - I615.4.3 Development - Sub-precinct G with two new activities as follows:  (A18) Any vehicle access to Fred Taylor Drive, other than through the strategic access points identified in Precinct plan 2, or left in left out access points on Fred Taylor Drive. - D  (A19) Roads and pedestrian linkages - RD	The purpose of sub-precinct G is to manage future road alignment. In its Decision Version council added Objective 9 (Sub-precinct G indicates a road that provides an integrated and efficient roading network) and restricted discretionary activity assessment criteria for subdivision and added sub-precinct G to the GIS Viewer.  The addition of the two new activities would trigger the restricted discretionary assessment criteria for subdivision in sub-precinct G.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Clarification or Explanation	C1	I610 Redhills Precinct	I610.8.2(B)	This section relates to subdivision and development which does not comply with Standard I610.6.1 Infrastructure Upgrades or Timing of Development - Transport or Standard I610.6.2 Infrastructure Upgrades and Location of Development - Transport. However, the assessment criteria outlined in the section that relates to bulk water and wastewater infrastructure as well as roading.	Section I610.8.2(B)  Subdivision and development...shall:  (a) demonstrate that all necessary transport infrastructure services external to the project are available, including bulk water, wastewater and road infrastructure, and can be connected in a timely and coordinated manner to service the precinct;  (b) demonstrate that sufficient evidence of capacity in the <del>wastewater, water and</del> roading network exists;  <del>(c) ensure that networks to the sub-division area can be supplied with (and connected to the public system for) water and wastewater services and roading external to the precinct;</del>  (d) ...  (e) where public roading infrastructure is required to be extended upgraded, undertake the preparation ... in a timely manner.	Need to delete the references to water and wastewater, and update all terms to refer to roading, as the standards only pertain to transport.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32



Attachment 16: Chapter I: Precincts (Special Housing Areas)

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical Matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C2	Special Housing Areas: Hingaia 1 Precinct	Development Control 4.5	Development control 4.5.1 refers to "catchments on Precinct plan 2 (catchments draining to intermittent or permanent streams)" and development control 4.5.1 refers to "all other catchments (catchments draining to the coast)". However, there is not Precinct plan 2 or any other part of the precinct provisions that specify which development control applies to which area. Reference to the precinct plan should be removed.	<b>Recommendation:</b> 4.5 On-site Stormwater Management – new impervious surfaces <del>1. In the catchments on Precinct plan 2 (catchments draining to intermittent or permanent streams (as indicated on Hingaia 1 - Precinct Map) all new impervious surfaces of 50m<sup>2</sup> and over are to be designed to achieve...</del>	Under the HASHA decision, there were two maps, the zoning map (incorrectly called precinct plan 1) and the precinct map (incorrectly called precinct plan 2). Intermittent and permanent streams are indicated on the precinct map. Therefore change as indicated. However, catchment extent is not indicated, and it is not included anywhere else on the GIS viewer.  A plan change is required to clarify the development control as indicated, there are no other options available.  This change is required to make the provision implementable, and align it with the correct precinct map. It does not indicate a change in policy, and allows for the precinct provisions to be applied as intended - thereby giving effect to the RPS.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Clarification or Explanation	C3	Special Housing Areas: Huapai Triangle Precinct	5.62 Huapai Triangle Precinct Description	The Green Corridor "zone" in has been described incorrectly in the precinct description. It is not applied to the majority of the precinct. Also recommend updating the term to "green infrastructure corridor zone" to be aligned with the GIS viewer.	Huapai Precinct Description (paragraph 3) to read: The Mixed Housing Suburban zone, with appropriate modifications for the Huapai Triangle precinct, is applied to the majority of the precinct to enable the development of a new neighbourhood. The Neighbourhood Centre zone provisions are applied to the central neighbourhood centre. <del>The Green Corridor zone, with appropriate modifications for the Huapai Triangle precinct, is applied to the majority of the precinct to enable the development of a new neighbourhood. The Green Corridor zone-Infrastructure Corridor Zone, with appropriate modifications is applied to the northern and eastern periphery of the precinct containing stormwater management areas, susceptible to flooding, green linkages, and potential car parking close to Huapai station for future rail passenger services.</del>	Rewording of paragraph and correction of terminology, and delete inaccurate part of description - Inconsistent with the AUP GIS Viewer, where it has been called the green infrastructure corridor zone. This zone needs to be specified in the keys for Figures 5-7. It is not applied to the majority of the precinct.  Plan change (technical matter) required to clarify the precinct description and the intended direction of the plan within this precinct. The option of leaving as is was considered, as the terminology is correct under the PAUP and HASHA legislation, but this creates unclarity of purpose of the precinct going forward as part of the AUP:OIP.  However, this calls into question the appropriateness of calling this a zone, when it is only applied within this specific precinct - could be more of a precinct control/management layer. It is technically correct under the HASHA legislation, but could be better aligned with the rest of the plan going forward. This is a policy debate to be had as part of the enhancements plan change. Correct as underlined in the interim.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 17: Chapter J: Definitions

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Anomaly	Nonsensical outcomes	C1	Chapter J: Definitions	J1 Definitions. Definition of 'Building' within table J1.4.1	There is a drafting error in the definition of 'buildings' (Table J1.4.1) that results in changing the definition of: • <b>stacks or heaps of materials</b> (re-ordered wording makes a stack not a building unless it exists for over a month rather than existing for more than a month). As it stands, the definition indicates that if a stack of materials is in existence for 1 week, it is a building, however if it exists for 12 months, it is not a building. This makes little sense.	Amend Table J1.4.1 Buildings to the following:  <b>Stacks or heaps of materials</b> Over 2m high <del>Do not exist</del> <u>In existence</u> for more than one month	The definition of stacks or heaps of materials as written makes a stack or heap of material 2m high a building from its placement, rather than from when it is in existence for longer than one month. This was a drafting error in splitting out the stack height from the period of existence.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C2	Chapter J: Definitions	J1 Definitions - "Gross Floor Area"	There is a reference to Floor Area Ratio (FAR) in the definition of Gross floor area (GFA). This reference is confusing and should not be in the definition.	Amend definition of Gross floor area as follows: ... (2) For the purposes of calculating the <u>gross floor area (GFA)</u> the sum of the total floor area...	Floor area ratio is a separate definition which is the relationship between the gross floor area and the net site area. The reference to 'FAR' within the definition of the Gross Floor Area is therefore misleading and confusing.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C2	Chapter J: Definitions	J1 Definitions - "Height"	The definition of height refers to "the daylighting standard", which is not otherwise defined. This should reference "the height in relation to boundary standard", which most zones include.	Amend the definition of height as follows: Excludes: (1) (b) 1.5m above the maximum permitted activity height or the <u>daylighting height in relation to boundary</u> standard for the site, whichever is the lesser...	The reference to 'daylighting' is incorrect and the name of the standard is 'height in relation to boundary'. The correction improves clarity as to which standard applies.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Anomaly	Nonsensical outcomes	C2	Chapter J: Definitions	J1 Definitions - "Height"	The definition of height excludes chimneys within certain thresholds - that only chimneys 1.5m above the permitted activity height for the site are excluded. This threshold is nonsensical and was introduced by the IHP (and not Council) with no commentary.	Amend the definition of height (part relating to chimneys) as follows: "Excludes: ... (2)(b) Chimneys that do not exceed 1.1m width on any elevation or that <u>do not exceed</u> 1.5m above the permitted activity for the site."	It would be nonsensical to exclude only chimneys only exceeding 1.5m in height but less than 1.1m in width from the definition of height. The definition makes more common sense as amended.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C1	Chapter J: Definitions	J1 Definitions - Definition of 'Pest plant Removal'	The definition of Pest Plant Removal incorrectly references some documents. DOC does not have a Pest Plant list, and the Auckland Regional Plant Pest Management Strategy should refer to the Auckland Regional Pest Management Strategy (i.e. remove the word Plant).	Amend the definition of Pest plant removal as follows: The alteration or removal of any tree or vegetation listed as a plant pest within the Auckland Regional Plant Pest Management Strategy, Department of Conservation Pest Plants List or the National Pest Plant Accord (excluding research organisms) under the Biosecurity Act 1993.	To update the definition of Pest plant removal. The 'Auckland Regional Pest Management Strategy' is now called the 'Auckland Regional Pest Management Plan' under changes to the Biosecurity legislation. Also the Department of Conservation does not have a 'Pest Plant List', therefore is redundant in the definition of Pest plant removal.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C2	Chapter J: Definitions	J1 Definitions - "Site"	The definition of "site" (b)(i) refers to section 37 of the Building Act 2004. This is incorrect as this part of the definition relates to two or more contiguous lots - it should refer to section 75 of the Building Act 2004.	Amend definition of site (b)(i) to replace section 37 with section 75 of the Building Act 2004..	This part of the site definition is referring to land that is composed of 2 or more contiguous lots held in two or more CTs. In the Building Act, Section 37 relates to not complying with district plan, whereas Section 75 relates to construction of building on 2 or more allotments.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32
Technical Matter	Inconsistency of provisions, references, terms or formatting	C1	Chapter J: Definitions	J1 Definitions - "Vegetation alteration and removal"	Vegetation alteration and removal is no longer defined within the definitions and as such no longer include reference to works within the root zone, although it was in the notified version of the plan.  Council's closing statement included the definition for vegetation alteration and removal, however it is not in the recommendations version of the plan, but the panel's report (Topic 065 Definitions s12.2) does not recommend its deletion. Therefore, the definition for Vegetation Alteration and removal as notified, should be reinstated.	Include the following definition: Vegetation alteration and removal: Damaging, cutting, destroying or removing any part of protected vegetation including roots. Includes: • tree alteration • tree removal. Excludes: • the alteration or removal of vegetation planted as crop, garden or pasture.	This is a clarification to assist plan users and consents when interpreting the plan.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Clarification or Explanation	C2	Chapter J: Definitions	J1 Definitions - Definition of 'Yards'	The definition of 'Yards' do not include the exclusions on 'any crop support structures, artificial crop protection structures, hedges or shelter belts'. As such any crop structure would be subject to Yard standards. Therefore, farmers may be required to obtain a resource consent for erecting crop structures that infringe yard standards. This is inappropriate as the yard standards were not drafted with the intent of managing crop structures.  Council's evidence (Buxton Topic 065) supported the inclusion of artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures into the definition to address submitters concerns. However, through the IHP process, this definition has been removed and the impact of which is an unclear treatment of crop structures within the AUP.	The proposed change is to insert these words back into the exclusion list for the yard definition and introduce a definition for the 'artificial crop protection structures, hedges or shelter belts'.  <b>Yard</b> Excludes: • eaves of any building and any roof, gutter or downpipe that projects over any yard by not more than 750mm; and • fire escapes required under the NZ Building Act 1991. • <u>Any crop support structures, artificial crop protection structures, hedges, or shelter belts.</u>	The issue raised in Horticulture New Zealand's (Hort) appeal to the High Court relates to the definition of 'Yard'. Horticulture New Zealand seeks to amend the definition of yard, for an exclusion to 'artificial crop protection, hedges or shelter belts'.  The missing exclusions suggest that a resource consent may be required for infringing yard standards. Therefore, farmers may be required a resource consent for erecting crop structures.  Council evidence had supported the exclusion of "Any crop support structures, artificial crop protection structures, hedges, or shelter belts" to yard rules.  Council has agreed in principle to add these exclusions into the definition of 'Yard', as part of the settlement of Horticulture New Zealand's appeal.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 32

## Attachment 18: Chapter L: Schedules: Schedule 6 Outstanding Natural Features Overlay schedule

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical	Inconsistency	C1	Chapter L: Schedule	Schedule 6: Outstanding Features Overlay Schedule (ID: 80)	Feature ID 80 (Lunn Avenue Backed Sediments) is no longer reflected on the AUP maps. This feature was removed as part of the Independent Hearings Panel (IHP) process. Council's closing statement position and the PAUP IHP recommendations version supported the removal of this feature.  While this feature has been removed from the AUP maps, it has not been removed from the relevant schedule (i.e. Schedule 6)	Remove Feature ID 80 from Chapter L, Schedule 6 of the AUP.  Do not recommend renumbering the other Feature ID numbers.	Council's evidence as part of the IHP hearings supported the removal of this feature as the baked sediments identified as the outstanding natural feature is no longer exposed.  Although this feature was subsequently deleted from the map as part of the IHP process, the text in Schedule 6 was not deleted in both the PAUP IHP recommendations version and subsequently the AUP (operative in part).  This is a clear error and Feature ID 80 should be deleted from Schedule 6 as the AUP map no longer shows this feature.  Subsequent feature IDs (i.e. 81 and onward) should not be renumbered, as these are linked to AUP maps and text.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31

## Attachment 19: Schedule 12: Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical error	Inconsistency of references, terms or formatting	C1	Schedule 12 Sites of Significance to Mana Whenua	Sites 003, 011, 020, 021, 030, 031, 032, 033, 047, 048, 052, 054, 057, 058, 059, 064, 065, 072, 073, 074	Macrons are missing from some of the words within Schedule 12.	Correct spelling and macrons of Maori words.	To reflect the correct spelling of names and words within Schedule 12.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical error	Inconsistency of references, terms or formatting	C1	Schedule 12 Sites of Significance to Mana Whenua	Sites 001, 005, 007, 009, 010, 011, 013, 014, 015, 018, 019, 021, 022, 023, 024, 029, 030, 034, 035, 036, 037, 043, 044, 048, 049, 050, 052, 053, 054, 055, 058, 059, 060, 061, 072, 074, 075	The site name and/or location description for 37 sites within Schedule 12 are incorrect or unclear.	Correct site name and/or location description.	To: * correct and/or provides greater clarity about, the location of the sites. * reflect the correct spelling of the site name, which in turn, upholds the mana of this site.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Anomaly	Overlay Mapping Area	C1	Sites of Significance to Mana Whenua Overlay	Sites 003, 005, 009, 010, 012, 013, 015, 016, 017, 020, 021, 022, 023, 024, 029, 030, 044, 052, 055, 056, 058, 060, 061	The mapped extent is incorrect.	Correct the extent of place in the GIS viewer.	To reflect the correct extent of place. In some cases: * The mapped extent is too big or in the wrong location, which means that adjoining land parcels are affected by Schedule 12 provisions, which is not what was intended. * The mapped extent is too small or in the wrong location, which means that there are areas that are not protected by Schedule 12 provisions, which is not what was intended.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31

## Attachment 20: Chapter L: Schedules - 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID00255 Railway workers' residences	This entry into the schedule requires amendment to reflect the evidence of Auckland Council (Rebecca Freeman) and Housing New Zealand Corporation (Amelia Linzey) for Topic 32: Historic heritage schedules. The amendment is to the exclusions column.	Add to exclusions column "interior of building(s); all buildings that are not primary feature(s)".	In error the agreed position included in evidence for this place was not reflected in Schedule 14.1.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID01117 Fort Takapuna (Operetu)/Fort Cautley military complex R11_1723 and ID00830 Fort Takapuna (Operetu)/Fort Cautley military complex R11_1723	This place has duplicate entries into the schedule. This duplicate entries error was introduced within the proposed plan. In addition, the entry ID01117, requires amendment to the primary feature. This primary feature error was introduced through the recommendations by the panel. The last portion of the list of primary features was deleted in error.	Merge the duplicate entries, through the deletion of ID00830 from the schedule and from the maps. Add to primary feature column "8. Guard house/hut; 9. Pillboxes"	In error this place has duplicate entries into the schedule and the last portion of the list of primary features has been deleted.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID01596 St Benedict's Catholic Church and Presbytery	This entry into the schedule requires amendment to include a primary feature for a category A place. The proposed plan (E.2 Historic Heritage Overlay) stated "The primary features of Category A... are identified in the schedule and shown on the planning maps." A primary feature was omitted for this place in error in the proposed plan, this error was carried over into the operative in part plan. There are also some minor corrections for consistency with the rest of the schedule, such as reducing the use of capital letters.	Add to primary feature column "Church; presbytery".	In error a primary feature for this category A place was omitted for the entry in Schedule 14.1.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID01625 Whare Tane	This entry into the schedule requires amendment to include a primary feature for a category A place. The proposed plan (E.2 Historic Heritage Overlay) stated "The primary features of Category A... are identified in the schedule and shown on the planning maps." A primary feature was omitted for this place in error in the proposed plan, this error was carried over into the operative in part plan.	Add to primary feature column "Residence; garage".	In error a primary feature for this category A place was omitted for the entry in Schedule 14.1.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID01678 Pumphouse	The extent of place shown within GIS Viewer is incorrect. The extent of place was mapped as being the footprint of the primary feature in error. This error was introduced through the recommendations from the panel.	Amendment to GIS Viewer to enlarge the extent of place to that shown in the evidence of MOTAT (Attachment G to the planning evidence in chief of Helen Hamilton).	The extent of place shown within GIS Viewer is incorrect for this place. The extent of place does not meet Policy B5.2.2.2 nor does it reflect that recommended by the Independent Hearings Panel and accepted within decisions by the Governing Body.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID01679 Engineer's House	The extent of place shown within GIS Viewer is incorrect. The extent of place was mapped as being the footprint of the primary feature in error. This error was introduced from the recommendations from the panel. In addition, this entry to the schedule requires amendment to exclusions for the purpose of clarity.	Amendment to GIS Viewer to enlarge the extent of place to that shown in the evidence of MOTAT (Attachment C to the planning evidence in chief of Helen Hamilton). In addition, amend the exclusion column to: "Interior glass partitions of Engineer's House; Buildings and structures that are not the primary feature; including interior glass partitions and vegetation."	The extent of place shown within GIS Viewer is incorrect for this place. The extent of place does not meet Policy B5.2.2.2 nor does it reflect that recommended by the Independent Hearings Panel and accepted within decisions by the Governing Body. The amendment to exclusions was for the purpose of clarity.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID01684 Remuera Railway Station and signal box	This entry into the schedule requires amendment to include a primary feature for a category A place. The proposed plan (E.2 Historic Heritage Overlay) stated "The primary features of Category A... are identified in the schedule and shown on the planning maps." A primary feature was omitted for this place in error in the proposed plan, this error was carried over into the operative in part plan.	Add to primary feature column "Railway station; signal box".	In error a primary feature for this category A place was omitted for the entry in Schedule 14.1.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID01709 Holy Sepulchre Church and hall	This entry into the schedule requires amendment to include a primary feature for a category A place. The proposed plan (E.2 Historic Heritage Overlay) stated "The primary features of Category A... are identified in the schedule and shown on the planning maps." A primary feature was omitted for this place in error in the proposed plan, this error was carried over into the operative in part plan.	Add to primary feature column "Church; hall".	In error a primary feature for this category A place was omitted for the entry in Schedule 14.1.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID01727 St Barnabas's Chapel	The extent of place shown within GIS Viewer is incorrect. This place was the subject of mediation with Diocesan School for Girls during hearings on the proposed plan. The extent of place was agreed during these mediations, and this has not accurately shown with GIS Viewer. The extent of place extends further to the south than what was agreed, and therefore extends over an adjoining building.	Amendment to GIS Viewer to reduce the extent of place. The extent of place should be reduced to the south, and not include any portion of the building to the rear.	The extent of place shown within GIS Viewer is incorrect for this place. The extent of place covers land that is not part of the historic heritage place, therefore does not meet Policy B5.2.2.2.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID01730 Stoneways/William Henry Gummer's House (former)	This entry into the schedule requires amendment to include a primary feature for a category A place. The proposed plan (E.2 Historic Heritage Overlay) stated "The primary features of Category A... are identified in the schedule and shown on the planning maps." A primary feature was omitted for this place in error in the proposed plan, this error was carried over into the operative in part plan.	Add to primary feature column "Residence".	In error a primary feature for this category A place was omitted for the entry in Schedule 14.1.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID01770 Shot tower	This entry into the schedule requires amendment to include a primary feature for a category A place. The proposed plan (E.2 Historic Heritage Overlay) stated "The primary features of Category A... are identified in the schedule and shown on the planning maps." A primary feature was omitted for this place in error in the proposed plan, this error was carried over into the operative in part plan.	Add to primary feature column "Tower".	In error a primary feature for this category A place was omitted for the entry in Schedule 14.1.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID01823 Marivare	This entry into the schedule requires amendment to include a primary feature for a category A place. The proposed plan (E.2 Historic Heritage Overlay) stated "The primary features of Category A... are identified in the schedule and shown on the planning maps." A primary feature was omitted for this place in error in the proposed plan, this error was carried over into the operative in part plan.	Add to primary feature column "Residence".	In error a primary feature for this category A place was omitted for the entry in Schedule 14.1.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID01857 St John's College historic campus	In error the Kinder Wing has been identified as a primary feature. In the legacy Auckland City District plan, St John's College had three separate scheduled buildings, being Chapel, and Dining Hall and Waitoa Room – both category A, and Kinder Wing – category B. As part of the rollover to the proposed plan, these three buildings were combined into a single place – St John's College historic campus – category A and the primary features were identified as "Chapel, Dining Hall/Waitoa Room and Kinder Wing". As the Kinder Wing was a Category B item in the legacy plan, and as no re-evaluation of this place occurred during the rollover, it is not considered appropriate that it is identified as a primary feature of the place.	Amend primary feature column to: "Chapel; Dining Hall/Waitoa Room and Kinder Wing"	In error the Kinder Wing was identified as a primary feature.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID01892 Pearson House	This entry into the schedule requires amendment to include a primary feature for a category A place. The proposed plan (E.2 Historic Heritage Overlay) stated "The primary features of Category A... are identified in the schedule and shown on the planning maps." A primary feature was omitted for this place in error in the proposed plan, this error was carried over into the operative in part plan.	Add to primary feature column "Building".	In error a primary feature for this category A place was omitted for the entry in Schedule 14.1.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID02038 Strand Arcade	This entry into the schedule requires amendment to include a primary feature for a category A place. The proposed plan (E.2 Historic Heritage Overlay) stated "The primary features of Category A... are identified in the schedule and shown on the planning maps." A primary feature was omitted for this place in error in the proposed plan, this error was carried over into the operative in part plan.	Add to primary feature column "Building".	In error a primary feature for this category A place was omitted for the entry in Schedule 14.1.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID02048 Myers Park historic landscape, including trees and caretaker's cottage R11_2195 and R11_2669	This place requires amendment to exclusions. This place was scheduled in the legacy Auckland City District Plan as two separate entries, being the park and the kindergarten. During the rollover to the proposed plan, the scheduled park/building were combined into a single category A historic heritage place – ID02048. In error the interior of the caretaker's cottage was included in the protection, this error was carried over into the operative in part plan. The interior of the cottage does not warrant heritage protection.	Add to exclusions column "Interior of cottage".	In error the interior of the caretaker's cottage is protected.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID02054 St Patrick's Cathedral complex	This place requires an amendment to exclusions. Through mediation with the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocesan of Auckland it was agreed to reduce the extent of place to exclude Liston House. This did occur. In error Liston House continued to be within the exclusions column for this place, despite no longer being within the extent of place.	Delete Liston House from the exclusions column.	In error Liston House was retained in the exclusions column despite no longer being within the extent of place for the complex.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31

## Attachment 20: Chapter L: Schedules - 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID02073 Campbell Free Kindergarten	This place requires an amendment to exclusions. Extent of place includes air space above land. The airspace for this place includes the motorway viaduct. The viaduct does not add to the heritage values of the place and therefore should be identified as an exclusion.	Amend exclusions column to: "Interior of building(s), except the front room and Arts and Craft staircase, viaduct".	In error the exclusions column does not list the viaduct.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID02074 City Destructor Buildings (former), including boiler room, depot perimeter buildings, generator room, battery house, chimney, stables, and destructor building	This place requires amendment to exclusions. This place was scheduled in the legacy Auckland City District Plan as a number of separate buildings/structures. The destructor building and stables had their interiors protected within the legacy plan. During the rollover to the proposed plan, the scheduled buildings/structures were combined into a single category A historic heritage place – ID02074. In error the interiors of the destructor building and stables were excluded from protection, this error was carried over into the operative in part plan.	Add to exclusions column "Interior of building(s), except destructor building and stables"	In error the destructor building and stables interiors are not protected.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID02735 Queens Wharf	This place requires amendment to exclusions. This error was introduced through the addition of the place to the schedule through recommendations by the panel. The last portion of the list of exclusions was deleted in error.	Add to exclusions column "...replacement of <u>corroded reinforcement coating of reinforcement and reinstatement with new concrete either by spraying or recasting with concrete or mortar.</u> "	In error the last portion of the exclusions has been deleted.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Technical	Amendments to schedules (Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage)	C1	4.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage	ID02779 Ngahere	The extent of place shown within GIS Viewer is incorrect. The extent of place was mapped over the neighbouring property in error, being 72 Mountain Road. The place Ngahere occupies only 74 Mountain Road and as such that should be the extent of place. This error was introduced through the recommendations from the panel.	Amendment to GIS Viewer to reduce the extent of place. The extent of place should be only on 74 Mountain Road.	The extent of place shown within GIS Viewer is incorrect for this place. The extent of place covers land that is not part of the historic heritage place, therefore does not meet Policy B5.2.2.2.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31

## Attachment 21: Chapter L: Schedules: Schedule 14.2 Historic Heritage Areas - Maps and Statements of Significance

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical	Amendments to diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C1	Schedule 14.2 Historic Heritage Areas - Maps and Statements of Significance	Map 14.2.12.1 Historic Heritage Area: Karangahape Road	The map incorrectly identifies 19 Beresford Square, containing St James Church (former), as a non-contributing site. This error was introduced through an error in the Karangahape Road Historic Heritage Area evaluation. The evaluation notes 15-27 Beresford Square is a car park and therefore "non-contributing". The property is labelled as "non-contributing" in the evaluation map. The address however also contains St James Church (former) at 19 Beresford Square. The building is noted in the evaluation as being "contributing" and is included, specifically, in the (e) Technological criteria. Accordingly 19 St James Church (former) should be identified as a contributing site within the Karangahape Road historic heritage area, and within Map 14.2.12.1.	Amend Map 14.2.12.1 to show St James Church (former) at 19 Beresford Square as a contributing site to the Karangahape Road Historic Heritage Area.	The amendment corrects an error and ensures map correctly identifies the sites that contribute to the historic heritage area.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31

## Attachment 22: Chapter L: Schedules: Schedule 15 Special Character Schedule, Statements and Maps

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Technical	Amendments to diagrams, figures, tables or appendices	C1	Schedule 15 Special Character Schedule, Statements and Maps	15.1.7.1.1 Special Character Areas Overlay - Residential: Helensville - Extent of Area (Special Character Area Map)	The map is correct but the legend contains an error. The residential Special Character Area Map legends identify "sites subject to demolition, removal or relocation rules". The legend for these maps were changed during the panel recommendations. The Helensville legend identifies "sites with identified historic character buildings". This is the wording of the proposed plan, and is therefore an error.	Amend map legend for 15.1.7.1.1 to state "sites subject to demolition, removal or relocation rules".	The amendment corrects an error and ensures this Special Character Area Map aligns with the other maps and the Special Character Overlay provisions.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31



## Attachment 23: AUP GIS Viewer Mapping Overlays

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Anomaly	Overlay mapping error	C1	Unitary Plan Management Layers > Overlays > Natural Resources	Natural Stream Management Areas Overlay - 63 Morrison Road, Waiuku	The Natural Stream Management Overlay incorrectly remains on this site. According to Council's evidence, the natural stream on this site does not meet the criteria for a natural stream management area. The Natural Stream Management Overlay was therefore left on this site, incorrectly.	Remove the Natural Stream Management Overlay from this site	The natural stream on this site does not meet the criteria for a natural stream management area. Therefore there is an additional layer of provisions for this site which is not applicable. This also aligns with Council closing statement position which outlined that the Natural Stream Management Overlay should be removed from this site.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Anomaly	Overlay mapping error	C3	Unitary Plan Management Layers > Overlays > Natural Heritage	Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Overlay	The Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Overlay is a statutory layer on the GIS viewer that gives effect to the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008. The AUP GIS layer- Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Overlay is a spatial representation of the AUP implementation of the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008. These two overlays should be aligned and they are not aligned in some parts of the AUP GIS viewer.	Realign the AUP Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Overlay to the Statutory Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Overlay, in the parts where they do not align.	As the AUP GIS layer seeks to implement the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008, it should align with the area that the Act covers. If these two overlays do not align, it misrepresents the spatial area that the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008 applies to.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31
Anomaly	Overlay mapping error	C1	Unitary Plan Management Layers > Overlays > Natural Heritage	Regionally Significant Volcanic Viewshafts and Height Sensitive Area Overlay 98 Mountain Road, Epsom	Without the Height Sensitive Area Overlay, the Ascott Hospital will have a less than 9m height restriction (i.e. 3-4m restriction) to the site. Council's closing statement position supported a permitted 9m Height Sensitive Area Overlay to the Ascott Hospital Site. However, this was not applied in the AUP (operative in part) version.	Add a permitted 9m Height Sensitive Area Overlay to the Ascott Hospital site (98 Mountain Road, Epsom)	Without the permitted height of 9m, the Ascott Hospital will be limited in its ability to expand upwards. Given the restricted land supply in the area, the hospital will need to build vertically to meet demand for growth. Council's closing statement position supported a permitted 9m Height Sensitive Area Overlay, as it was in the operative plan at the time (Auckland Council District Plan Operative Auckland City - Isthmus Section 1999), therefore the omission of this overlay is a clear error.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 31

## Attachment 24: AUP GIS Viewer Mapping Controls

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Anomaly	Control mapping error	C1	Unitary Plan Management Layer > Controls	Building frontage controls > Key Retail Frontage	There are key retail frontage controls on sites that are zoned Open Space. Key retail frontage controls do not apply to open space zones. The mistake occurred from the PAUP IHP Recommendations Version, when the zoned were changed from Mixed Use to Open Space.  The key retail frontage that was applied to the Mixed Use Zone, was left on the site by mistake.	Remove the key retail frontage control from the following sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1/595 Te Atatu Road, Te Atatu Peninsula</li> <li>2 Memorial Drive, New Lynn</li> </ul>	This is a clear error as key retail frontage controls do not apply to Open Space Zones. Remove key retail frontage control on open space zones. No change to objectives or policies or provisions in the AUP.  If these key retail frontage controls remain, it can undermine the credibility of the other mapping controls that apply to the sites. Removing the key retail frontage control will clarify any doubts on the controls that apply to these sites.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Control mapping error	C1	Unitary Plan Management Layer > Controls	Height Variation Control (31 Curley Avenue, Silverdale)	Height Variation Control applies to sites zoned Town Centre, around Curley Avenue, Silverdale. While 31 Curley Avenue, Silverdale is zoned Town Centre, the Height Variation Control is omitted for this site.  This issue occurred from the PAUP Notified to the PAUP IHP Recommendation Version, when 31 Curley Avenue was zoned Town Centre. The Height Variation Control was omitted by mistake.	Add Height Variation Control of 18m, at 31 Curley Avenue, Silverdale.	This is a clear omission as the zone for the site was changed to Town Centre, from the PAUP IHP Recommendations Version. Add the Height Variation Control on a parcel of land zoned Town Centre to be consistent with contiguous sites zoned Town Centre. No change to objectives or policies in the AUP.  The change will allow this site to be consistent with its contiguous sites. It will ensure that there is no difference in height allowances between sites in the town centre and keep development standards consistent across the area.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Control mapping error	C4	Unitary Plan Management Layer > Controls	Height Variation Control (Howick Town Centre)	Mixed use zones adjacent to the Howick Town Centre should have Height Variation Controls applied, but have been omitted in the AUP (operative in part) Version.  The PAUP Notified Version included Height Variation Controls for these mixed use zones. The Council's closing evidence and the IHP report (029, 030,079 and 0101- Special Character and pre-1944), supported the retention of Height Variation Controls for these mixed use zones in the Howick Town Centre area.  However, the Height Variation Control was omitted at in the AUP (operative in part) Version. This is a clear error between different versions of the AUP.	Add Height Variation Control to mixed use zones in Howick Town Centre  Consequently, the following text needs to be altered in Chapter H10 and H13, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to insert the option of 'Total Building Height' of less than 11m to Table H13.6.1.2</li> <li>to insert the option of 'Total Building Height' of less than 11m to Table H10.6.1.1</li> </ul>	The IHP retained the height variation controls for the Howick Town Centre, noting the historic importance of the area. Also, Council's closing statement, did not support an increase in heights from those that was notified in the PAUP Notified Version. Therefore, the omission of the Height Variation Controls is clear error.  Also, it would be contrary to the intent of the Height Variation Controls in Howick Town Centre, if the adjacent mixed use zones were permitted heights of greater than 9m.	There is a consequential impact on Chapter H10- Business: Town Centre Zone and Chapter H13: Business: Mixed Use Zone.  Table H10.6.1.1 and Table H13.6.1.2 set out total permitted building height shown in Height Variation Controls. At present it does not cater for heights less than 13m.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Control mapping error	C1	Unitary Plan Management Layer > Controls	Height Variation Control (Howick Town Centre) 30-54 Cook Street, Howick	Mixed use zones adjacent to the Howick Town Centre should have Height Variation Controls applied, but these have been omitted in the AUP (operative in part) Version.  The sites at 30-54 Cook Street, Howick were zoned Residential-Single House under the PAUP Notified Version. These were subsequently changed to Business- Mixed Use in the PAUP IHP Recommendations Version.  The PAUP Notified Version included Height Variation Controls for mixed use zones adjacent to the Howick Town Centre. The Council's closing evidence and the IHP report (029, 030,079 and 0101- Special Character and pre-1944), supported the retention of Height Variation Controls for these mixed use zones.  As these sites have been re-zoned Business- Mixed Use, these should have the Height Variation Control of 9m applied to be consistent with its surrounding Business- Mixed Use sites.	Add Height Variation Control to sites 30-54 Cook Street, Howick, which are zoned Business- Mixed Use	As the Business- Mixed Use Zones adjacent to the Howick Town Centre seek to reestablish the Height Variation Control of 9m, these sites, as Business Mixed Use Zones should have the Height Variation Control of 9m applied as well.  It would be contrary to the intent of the Height Variation Controls in Howick Town Centre, if the adjacent these mixed use zones were permitted heights of greater than 9m.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Control mapping error	C1	Unitary Plan Management Layer > Controls	Height Variation Control (71, 75 and 128 Hingaia Road 17 Pararekau Road, Hingaia)	There is a 12.5m height control placed on these sites. The Panel sought that plan provisions (including height variation controls) be simplified and clarified. As such height variation controls across the region refrain from half metre (0.5m) heights but round it off (i.e. 12.5 to 13m). Also other areas (e.g. Howick Town Centre) have changed height variation controls from 12.5 to 13m for simplicity and clarity.  These areas retained the 12.5m height variation control, in error.	Amend the Height Variation Control on these sites to 13m: 128 Hingaia Road 71 Hingaia Road 17 Pararekau Road 75 Hingaia Road	The Panel in its recommendation report (IHP Report to AC Topic 010, 029, 030, 079 Special character, section 10, page 16), sought that plan provisions are clarified and simplified. For Height Variation Controls, this means that variable heights allowed on the planning maps (i.e. 11.75m, 12.25m or 12.5m) are simplified to 13m. The purpose is to enable a simplified assessment criteria rather than separate provisions. Height Variation Controls across the region have been amended in line with the Panel's recommendations, including the Howick Town Centre heights which was changed from 12.5 to 13m.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Control mapping error	C1	Unitary Plan Management Layer > Controls	Subdivision Variation Control (Warkworth)	Three sites zoned Rural- Countryside Living in Warkworth do not have its associated Subdivision Variation Controls.  Table E39.6.5.2.1 of the AUP (operative in part) Version identifies Rural- Countryside Living zones in Warkworth as being receiving areas for transferable rural site subdivision. However, the AUP GIS Viewer (the maps) do not show the Subdivision Variation Control applied to any of the Countryside Living Zones in Warkworth.  This is a clear error between different versions of the plans.	Add Subdivision Variation Control to three areas, in Warkworth zoned Rural-Countryside Living Zone.	These Countryside Living Zone sites in Warkworth are subject to subdivision rules in Chapter E39, including transferable rural site subdivision controls in Table E39.6.5.2.1. However, the AUP GIS Viewer (i.e. the maps) do not illustrate the sites that the subdivision rules apply.  To ensure consistency between the rules in Chapter E36: Subdivision Rural and the maps, Subdivision Variation Controls should be added to the Rural Countryside Living Zones in Warkworth.  This clarifies the rules that apply for transferable rural subdivision sites, and provides no doubt that these rules apply to these sites in Warkworth.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33

Attachment 25: AUP GIS Viewer Mapping Precincts

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Anomaly	Precinct Mapping Error	C2	I410 Drury South Industrial Precinct	Approximately 152 Maketu Road, Drury	In the GIS viewer, this property is shown as a part of sub-precinct A. This is clear mistake. In the precinct text, I410.10.1.Drury South Industrial: Precinct Plan - 1 shows this property as part of the sub-precinct C. Alter sub-precinct boundaries for sub-precinct A and sub-precinct C.	Alter sub-precinct boundaries for sub-precinct A and sub-precinct C to include the land area of approximately 152 Maketu Road, Drury in the sub-precinct C.	Alter sub-precinct boundaries for sub-precinct A and sub-precinct C to include the land area of approximately 152 Maketu Road, Drury.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Precinct Mapping Error	C2	I412 Flat Bush Precinct	285 Murphys Road, Flat Bush	An area of Open Space – Informal Recreation Zone has extended into 285 Murphys Road. The northern boundary of the property was established on DP 350409 when Lot 2 DP 350409 was created and vested in Manukau City Council as recreation reserve.  This reserve will contain the footpath on the northern side of the Park Edge Road (Argento Drive) which intersects with Murphys Road. This road was provided for in the Flat Bush structure plan.  The Flat Bush Sub-Precinct F boundary is not coincident with either the property boundary or the Open Space Zone, and Sub Precinct F should also extend to the northern boundary of the THAB zone.  These changes should be made through a plan change (anomaly) as there is a misalignment between the IHP report and the GIS viewer.	Flat Bush Precinct, sub-precinct F boundary should follow the precinct boundary, as shown in I412.10.1 Flat Bush: Precinct plan 1 - Sub-precincts Boundary.  In the viewer, the Flat Bush Precinct, sub-precinct F boundary 'should coincide with the property boundary and the Open Space Zone boundary, and sub-precinct F should also extend to the eastern boundary of the THAB zone.	The property boundary, zone boundary and sub-precinct boundary should coincide with each other to form a common boundary that avoids undefined land parcels. The change will align with the precinct boundaries, as per I412.10.1 Flat Bush: Precinct plan 1 in the AUP.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Precinct Mapping Error	C1	I412 Flat Bush Precinct	317 Te Irirangi Drive, Clover Park, Auckland	Part of 317 Te Irirangi Drive, Clover Park was zoned School Zone and the remaining part was zoned THAB in the notified version of Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan. Then the zoning changed from THAB to Special Purpose – School zone. Flat Bush residential sub-precincts A, D & E, have remained over the property even after that part of the site has been rezoned from THAB to Special Purpose – School Zone.  Sancta Maria Catholic Primary School currently occupies the site. The sub-precincts over this site should have been removed as a consequential amendment as part of the rezoning. This is a clear oversight. The residential sub-precincts should not remain when the site has been rezoned to Special Purpose – School. Removal of the sub-precincts over the site in precinct plan is needed to rectify this.	Remove sub-precinct A, D, and E over the subject site in the GIS viewer.	The residential sub-precincts should not remain when the site has been rezoned to Special Purpose – School. Removal of the sub-precincts over the site in precinct plan is needed to rectify this.	There are consequential changes to the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. The changes is to remove sub-precinct A, D and E over the subject site in I412.10.1 Flat Bush: Precinct plan 1 – Sub-precincts Boundary.	Proposed recommendation is shown in Attachment 33.  Consequential changes is shown in Attachment 34.
Anomaly	Precinct Mapping Error	C1	I412 Flat Bush Precinct	LOT 4 DP 138638 LOT 1 DP 138638 LOT 3 DP 98087 LOT 6 DP 98087 LOT 2 DP 98087 LOT 4 DP 98087 LOT 5 DP 98087 LOT 3 DP 419859 LOT 2 DP 419859 LOT 1 DP 419859 LOT 6 DP 419859 LOT 5 DP 419859 LOT 4 DP 419859 LOT 7 DP 105187 LOT 4 DP 501965 LOT 3 DP 501965 LOT 1 DP 501965 LOT 2 DP 501965 LOT 5 DP 501965 LOT 6 DP 501965 LOT 7 DP 501965 LOT 8 DP 501965 LOT 9 DP 501965 LOT 10 DP 501965 LOT 11 DP 501965 LOT 12 DP 501965 LOT 13 DP 501965 LOT 14 DP 501965 LOT 15 DP 501965 LOT 16 DP 501965 LOT 18 DP 501965 LOT 19 DP 501965 LOT 20 DP 501965 LOT 17 DP 501965 LOT 21 DP 501965 LOT 3 DP 453745 LOT 2 DP 453745 LOT 1 DP 453745 LOT 4 DP 453745 LOT 5 DP 453745 LOT 6 DP 453745 LOT 7 DP 453745 LOT 2 DP 479102 LOT 4 DP 479102 LOT 5 DP 479102 LOT 3 DP 479102 LOT 1 DP 479102 LOT 1 DP 488765 LOT 2 DP 488765 LOT 3 DP 488765	The Flat Bush precinct Plan 1 shows sub-precinct I over sites zoned as Single House. This is clearly an error as the sub-precinct I is for Countryside Living zone. The precinct should be removed from these sites so the sites can be developed in accordance with Single House zone provisions.	Remove sub-precinct I from sites zoned as Single House. Leave sub-precinct I over part of site zoned Residential Large lot – 76 Browns Lane (LOT 4 DP 138638).	The objectives and policies of the sub-precinct do not align with the underlying zone (Single House). Removal of the sub-precinct is needed to rectify this.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33

Attachment 26: AUP GIS Viewer Mapping Zoning (Central)

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	10 and 12 Kitenui Avenue, Mt Albert	<p>Re: the zoning of 10 and 12 Kitenui Avenue, Mt Albert Marist Primary School. Change the zoning from Mixed Housing Urban to Special Purpose – School. The property at 10 and 12 Kitenui Avenue belongs to the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland and has been developed as part of Marist Primary School.</p> <p>The sites were zoned Mixed Housing Urban in the Notified Version of the PAUP. The Roman Catholic Bishop submitted to rezone the sites to Special Purpose – School (Submission 5256-89).</p> <p>The Council's evidence for topic 080 Rezoning and Precincts (General) supported the rezoning of school land to School zone (evidence of Bruce Young, 3 December 2015, Attachment C), however, no maps were appended to the Council's evidence "due to the large number of maps associated with the school rezoning" requests (evidence of Bruce Young, para 13.1). No parties opposed the requested rezoning.</p> <p>The sites have been zoned Mixed Housing Urban in the Panel's Recommendations Version of the Plan, and the Council has carried that zoning through to the Decisions Version of the Plan. The Panel has not discussed the zoning of the site in any of its recommendations reports and neither the Panel nor the Council has provided a rationale for the Mixed Housing Urban zoning. The on the maps is at odds with the Council's evidence and unsupported by any explicit recommendations, decisions or rationale and appears to be a mistake.</p> <p>The Bishop seeks that the zoning of 10 and 12 Kitenui Avenue be corrected to Special Purpose – School in line with the Bishop's submission and the Council's evidence. This change of zoning is supported.</p>	Rezone 10 and 12 Kitenui Avenue from Mixed Housing Suburban to Special Purpose: School zone.	<p>The property at 10 and 12 Kitenui Avenue belongs to the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland and has been developed as part of Marist Primary School. The sites were zoned Mixed Housing Urban in the Notified Version of the PAUP.</p> <p>The Roman Catholic Bishop submitted to rezone the sites to Special Purpose – School (Submission 5256-89). The Council's evidence for topic 080 Rezoning and Precincts (General) supported the rezoning of school land to School zone (Evidence Report of Bruce Young, Special Purpose School zone 3 December 2015, Attachment C). No maps were provided. No parties opposed the requested rezoning. In the Evidence Report 6.2, Mr Young state "Existing independent and integrated schools (are) to be zoned Special Purpose-School...on the basis that it would provide for efficient use and development of school sites and would give greater flexibility than other zones for the type and scale of buildings required for school purposes".</p> <p>The sites have been zoned Mixed Housing Urban in the Panel's Recommendations Version of the Plan, and the Council has carried that zoning through to the Decisions Version of the Plan. The Panel has not discussed the zoning of the site in any of its recommendations reports and neither the Panel nor the Council has provided a rationale for the Mixed Housing Urban zoning. There is therefore an error in the zoning that needs to be addressed - Rezone 10 and 12 Kitenui Avenue from Mixed Housing Suburban to Special Purpose: School zone.</p>	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	46 Point Chevalier Road, Point Chevalier	<p>Rezoning of 46 Pt Chevalier Road, Pt Chevalier - The 46 Pt Chevalier Road is occupied by the presbytery for the parish of St Francis and St Therese and is the property of the belongs to the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland. The parish church and school are located on the adjoining lots at 2 Montrose Street. The presbytery lot was zoned Mixed Housing Suburban in the Notified Version of the PAUP.</p> <p>The Roman Catholic Bishop submitted to rezone the site to Special Purpose – School (Submission 5256-109) – the same as the adjoining lot occupied by the school.</p> <p>The Council's consistent approach throughout the PAUP has been to apply a single zoning, the Special Purpose – School zone, to sites owned by the Roman Catholic Bishop on which a school, church and presbytery has been developed.</p> <p>In addition, Council's evidence for topic 080 Rezoning and Precincts (General) supported in principle the rezoning of such land to Special Purpose – School (evidence of Bruce Young, 3 December 2015, paragraphs 1.4, 1.5, 12.4 and Attachment B), however, no maps were appended to the Council's evidence "due to the large number of maps associated with the school rezoning" requests (evidence of Bruce Young, para 13.1) and Appendix C omits reference to this submission. No parties opposed the requested rezoning.</p> <p>The site has been zoned Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings in the Panel's Recommendations Version of the Plan, and the Council has carried that zoning through to the Decisions Version of the Plan.</p> <p>The zoning shown on the maps is at odds with the consistent approach of the PAUP to the Bishop's campuses and the Council's evidence and unsupported by any explicit recommendations, decisions or rationale and therefore appears to be a mistake. The Bishop seeks that the zoning of 32 Pt Chevalier Road be corrected to Special Purpose – School in line with the Bishop's submission.</p>	Rezone 46 Point Chevalier Road, Point Chevalier from THAB to Special Purpose:School zone.	<p>46 Pt Chevalier Road is occupied by the presbytery for the parish of St Francis and St Therese and is the property of the belongs to the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland. The parish church and school are located on the adjoining lots at 2 Montrose Street. The presbytery lot was zoned Mixed Housing Suburban in the Notified Version of the PAUP. The Roman Catholic Bishop submitted to rezone the site to Special Purpose – School (Submission 5256-109) – the same as the adjoining lot occupied by the school.</p> <p>The Council's consistent approach throughout the PAUP has been to apply a single zoning, the Special Purpose – School zone, to sites owned by the Roman Catholic Bishop on which a school, church and presbytery has been developed. In addition, Council's evidence for topic 080 Rezoning and Precincts (General) supported in principle the rezoning of such land to Special Purpose – School (evidence of Bruce Young, 3 December 2015, paragraphs 1.4, 1.5, 12.4 and Attachment B). Appendix C omits reference to this submission, however, no parties opposed the requested rezoning. The site has been zoned Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings in the Panel's Recommendations Version of the Plan, and the Council has carried that zoning through to the Decisions Version of the Plan.</p> <p>The Panel has not discussed the zoning of the site in any of its recommendations reports and neither the Panel nor the Council has provided a rationale for applying the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zoning or distinguishing between the approach taken on this campus and the approach taken on all of the Bishop's other campuses within the Plan. The zoning shown on the maps is at odds with the consistent approach of the PAUP to the Bishop's campuses and the Council's evidence and unsupported by any explicit recommendations, decisions or rationale and therefore appears to be a mistake. Rezone 46 Point Chevalier Road, Point Chevalier from THAB to Special Purpose:School zone.</p>	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33

## Attachment 27: AUP GIS Viewer Mapping Zoning (South)

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment contains the proposed recommendation?
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	218 Pukekohe East Road, Pukekohe	The property at 218 Pukekohe East Road, Pukekohe (approx. 15.5 ha) is partly zoned Rural - Rural Production, and the remaining part is shown as in the Waikato District Council area. The entire property should be in Auckland Council's area and zoned Rural - Rural Production Zone.  This error was first noticed in the PAUP IHP recommendations version, and was then carried forward to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part).  The land has been transferred from Waikato District Council to Auckland Council in 2011 (through a gazette notification). Therefore the entire properties should reflect the appropriate zone (In this case, Rural Production zone).	Rezone the entire property at 218 Pukekohe East Road, Pukekohe to Rural - Rural Production Zone.	The front portion of the property at 218 Pukekohe East Road, Pukekohe has been correctly zoned Rural - Rural Production. So are the adjoining properties 216 and 218 Pukekohe East Road, Pukekohe. It is therefore necessary to rezone the entire property at 218 Pukekohe East Road, Pukekohe to avoid spot zoning as well as split zoning.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C2	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	Wairoa Hill Road - Hunua	Wairoa Hill Road in Hunua area runs through land zoned Rural - Rural Production and Public Open Space - Conservation. However this road is not shown in the map as Road in white and instead the road also has the same colour of the zones of the land on both sides of the road.  This error was first noticed in the PAUP IHP recommendations version, and was then carried forward to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part).	Change the zoning of Wairoa Hill Road from Rural - Rural Production Zone and Public Open Space - Conservation to Road.	Wairoa Hill Road in Hunua has not been depicted as "Road" in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) maps. This road has been given the same zoning of the surrounding zones, namely, Rural - Rural Production and Public Open Space - Conservation respectively. This is an error that needs to be fixed by showing Wairoa Hill Road in white.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C4	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	Multiple properties	Several residential properties in Manuwera have been zoned Mixed Housing Urban instead of Mixed Housing Suburban, and do not match the adjacent properties.  Change the zoning of those properties listed in Table 1 below from Residential - Mixed Housing Urban to Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban.	Change the zoning of those properties listed in Table 1 below from Residential - Mixed Housing Urban to Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban	The surrounding properties in the area has been zoned Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban. However, those properties which were earlier zoned Single House due to potential flood and inundation risks were subsequently rezoned to Residential - Mixed Housing Urban inadvertently. This needs to be corrected to avoid spot zoning.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	184 Papakura-Clevedon Road, Clevedon, Auckland	This property is zoned 'Rural - Mixed Rural' under the IHP recommendation but should be 'Rural - Countryside Living'. The land use being a single unit (detached dwelling) is aligned with the Rural - Countryside Living Zone, not the Rural - Mixed Rural Zone. The surrounding land is also zoned Rural - Countryside Living. Hence change of zone is required.	Change the zoning of the property at 184 Papakura-Clevedon Road, Clevedon from Rural - Mixed Rural Zone to Rural - Countryside Living Zone.	The surrounding properties are zoned Rural - Countryside Living leaving this property in Rural - Mixed Rural Zone. This is a clear mistake. The land use being a single unit (detached dwelling) is aligned with the Rural - Countryside Living Zone, not the Rural - Mixed Rural Zone. Change of zone required.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	37 Miller Road, Mangere Bridge	Westmount School campus located at 37 Miller Road, Mangere Bridge. The campus property has been zoned Mixed Housing Suburban zone in the decision version of the Unitary Plan. Westmount School is a private/independent school and in accordance with the approach taken in the Unitary Plan, this should be zoned Special Purpose - School which is applied to all independent and integrated schools.	Change the zoning of the property at 37 Miller Road, Mangere Bridge from Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone to Special Purpose - School Zone.	Westmount School is a private/independent school and in accordance with the approach taken in the Unitary Plan, this should be zoned Special Purpose - School which is applied to properties of all independent and integrated schools.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	164 Coronation Road, Mangere Bridge	The property at 164 Coronation Road, Mangere Bridge (approximately 265m from 37 Miller Road) is zoned Special Purpose - School zone in the Auckland Unitary Plan (operative in part). The Planning Consultant representing the School has confirmed that the site is not part of a school complex and is a residential building. The property is owned by Westmount Education Trust Incorporated. The Auckland Council District Plan (Manukau Section) has the property zoned Main Residential. The change of zone is required.	Change the zoning of the property at 164 Coronation Road, Mangere Bridge from Special Purpose - School Zone to Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban.	The Planning Consultant, on behalf of the School has confirmed that the site is not part of a school complex and is a residential building. The property is owned by Westmount Education Trust Incorporated. The Auckland Council District Plan (Manukau Section) has the property zoned Main Residential. In this background, the change of zone is needed.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	68 Hutton Street, Otahuhu	68 Hutton Street Otahuhu, has been incorrectly zoned Mixed Housing Suburban, where it should be Special Purpose - Cemetery to reflect the current land use as the Hutton Street Cemetery.  To correct this error, the above property should be rezoned to Special Purpose - Cemetery to reflect its current use.  Council evidence in Topic 081 supported rezoning the cemetery from MHS to Cemetery zone as sought by submitter. However this was never rezoned in the Case team version of the GIS Viewer, and therefore this is a clear mistake.	The property at 68 Hutton Street, Otahuhu should be rezoned to Special Purpose - Cemetery to reflect its current use.	Council evidence supported rezoning the cemetery from MHS to Cemetery zone as sought by submitter. However this was never rezoned in the Council case position GIS Viewer, and therefore is a mistake and misalignment between evidence and zone.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C2	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	30 Walters Road, Takanini, Auckland	Even though the property at 30 Walters Road, Takanini is part of the Town Centre zone, the maximum building height applied to Town Centre zone at Takanini is not shown on the GIS viewer in the Height Variation Control Overlay for the AUPOP. Change of zoning from Mixed Use to Town Centre was confirmed in the decision version of GIS, and only the maximum building height which is 18m was missing. (However this is correctly shown for the rest of the Town Centre zone areas in Takanini).	In order to correct this error, insert maximum building height applied as 18m under Height Variation Control for this site in the GIS viewer of the Auckland Unitary Plan (operative in part).	The property at 30 Walters Road, Takanini is part of the Town Centre zone, however the maximum building height applied to Town Centre zone at Takanini is not shown on the GIS viewer in the Height Variation Control Overlay. Town Centre zoning for the property is confirmed in the GIS, and only the maximum building height which is 18m is missing. This error should be corrected.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	171 Hingaia Road, Hingaia, Auckland	This property and the surrounding properties were zoned Future Urban in the Draft version of the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (PAUP). The zoning was changed to Special Purpose - School zone in the notified version of the PAUP. In the Case Team version, only the zoning of this property was changed back to Future Urban whilst surrounding properties remained in Residential - Mixed Housing Urban zone. This is a mistake. When the Special Purpose - School zone was removed from the school properties owned by the Ministry of Education, those properties were rezoned back to the previous zoning which is generally the zoning of the surrounding properties as well. Accordingly, this property at 171 Hingaia Road should be zoned Mixed Housing Urban which is the zoning of surrounding properties.	Accordingly, this property at 171 Hingaia Road should be zoned Mixed Housing Urban which is the zoning of surrounding properties.	When the Special Purpose - School zone was removed from the school properties owned by the Ministry of Education, those properties were rezoned back to the previous zoning which is generally the zoning of the surrounding properties as well. Accordingly, this property at 171 Hingaia Road should be zoned Mixed Housing Urban which is the zoning of surrounding properties.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	211 Kitchener Road, Waiuku, Auckland	This property is zoned Mixed Housing Suburban whereas all the surrounding properties are zoned Residential Large Lot. The spot zoning was overlooked in different versions of the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (PAUP). This is a mistake. Accordingly, this property at 211 Kitchener Road, Waiuku should be rezoned Residential - Large Lot which is the zoning of surrounding properties.	Accordingly, this property at 211 Kitchener Road, Waiuku should be rezoned Residential - Large Lot which is the zoning of surrounding properties.	This property is zoned Mixed Housing Suburban whereas all the surrounding properties are zoned Residential Large Lot. The spot zoning was overlooked in different versions of the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (PAUP). This is a mistake. Accordingly, this property at 211 Kitchener Road, Waiuku should be rezoned Residential - Large Lot which is compatible with the zoning of surrounding properties.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33

**Attachment 28: AUP GIS Viewer Mapping Zoning (North)**

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Anomaly	Zoning Mapping Error	C1	Unitary Plan zoning maps only (GIS viewer)	Sites at 16-18 and 20 Dominion Street, Takapuna, adjacent to St Joseph's Catholic School (Lots 1 DP 156416, Pt lot 2 DP 4553, Pt lot 6, DP 4553)	The 'school' zoning of these lots is clearly wrong, as the land is privately owned and has been developed in private residential units for many years. The zoning 'error' existed prior to the Unitary Plan being notified but has not previously been formally identified and corrected (see also Error Register, E_440)	Rezone the sites (from 'school') to Residential Mixed Housing - Urban zone.	The proposed zoning change is an important correction, given the fact that the land is private residential land and not part of the adjacent school. The error seems to relate for old subdivisions and former acquisitions of portions of (house) sites for 'school' purposes.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33

Attachment 29: AUP GIS Viewer Mapping Zoning (West)

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	490B Don Buck Road, Massey	<p>The land at 490B Don Buck Road, Massey (approx. 4ha) has been incorrectly zoned Special Purpose School zone. This error was first seen in the PAUP IHP recommendations version, that was then carried over to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part). The property is privately owned and used for residential purposes.</p> <p>The adjacent site at 490A Don Buck Road, Massey is St Pauls College, a private catholic school zoned Special Purpose School zone. The subject site has had the Special Purpose zoning applied to it as a result of a GIS mapping error due to the presence of the St Pauls College immediately next to the subject site. The land to the east, north and south of the subject site is zoned Residential - Mixed Housing Urban zone in the AUP.</p> <p>The subject site was zoned Future Urban Zone in the PAUP Notified Version and Council's closing statement evidence in the Independent Hearings Panel Process. The PAUP IHP recommendations version rezoned the surrounding Redhills area from Future Urban Zone to a mix of residential zones. In doing so, it kept the Special Purpose School on 490A Don Buck Road but in error zoned the subject site to Special Purpose School Zone.</p>	Re-zone 490B Don Buck Road, Massey from Special Purpose School Zone to Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone.	The Special Purpose zoning of the land provides for the establishment and operation of private schools. The land at 490B Don Buck Road is used for residential purposes/ countryside living and the owners do not use or intend to use the land for school purposes. The property should be rezoned to align with the adjacent residential zone as Residential Mixed Housing Urban Zone.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	122-134 Lincoln Road, Henderson (Lot 1 DP 505338)	<p>The subject site at 122-134 Lincoln Road, Henderson has been split zoned. This is a GIS mapping anomaly where the site has been split zoned Business - Mixed Use zone (east part of site/at street frontage), and Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Building Zone (west/rear part of site).</p> <p>The Business Mixed Use Zone covers majority of the site, and is consistent with adjoining sites to the north and south along Lincoln Road. However a small portion of the site, to the rear, is zoned Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Building Zone, which is consistent with the adjoining rear site, however creates a split zoning for 122-134 Lincoln Road.</p> <p>This error has been applied to the property since the PAUP notified version and it has not changed throughout the IHP hearings process through to Council's PAUP Decision version.</p> <p>There is no apparent reason for the rear portion of the subject site to be zoned Terrace Housing and Apartment Building. There is no relevant designation, or overlay which may have created a reason for the split zone. Zoning of the site should follow property boundaries.</p>	Extend the Business – Mixed Use zone to apply to the entire site at 122-134 Lincoln Road, Henderson.	Zone boundaries should follow property boundaries. Generally there should be no split zones or more than one zone applied to a property. The entire property at 122-134 Lincoln Road should be rezoned to align with the business zone covering the majority of the site and adjacent sites along Lincoln Road.	There are no consequential changes to other sections or other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	2 Falcon Crescent, Hobsonville (Lot 5 DP 505331)	<p>The requiring authority NZTA requested Designation 6741 (State Highway 16 and 18 – Westgate to Whenuapai and Hobsonville) be partially uplifted from 2 Falcon Crescent, Hobsonville (formerly known as 122 Hobsonville Road, Hobsonville) in February 2012 and again in February 2014 because the site was no longer required for the purposes of the motorway. This request was not actioned in the Waitakere District Plan and the error was carried over into the PAUP Notified Version and now the AUP Operative in part version.</p> <p>2 Falcon Crescent Hobsonville is split zoned Strategic Transport Corridor, Mixed Use, and Local Centre. The Hobsonville Corridor Precinct applies to the part zoned Mixed Use which is directly adjacent to the part zoned Strategic Transport Corridor.</p> <p>The purpose of the Strategic Transport Corridor zone is to provide for state highways and to be provided for as an integrated transport system. Since the portion of the site is no longer required for the purposes of the motorway and Designation 6741 in the AUP has been uplifted, NZTA has requested the zone of this portion be changed to align with adjacent zone.</p> <p>This is a GIS zone mapping anomaly from the designation no longer applying over the site. The zoning of the land should be amended to reflect the intended use of the site.</p> <p>Note the sites to the east of this site have already had the designation uplifted but are still zoned Strategic Transport Corridor. The customer has indicated that these sites to the east are already being developed for residential purposes and should also be considered for rezoning. If all the sites are to be rezoned, consideration should be given to whether they should be included within the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct.</p>	Extend the Business – Mixed Use Zone to apply to 2 Falcon Crescent Hobsonville as it is no longer subject to the Designation 6741 in the AUP.	<p>The underlying Strategic Transport Corridor Zone is no longer appropriate as the site is no longer required for the motorway and Designation 6741 in the AUP has been uplifted from the site. While this zone does provide for activities not otherwise provided for by the zone (e.g. dwellings) with the same activity status as provided for within the adjoining zone (being Mixed Use), it would be better to apply the most appropriate zone. Zoning of the land should reflect the intended use of the site. Furthermore this does not take into account what is provided for by the precinct which applies to the adjoining sites.</p> <p>Propose rezoning the subject site from Strategic Transport Corridor Zone to Business – Mixed Use zone, to be contiguous with the adjoining Business – Mixed Use zoning, and to better reflect the current and further intended use of the site (being developed for a mix of commercial and residential uses).</p>	<p>There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. These changes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extend the I603 Hobsonville Corridor sub-precinct A boundary over the subject sites in diagrams I603.10.1 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 1 and I603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2.</li> </ul> <p>The Hobsonville Corridor Precinct is located between Hobsonville Road and the Upper Harbour Highway (State Highway 18), and extends from Brigham Creek Road eastwards to Memorial Park Lane at the Hobsonville Domain. The purpose of the precinct is to provide a comprehensive and integrated approach to development to enable integrated land use and transport outcomes to occur in the proximity of the Brigham Creek interchange. High standards of urban design and landscape development are required throughout the precinct to provide active, pedestrian-orientated frontages along Hobsonville Road and to maintain amenity for Hobsonville primary school and residents on the south side of Hobsonville Road.</p> <p>The inclusion of the properties into the precinct will ensure an integrated approach to development aligns with the surrounding environment.</p>	<p>Proposed recommendation is shown in Attachment 33.</p> <p>Consequential change is shown in Attachment 34.</p>
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	19 Carder Court Hobsonville, 5 Carder Court Hobsonville, 17 Carder Court Hobsonville, 36 Memorial Park Lane Hobsonville, 33 Carder Court Hobsonville, 29 Carder Court Hobsonville, 31 Carder Court Hobsonville, 15 Carder Court Hobsonville, 23 Carder Court Hobsonville, 7 Carder Court Hobsonville, 44 Memorial Park Lane Hobsonville, 11 Carder Court Hobsonville, 21 Carder Court Hobsonville, 27 Carder Court Hobsonville, 13 Carder Court Hobsonville, 42 Memorial Park Lane Hobsonville, 25 Carder Court Hobsonville, 38 Memorial Park Lane Hobsonville, 9 Carder Court Hobsonville, 40 Memorial Park Lane Hobsonville, Carder Court Hobsonville	<p>The underlying zone of the subject sites are zoned Strategic Transport Corridor. The purpose of the zone is to provide for state highways and to be provided for as an integrated transport system.</p> <p>These properties are no longer required for the purposes of the motorway and are not subject to any designation. This is a GIS zone mapping anomaly and zoning of the properties should be amended to reflect the intended use of the site. The subject sites have already been subdivided and are under multiple ownerships. Development of the sites has already begun.</p> <p>Note the site to the west of these properties is no longer subject to a designation but still zoned Strategic Transport Corridor. This has already been flagged as an issue and addressed in a separate line item above. The customer has indicated that this site is already being developed for residential purposes and should also be considered for rezoning. If all the sites are to be rezoned, consideration should be given to whether they should be included within the Hobsonville Corridor Precinct.</p>	Rezoning the subject sites from Strategic Transport Corridor Zone to Business – Mixed Use Zone.	<p>The underlying Strategic Transport Corridor Zone is no longer appropriate as the sites are no longer required for the motorway. While this zone does provide for activities not otherwise provided for by the zone (e.g. dwellings) with the same activity status as provided for within the adjoining zone (being Mixed Use), it would be better to apply the most appropriate zone. Zoning of the land should reflect the intended use of the site. Furthermore this does not take into account what is provided for by the precinct which applies to the adjoining sites.</p> <p>Propose rezoning the subject sites from Strategic Transport Corridor Zone to Business – Mixed Use zone, to be contiguous with the adjoining Business – Mixed Use zoning, and to better reflect the current and further intended use of the site (being developed for a mix of commercial and residential uses).</p>	<p>There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. These changes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extend the I603 Hobsonville Corridor sub-precinct A boundary over the subject sites in diagrams I603.10.1 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 1 and I603.10.2 Hobsonville Corridor: Precinct plan 2.</li> </ul> <p>The Hobsonville Corridor Precinct is located between Hobsonville Road and the Upper Harbour Highway (State Highway 18), and extends from Brigham Creek Road eastwards to Memorial Park Lane at the Hobsonville Domain. The purpose of the precinct is to provide a comprehensive and integrated approach to development to enable integrated land use and transport outcomes to occur in the proximity of the Brigham Creek interchange. High standards of urban design and landscape development are required throughout the precinct to provide active, pedestrian-orientated frontages along Hobsonville Road and to maintain amenity for Hobsonville primary school and residents on the south side of Hobsonville Road.</p> <p>The inclusion of the properties into the precinct will ensure an integrated approach to development aligns with the surrounding environment.</p>	<p>Proposed recommendation is shown in Attachment 33.</p> <p>Consequential change is shown in Attachment 34.</p>

Type of error	Sub-category of error	Nature and degree of change	Sub-section of the AUP	Specific provision reference of the AUP or affected property(ies)	Current issue	Proposed Recommendation	Rationale (reasons for change)	Consequential changes on other parts of the Plan including the viewer	Which attachment shows the proposed recommendation?
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	60A Stanley Point Road, Devonport (Pt Lot 9 DP 3651)	Incorrect zoning. Auckland Council owns the piece of land and should be zoned to open space to reflect appropriate use of the land.	Change the zoning from Residential – Single House zone to Open Space – Informal Recreation zone	Site has changed from private ownership and Single Housing Zone to now being owned by Council for access to the beach at 'secret cove'. Change of zone reflects actual and appropriate land use zoning for the property.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	Witten Road, Pakiri (Lot 1 DP 185887)	Incorrect zoning. Auckland Council owns the piece of land and should be zoned to open space to reflect appropriate use of the land.	Change the zoning from Rural - Rural Coastal zone to Open Space – Informal Recreation zone	Incorrect zoning of land adjacent to existing reserve. Change of zone reflects actual and appropriate land use zoning for the property.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	2 Brickworks Bay Road & esplanade reserve off Bannings Way, Hobsonville (Lot 101 DP 468595 & (Lot 102 DP 468595, Lot 101 DP 378286, Lot 9 DP 58018, & Lot 3 DP 100813) – all esplanade reserve)	Incorrect zoning. Auckland Council owns the piece of land and should be zoned to open space to reflect appropriate use of the land.	Change from Single House zone to Open Space – Conservation zone	Auckland Council owned reserve. Important heritage site and proposed zoning is consistent with zoning of adjacent land.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	8 Paul Mathews Drive, Rosedale & Rosedale Park (Pt Lot 2 DP 171142 & part of Rosedale Park (Lot 4 DP 180979, Sec 1 SO 444799, Sec 4 SO 444799 & Lot 3 DP 180979)	Incorrect zoning. Auckland Council owns one part of land and the other part is privately owned.	Change from Open Space – Sport & Active Recreation zone, & Business - Light Industry zone to Business - Light Industry zone & Open Space – Sport & Active Recreation zone	Land exchange occurred between reserve land and private property. Zoning needs to change to reflect this land exchange.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	Aituroa Road, Puhoi (Lot 3 DP 493324)	Incorrect zoning. Auckland Council owns this land parcel.	Change from "water" to Open Space - Conservation Zone	Land is in Auckland council ownership and is an esplanade reserve. It is currently incorrectly shown as "water"	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	St Patricks Square - Between Wyndham and Swanson Streets	Incorrect zoning. Auckland Council owns the piece of land and should be zoned to the correct open space zone to reflect the actual use of the land.	Change the zoning from Open Space – Community zone to Open Space – Civic Spaces zone	Zoning of St Patricks Square is incorrect. It should be Open Space – Civic Spaces which reflects its function and use as a civic space	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	20, 22 & 24 Budock Road, Hillsborough (Lot 1 DP 98350, Lot 1 DP 177671, & Lot 2 DP 177671)	Change in zoning required - Auckland Council has recently acquired the piece of land for a park entrance. Zoning of land should change to reflect actual and appropriate use of land.	Change from Residential – Mixed Housing Suburban zone to Open Space – Conservation zone	Recent acquisition by Auckland Council to widen the entrance to the park from Budock Road. Change of zone reflects the change of land ownership and use of land.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	21A Fearon Avenue, Three Kings (part of) (Lot 52 DP 16446)	Incorrect zoning. Auckland Council owns the piece of land and should be zoned to the correct open space zone to reflect the actual use of the land.	Change from Residential – Mixed Housing Urban Zone to Open Space – Sport & Active Recreation Zone	Accessway to Fearon Park is part of the park and should therefore have the same zoning as the park	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	5 Paisley Place, Mount Wellington (Lot 4 DP 466684)	Incorrect zoning. Privately owned land that is currently zoned as Open Space - Informal Recreation Zone.	Change from Open Space - Informal Recreation Zone to Business - Light Industry Zone	Land is in private ownership and is not an esplanade reserve.	There are consequential changes in the AUP as a result of the proposed amendment. The change is to add the property into I315 Gabador Place Precinct; new zoned property to added into the precinct in AUP GIS Viewer.	Proposed recommendation is in Attachment 33.
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	34 Wiri Station Road & 30 Barrowcliffe Place, Manukau Central (Lot 4 DP 474772 & Lot 3 DP 474772)	Incorrect zoning. Auckland Council owns the reserve land and should be zoned to open space zone to reflect the actual use of the land.	Change from Residential – Mixed Housing Suburban zone to Open Space – Informal Recreation zone	Not all the "reserve" land was zoned to Open Space. Change of zone reflects actual and appropriate land use zoning for the properties.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	27 Retreat Drive, Mangere (Lot 98 DP 334903)	Incorrect zoning. Auckland Council does not own the piece of land and should not be zoned Open Space. It is in private ownership.	Change from Open Space – Conservation zone to Residential – Large Lot zone	Land is in private ownership and not open space. Should have an appropriate residential zoning.	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33
Anomaly	Zone Mapping Error	C1	AUP GIS Viewer (Unitary Plan Zones)	227, 229 & 245 Great South Road, Papatoetoe (Lot 2 DP 127542, Pt Lot 4 DP 38778, Pt Lot 5 DP 38778, Pt Lot 16 DP 4493)	Change in zoning required - Auckland Council has recently acquired a piece of land to add to Papatoetoe Recreation Ground. Zoning of land should change to reflect actual and appropriate use of land.	Change the zoning from Business – Town Centre zone to Open Space – Sport & Active Recreation zone	Land has been purchased by Auckland Council for improvement of the existing open space (Papatoetoe Recreation Ground)	There are no consequential changes on other parts of the AUP.	Attachment 33