

Sub	Submitter	Address	Duplicate	support /oppose	Themes	Speicifc Issues	Hearing	Further Consultation
s 9(2)(a)				Oppose	Height	Height (Block light to 8 Clayton St, Overwhelm the skyline and how the area relates to the Domain)	Yes	No
				Support	Height	Height Control (Great design and space around buildings, provide plenty of looks around to view other Maunga, good use of land resource)	No	No
				Oppose	Volcanic Viewshaft	Increase in height contradicts the Volcanic Viewshaft	Yes	No
				Oppose	Traffic	Vehicle access and parking limit of 500 carparks - Congestion on Morgan St - development at 110 Carlton Core utilises Morgan St as primary access to 117 carparks	Yes	No
				Oppose	Height	Height of Tower C (obscures natural light to s 9(2)(a) and causes privacy issues)	Yes	No
					Traffic	Traffic on Clayton St (not quantified and will increase traffic)		
					Community benefit	Proposed precinct mall (community benefits not supported as 277 a short walk away. Benefits are confined to the residents)		
						Precinct design to reflect the adjacent green zone		
				Oppose	Height	Height - concern the increase in height will affect morning light to Clayton St, Morgan St and George St, Restrict sightlines to Mt Eden and Mt Hobson, further destruction of both local and broader amenity value of area	No	No
					View to Maunga			
					Amenity of area			
				Support in part	The proposed height of building Tower A.	the submitter concurs that it would be appropriate for buildings that comply with the respective height limits in Standard IX6.1 to be assessed as a Restricted Discretionary Activity on a non-notified basis. However, the effect of listing Standard IX.6.1 in Rule A11 would be to enable any application made in future for a building that exceeds the height standards under IX6.1 (without limit) to also be assessed on a non-notified basis as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. The normal notification tests should therefore be applied to any application for additional building height beyond the limits specified in Standard IX.6.1.	Yes	Yes
					RD Activity status for development that does not comply with Standards			
					Precinct Plans	The Precinct Plans in section IX.10 do not provide sufficient certainty of the development outcome within the precinct, and fail to:		
					Setbacks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> define building bulk and location within the precinct; or incorporate the pedestrian circulation routes and building setbacks that are shown on the "Masterplan – Ground Level Circulation" or "Masterplan – Roof Plan"1. In order to rectify those omissions, the submitter is requesting inclusion of a 6m "setback" from the western precinct boundary and the addition of the western pedestrian route to Precinct Plan 2.		
				oppose	Height Tower A	Height - Tower A spoils ambiance of the suburb from visual sun/light/shadow perspective. Otherwise supports height.	No	No
					Apartment size	Apartment size will create slums - apartments should be bigger		
				oppose	Contrary to RMA and AUP	Effects are significant	Yes	No
				oppose	Height	Height - own two properties on Morgan St to the south of the proposed tower and shading will be unacceptable.	Yes	No
					Vehicle and pedestrian access to George St, Morgan st and Clayton St	Morgan St too narrow for cars to pass in two directions development at 110 Carlton Core utilises Morgan St as primary access to 117 carparks		
				oppose	Height	New precinct should not be isolated to three properties and should cover the wider area.	Yes	No
					Traffic	Increasing height will add to traffic congestion which is already high as a result of the Domain and Museum		
				oppose	Conflicts with centre strategy	<p>The current objectives, policies and rules for the Mixed Use zone provide sufficient scope and generality to achieve the objectives and policies of the RPS and create a high quality compact development.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan Change is an expedient proposal to achieve the intensification goals of the applicant which exceed the expectations set out under the RPS and Unitary Plan for this site.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan Change is contrary to the RPS - hierarchy of centres</p> <p>The subject site is not unique as relied upon in the S 32 Analysis.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan Change rationale for amenity based on creating public space through Clayton St is overstated. This is a secondary service street with low amenity space in the context of the building heights proposed and it is not really a high quality pedestrian area through-route to The Domain. Access to The Domain is readily achieved through the current street network. It is unclear whether the plaza has value beyond the subject site.</p> <p>The applicant overstates the reduction in carparking on site as a contribution to Auckland wide transport objectives - 500 carparks propsoed which is large.</p> <p>The S32 Analysis provides no substantial assessment of environmental effects from the proposed change to scale and intensification for this property and its impact beyond the site.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan Change creates a precinct which actually undermines the Mixed Use zoning.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan Change looks to revisit the zoning of the subject site when there appear to be no apparent new issues to have arisen which could alter the outcomes sought for this location than when the Unitary Plan hearings were heard.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan Change has been designed to create a consenting pathway for a specific development.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan Change objectives, policies and rules are so enabling as to be beyond the expectations for development in this area of Newmarket.</p>	Yes	No
					Creates a spot zone			
				oppose	Wastewater infrastructure		Not stated	No
				oppose	Height		Maybe	No
					Traffic			
				oppose	Volcanic Viewshaft	Morgan St and Clayton St struggle to cope with increase in traffic	Yes	No
					Character of the village	Oversupply of office and accomodation in the area		
					traffic	Covid - many buisnesses now workign from hoem so commercial/retail not required, Broadway becoming a ghost town		
					Oversupply of resi/commercial	Block view of Mt Hobson for residents of George St		

s 9(2)(a)

oppose	RMA and practise Inadequate consultation Objectives and Policies Proposed precinct inappropriate Notification provisions Construction effects Height AEE Inadequate Transport Assessment Landscape assessment	Use of PC not in accordance with sound RM practice and the purpose of the precinct could readily be achieved by applying for consent which would allow public participation. Proposal allows applicant to obtain approval for substantial height without an actual proposal - effectively spot zoning of a site. Application does not establish that obs and pols most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act and the provisions are the best way to achieve objectives Application does not establish that a precinct is appropriate for this site or why the height limit should be increased Issues related to public plaza location, access and status Oppose non-notification provisions significant effects on neighbours from construction Oppose increase in height - use of datum is misleading and justification of this approach is inadequate, difference in height between George St frontage and Clayton St not assessed, effects of height increase include dominance, overlooking, wind, shading. Current height limit determined through a recent process, Because of increase height building design is crucial and must be assessed through notified consent, proposal is out of character with existing character and expectations of MU zone. AEE inadequate - not all potential land uses and effects on neighbours assessed, Cumulative retail GFA total could be established on site is unlimited and effects should be established. Legibility through site obscure. Transport assessment deficient as traffic effects of full extent of development haven't been assessed. Inadequate assessment of impacts on landscape and views to and from volcanic cones.	Yes	Yes - Rebecca Macky
Support in part /oppose in part	Height Traffic	On the above basis, The Foundation Village Partnership may or may not support the Proposed Plan Change 44 dependent on: ☐ The concerns noted above regarding potential visual dominance effects of additional height at the site on the Foundation Precinct being adequately addressed; and ☐ Matter of Discretion IX.8.1 (2) providing for broader consideration of the traffic-related effects of additional development density at the site. ☐ Any other relevant consideration that may become apparent as part of receiving further information.	Yes	Yes
Support in part /oppose in part	Height Traffic	On the above basis, The Foundation Village Partnership may or may not support the Proposed Plan Change 44 dependent on: ☐ The concerns noted above regarding potential visual dominance effects of additional height at the site on the Foundation Precinct being adequately addressed; and ☐ Matter of Discretion IX.8.1 (2) providing for broader consideration of the traffic-related effects of additional development density at the site. ☐ Any other relevant consideration that may become apparent as part of receiving further information.	Yes	Yes
Oppose	Significant departure from AUP Bad design Proposal does not address water supply, wastewater Is the proposal appropriate post covid/ towers will be a breeding ground for a pandemic		Yes	No
Oppose	Height	Towers will be out of character with neighbourhood. Unnecessary to create retail precinct in close proximity to the Domain - retail sector should be concentrated around 277 and Osbourne and Nuffield Streets	No	No
Oppose	PC process vs RC process Volcanic viewshafts Traffic construction effects Use of George St Datum Height Access to public open space Stormwater systems	1) NHDLP can gain approval for the proposal by submitting a Resource Consent and following the planning processes everyone else does. 2) The proposed Plan Change directly conflicts with the Volcanic View Shafts 3) The traffic effects are unclear and are much more than minor. 4) The effects of construction on the general area are significantly understated and are likely to be much more than minor. 5) The use of the George St Datum understates the actual height of the development 6) The maximum height of the development is double what is provided for in the District Plan and is out of proportion with developments in the general that have been done over the last 20 years (e.g. the old Abels site on Carlton Gore Rd, developments along Broadway, the developments in the Kingdon St area and more recently the developments in Margaret St and on Carlton Gore Rd and in the Foundation Precinct. 7) Access to the area designated as Public Space is unclear and the protection of access to this space is unclear thus making it at risk of not being made available as the Plan Change implies. Height out of context - impacts centre hierarchy. Not opposed to additional height to offset the public good elements but submit this should be lower. Height gives rise to landscape effects Visual dominance and privacy effects - oppose outlook infringements being exempt from notification Shading - will shade submitter property Traffic - concerned about safety and efficiency of intersections at Morgan St and Clayton St	Yes	No
Oppose	PC process vs RC process Height Traffic	See above	Yes	No

s 9(2)(a)

Oppose	Height	Stick with AUP rules	NO	No
Oppose	Height	Height - will impact sunlight to property.	No	No
	Traffic	Traffic - already large traffic volume on George St and Carlton Gore Road Not sufficient infrastructure to cope with building this size Development should only be residential		
Supports	Traffic Parking	Auckland Transport generally supports PPC44 subject to: • The potential adverse transport effects of the plan change being no greater than those currently enabled by the AUP; • The resolution of Auckland Transport's concerns as outlined in this submission, including in Attachment 1.	Yes	Yes
		Proposed amendments to precinct description, objectives and policies in relation to traffic effects. Seek infringements to carparking standard to be subject to notification tests See pedestrian connection to be accessible 7 days a week including public holidays Support number of carparks Additional assessment criteria for vehicle access to address potential mitigation of pedestrian facilities along Morgan St. Amend precinct provisions to address potential effects associated with worse case traffic generation scenario.		
Oppose	Height Amenity Increased Traffic Lack of consultation Ad hoc basis	Height - building will dominate community, overlook other buildings and is not in keeping with zone or AUP. Current height limit is appropriate. Visual/landscape assessment is deficient in relation to urban character amenity values. In sufficient carparking where will additional cars park as street parking is 100% utilised in business hours. Concern about increase in traffic flows particularly in ACG school zone. No consultation.	Yes	No
Oppose	Size and bulk Traffic Circumventing RC process	Size and bulk - loss of light and wind effects Construction effects will be significant and without notification no ability for neighbours to get involved. Public benefit of plaza/walkway overstated. Danger to school children at ACG college - Morgan St will not cope with 500 + additional cars Proposed structure will dominate the Domain and views of the Museum. Height is out of character and will cause additional shading of property.	Yes	No
Oppose	Height		Maybe	No
Oppose	See Parkwood	See Parkwood	Yes	No
	Need for precinct height notification Visual landscape assessment urban character and amenity values traffic consultation consistency with RPS	The Objectives of PC44 can all be achieved through the resource consent process. Precincts are utilised in the AUP to enable local differences to be recognised. The proposed George Street Precinct has no special or differing characteristics to the rest of the Zone, with similar aspect, land uses, and topography. The increased height would be incongruous with the surrounding neighbourhood and Zone, which was established during the AUP process because of its homogeneous characteristics of slope, height, and aspect. the George Street datum used throughout PC44 is at odds with that used in the rest of the Zone. This creates a false impression of the real heights compared with the rest of AUP and compared to the Zone The proposed precinct provisions provide for further increases in height above the standards as a restricted discretionary consent, without public or limited notification. Many of the proposed new rules in the activity table are either unnecessary or inappropriate for the Zone. For example, A7 and A8 are identical to the Zone provisions so should not be duplicated; A11 provides for increased height as a non-notified restricted discretionary application. the proposed precinct provisions provide for consents for activities in the Activity Table (in particular A11 height) to be considered without notification. This is inappropriate considering the context of the site, the already considerable exceedance of the Zone heights proposed, and considering the existing Zone provisions already provide for additional height via the height variation control. The standards proposed are not appropriate as the effects have not been appropriately assessed. Many of the criteria, especially those relating to urban design, would be more suited to a design guide for the precinct. Generally, the visual/landscape montages are assessed from locations that are significant distances from the site Urban character and amenity values. This is a major issue for those living close to the applicant's sites and have not been assessed appropriately. The Integrated Transportation Assessment Report is deficient. The report determines traffic generation based on the restricted car parking environment in the proposal. This would appear to be flawed. The report loosely refers to the existence of two train stations being 800m away. These are at the outer perimeter of the walking catchment from the proposed precinct consultation on the proposal is best practice but this has not been undertaken. The RPS is a strategic document the purpose of which is to provide an overview of the resource management issues of the region and achieve integrated management of the natural and physical resources of the whole region – it is not a document aimed at providing guidance to individual, piecemeal development proposals.	Yes	No
Oppose	Height Traffic	Tower A height is 2x height of tallest building in zone. It will be visible from museum forecourt affecting heritage and community value of museum front lawn. Sun diagrams are misleading ITA based on out of date transport information and ignores recent developments and contains incorrect information on Morgan St widths. Development will increase congestion and delay. Development better handles as a resource consent.	Yes	No

s 9(2)(a)

Oppose	Respect for Domain, Museum and Ceotaph precinct Traffic	The bulk and scale of the proposed development opening on to George Street are an affront to this highly sensitive area. The scale of the proposed development is out of all proportion to its neighbourhood; there is no way the impact of a development of this scale can be mitigated. Traffic pressure on these three precinct streets from a development of the scale proposed would be unsustainable.	Yes	No
Oppose	Height Traffic	Height out of character for area. Proposal will create traffic congestion.	Yes	No
Oppose	Height	Height is out of character would support heights of: Tower A: 10 levels including 2 in basement (8+2=10) Tower B: 7 levels including 2 in basement (5+2=7) Tower C: 10 levels including 4 in basement (6+4=10) Tower D: 7 levels including 2 in basement (5+2+7) Concern with loss of protected site line to Mt Hobson and Mt Eden and direct morning sun light into rear bedrooms	No	No
Oppose	RMA and practise Inadequate consultation Objectives and Policies Propsoed precinct inappropriate Notification provisions Cosntuction effects Height AEE Inadequate Transport Assessment Landscape assessment	This use of the plan change process for the proposed development is not in accordance with sound resource management practice. The purpose of the precinct could be readily be achieved by applying for resource consent/s. That would allow for public participation. The notified plan change option enables the applicant to obtain approval for substantial height without the scrutiny of an actual proposal. This is effectively spot zoning of a site that is much less than 1ha in area. The applicant has failed to satisfactorily explain why a precinct should be identified for this particular site or why the height limit should be increased. The establishment of a public plaza appears to be the primary justification for the application of a precinct to the site but this is unlikely to act as a true public space. In PC44, non-notification applies to all Restricted Discretionary (RD) activities listed in the precinct s activity table (including infringements of nominated standards). This is inappropriate because it will prevent scrutiny and input by neighbours, other interested parties and the general public regarding an actual development proposal Consultation has been inadequate, and non-existent The use of the George Street Datum means that the heights proposed in PC44 are misleading and differ from the basis for determining the height of buildings in almost every other part of the City. The effects of the potential 10m height difference between the George Street frontage and the southern end of Height Area A generated by the George Street Datum have not been identified or assessed. The effects of the increased height are potentially adverse, and include dominance, overlooking, wind and shading (considerable to the south). The existing 27m height limit applying to the site under the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUIP) has been determined through the Unitary Plan process Height - visual dominance of tower A. Tower block will cause shading, loss of views, inetrferece with horizons , affect heritage values of public spaces (Domain and Museum). Inaccurate shading effects Protection of volcanic viewshaft - tikanga maori no adequately considered. Shortfall of carparking - proposed apartments will be low cost Traffic assessment out of date - traffic congestion in immediate area increased as a result of recent development, width of George St and Morgan St not correct, significantly increase congestion, No footpath on adjoining Domain area so not a natural pathway. Development better considered as a consent	Not stated	No
Oppose	Height Volcanic Viewshaft Traffic RC vs PC		Yes	No
Oppose	Height Constuction effects Cumulative retail GFA Traffic issues Auckland Domain	1. The effects of the increased height are potentially adverse, and include dominance, overlooking, wind and shading. 2. the construction effects (such as traffic, noise, vibration, water pollution, smell, dust and fire hazard) which are likely to have significant adverse impacts on the owners and occupiers of nearby properties for an abnormally long period of time. 3. The cumulative total of retail Gross Floor Area that could be established on the site is unlimited. Therefore, the population gaining access to this area in future (as well as the consequential effect) is also unable to quantify. 4. The traffic issues (including spill over street parking) of the full extent of potential development on the site have not been addressed. 5. Auckland Domain is Auckland s oldest park and is one of the largest in the city. It is the extinct cone of Pukekawa volcano and has an extensive history of Maori and European use. Any plan change in the surrounding areas should be denied unless it is proven absolutely necessary. PC44 hasn t yet been able to justify its need in this regard. Traffic flows in Morgan St and its current width will lead it to become one way. Concern about apartment size - low amenity Noise and amenity effects from food and beverage precinct with unlimited activities and hours of operation Height is out of character and be clearly visible from Devonport. Non notification rule not appropriate or acceptable construction effects likely to be significant.	Not stated	No
Oppose	Height Constuction effects amenity Traffic issues Non notation provisions		Yes	No
Oppose	Height Traffic	Height oo big for area and will shadow east and north side of George St Will create a wind tunnel Increase congestion, dangerous to pedestrians and parking is already difficult	Yes	No

s 9(2)(a)

Oppose	Height Traffic	Support up to 35m but 65m is too high. the size of the development would block the morning sun (the only sun on our side of the building) for the apartments that do not face the Domain (Carlton Gore and Morgan St facing units.) George, Morgan and Clayton streets are very small and narrow and traffic during rush hour and parking are already a challenge.	Yes	No
Oppose	Height Certainty of effects Landscape analysis Urban outcome Shading Dominance including cumulative effects Urban design elements Services includign Transport Network Capcity	Height: Adverse effects on s 9(2)(a) dominance, shading and residential amenity. Shading analysis on submitters site is limited and no mitigation is proposed for additional shading effects. Proposal is vague in terms of built envelope and design parameters. Concept desing exceeds Plan Change envelope which is already excessive compared to AUP. Viewpoints chosen are illogical. Relying solely on the land ownership rather than considering the appropriate urban outcome for the block or even a portion of this block is not a good enough reason to support this ad-hoc approach and definitely does not outweigh the uncertainty and vagueness that arise from the proposal relative to immediately adjoining neighbours such as the Submitter s site. The assessment of urban design effects on the submitters site and all other immediately adjoining sites within the wider block is nominal in the plan change. The Plan Change is unclear in respect of how the current function of Clayton Street may be impacted and the consequential effects on the use and access of the submitters site and others on Clayton Street. Concern about pushing infratsurcture effects assessmen to the resource consenting stage. The 27m height limit has been well-tested through that plan making process. Concern about limiting future engagement opportunities with the proposed notification provisions. Allowing further height infreingments as an RDA non-notified is inappropriate.	Yes	No
Oppose	Height Certainty of effects Landscape analysis Urban outcome Shading Dominance including cumulative effects Urban design elements Services includign Transport Network Capcity	Height: Adverse effects on s 9(2)(a) dominance, built character and residential amenity. Shading analysis on submitters site is limited and no mitigation is proposed for additional shading effects. Proposal is vague in terms of built envelope and design parameters. Concept desing exceeds Plan Change envelope which is already excessive compared to AUP. Viewpoints chosen are illogical. Relying solely on the land ownership rather than considering the appropriate urban outcome for the block or even a portion of this block is not a good enough reason to support this ad-hoc approach and definitely does not outweigh the uncertainty and vagueness that arise from the proposal relative to immediately adjoining neighbours such as the Submitter s site. The assessment of urban design effects on the submitters site and all other immediately adjoining sites within the wider block is nominal in the plan change. The Plan Change is unclear in respect of how the current function of Clayton Street may be impacted and the consequential effects on the use and access of the submitters site and others on Clayton Street. Concern about pushing infratsurcture effects assessmen to the resource consenting stage. The 27m height limit has been well-tested through that plan making process. Concern about limiting future engagement opportunities with the proposed notification provisions. Allowing further height infringsments as an RDA non-notified is inappropriate.	Yes	No
Oppose	Height Certainty of effects Landscape analysis Urban outcome Shading Dominance including cumulative effects Urban design elements Services includign Transport Network Capcity	Height: Adverse effects on s 9(2)(a) dominance, built character and residential amenity. Dominance issues will be excaerbrated to the properties to the south west due to the topography. Proposal is vague in terms of built envelope and design parameters. Concept desing exceeds Plan Change envelope which is already excessive compared to AUP. Viewpoints chosen are illogical. Relying solely on the land ownership rather than considering the appropriate urban outcome for the block or even a portion of this block is not a good enough reason to support this ad-hoc approach and definitely does not outweigh the uncertainty and vagueness that arise from the proposal relative to immediately adjoining neighbours such as the Submitter s site. The assessment of urban design effects on the submitters site and all other immediately adjoining sites within the wider block is nominal in the plan change. The Plan Change is unclear in respect of how the current function of Morgan Street may be impacted and the consequential effects on the use and access of the submitters site and others on Morgan Street. Concern about pushing infratsurcture effects assessmen to the resource consenting stage. The 27m height limit has been well-tested through that plan making process. Concern about limiting future engagement opportunities with the proposed notification provisions. Allowing further height infringsments as an RDA non-notified is inappropriate.	Yes	No

s 9(2)(a)

Oppose	Height Certainty of effects Landscape analysis Urban outcome Shading Dominance including cumulative effects Urban design elements Services including Transport Network Capacity	<p>Height: Adverse effects § 9(2)(a) dominance, built character and residential amenity. having analysis on submitters site is limited and no mitigation is proposed for additional shading effects.</p> <p>Proposal is vague in terms of built envelope and design parameters. Concept design exceeds Plan Change envelope which is already excessive compared to AUP.</p> <p>Viewpoints chosen are illogical.</p> <p>Relying solely on the land ownership rather than considering the appropriate urban outcome for the block or even a portion of this block is not a good enough reason to support this ad-hoc approach and definitely does not outweigh the uncertainty and vagueness that arise from the proposal relative to immediately adjoining neighbours such as the Submitter's site.</p> <p>The assessment of urban design effects on the submitters site and all other immediately adjoining sites within the wider block is nominal in the plan change.</p> <p>The Plan Change is unclear in respect of how the current function of Clayton Street may be impacted and the consequential effects on the use and access of the submitters site and others on Clayton Street.</p> <p>Concern about pushing infrastructure effects assessment to the resource consenting stage.</p> <p>The 27m height limit has been well-tested through that plan making process.</p> <p>Concern about limiting future engagement opportunities with the proposed notification provisions.</p> <p>Allowing further height infringements as an RDA non-notified is inappropriate.</p>	Yes	No
Oppose	Wastewater and stormwater infrastructure	Insufficient downstream capacity in the sewerage and stormwater drainage infrastructure will inevitably lead to an increase in wet weather overflows of sewerage to the receiving environment (stream and Waitaramoa/Hobson Bay).	Yes	No
Oppose	Height	height limit too tall for the area. It will create a wind tunnel and block light to adjacent buildings.	Yes	No
Oppose	Height Method for measuring height Views to Maunga Amend objectives and policies to elicitly avoid the effects on the backdrop of the Auckland War Memorial Museum and Cenotaph when viewed from afar Infringements to height control a non-complying activity 24/7 access to plaza Standard to require active edges Standard to require pedestrian connection and plaza not to be enclosed Include policy and standards to protect daylight and sunlight access to the proposed public plaza and protect the plaza from wind funnelling or deflection from buildings. Delete notification provisions Minor tidy up changes	<p>Height is opposed on the basis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">o the effect on the human scale of the environment including shading and dominanceo the relative efficiency of built formo inconsistency of built form with the surrounding Business – Mixed Use Zoneo inappropriate transition in built form from Newmarket through to The Domaino inappropriate building height in the context of The Domain, the Auckland War Memorial Museum and Cenotaph, and the status of Pukekawa as a maungao use of a horizontal height datum rather than height following the landform of Pukekawao precedent and cumulative effects of built form in the zone and around The Domain. <p>The proposed tower spacing, and other related precinct controls, do not fully mitigate shading and dominance effects of extra height in a future residential or mixed-use area. Shading and dominance effects may remain significant both within the precinct and the surrounding environment.</p> <p>The proposed precinct is not in or adjoining the Newmarket centre. Consequently, the proposed additional precinct height is inconsistent with the role of the Business - Mixed Use Zone in providing a transition in built form height between centres and other zones (in this case open space zones).</p> <p>The precinct includes land that is part of the outside tuff ring or volcanic cone of the maunga Pukekawa.</p> <p>It is also important to mana whenua that culturally significant views between the tops of maunga are retained even if they are not specifically scheduled in as an official viewshaft in the AUP. The extra height enabled by PC44 in the precinct enables buildings that could block views of some of the maunga such as Maungakiekie from Pukekawa as indicated in the application material. This needs to be assessed for viewing points from Pukekawa to other maunga.</p> <p>There is nothing that significantly differentiates the statutory, physical or human environment of the proposed precinct site, in relation to the surrounding Business – Mixed Use zoned land.</p> <p>The proposed precinct also sets a precedent for allowing tall buildings further to the west in the zone around the south eastern edge of The Domain.</p> <p>The council believes that such major precedent setting changes could have significant adverse and cumulative effects, the implications of which have not been appropriately assessed in PC44.</p> <p>The proposed introductory clause to Table IX.4.1 implies that the AUP overlays do not apply to activities listed in the activity table.</p>		Yes - Nick to discuss the decision to put in submission with JD. Is this just to expand scope.
Oppose	Volcanic Viewshafts RC Process	<p>Plan change exceeds the volcanic viewshaft.</p> <p>Allowing this Plan Change gives the impression to developers they can gain approval and then change their original approval so a conflict with the AUP arises.</p> <p>Allowing the Plan Change creates a precedent</p>	Yes	No
Oppose	Height Area A Spot zoning Assessment of amenity values Assessment of traffic parking shortage Construction noise	<p>the Site will potentially experience significant shading, dominance and other visual amenity effects from a future development on Height Area A.</p> <p>The proposed building heights for PC44 are disproportionate within the PC44 area and the wider environment. Further, the building heights for the PC44 area were recently considered during the formation of the AUP.</p> <p>PC44 is restricted to property owned by Newmarket Holdings Development Ltd Partnership and is in effect a spot zoning application.</p> <p>PC44 inadequately assesses the adverse effects on amenity values that PC44 will have on the Site, which 33 Broadway considers will be significant.</p> <p>PC44 inadequately assesses the adverse traffic safety and efficiency effects on the Site and wider road users.</p> <p>PC44 has the potential to create substantial parking shortages in the area, given the proposal to limit the number of car parking spaces in the George Street Precinct.</p> <p>Concerns as to how construction noise and vibration, construction traffic and the general construction methodology (particularly in relation to the construction of any building within Height Area A) will adversely affect the Site, particularly over an extended period of time.</p>	Yes	No

s 9(2)(a)

Oppose	1 The increased height provided for in the Proposed Plan Change. 2 The impact on the character and amenity of the area 3 The increased traffic problems 4 Lack of consultation	Height: Excessive for local environment, dominate the local community, height is at odds with the rest of the zone. Visual/landscape assessment is deficient. Concerns with the increase in traffic and parking shortages Applicant has not engaged with the community.	Not stated	No
Oppose	height Volcanic Viewshafts Broader visual connections between the Maunga	N/A The Authority is concerned that the proposed method of calculating height relative may result in a building height above the floor of the Regionally Significant Volcanic Viewshaft E8 to Maungawhau. Beyond the Regionally Significant Volcanic Viewshaft E8 to Maungawhau the Authority is concerned there is no discussion on the impact on Maungawhau's profile, legibility, or effect on perceived anchoring within the surrounding landscape. Similarly, when viewed from Maungauika, the building would be visible from different locations, particularly along the eastern and southern sides of the maunga. A singular static presentation is provided and it is unclear if different perspectives have been considered and assessed. There is no assessment on maunga to maunga views.	No Yes	No Yes should consider meeting authority to discuss outcomes of Iwi consultation to date.
Oppose	Height Traffic precinct extent	The Proposed Plan Change is so permissive as to not provide within it, any checks and balances to ensure the purposes and principles of the RMA are met and also the Objectives and Policies of the AUP. The Proposed Plan Change does not detail the environmental effects possible from the increase in scale and intensity of development on this site, including visual dominance effects, shadowing, traffic generation. The proposed Plan Change introduces a new height of 55m (65 total) which is inappropriate in this location. There are many diverse sites in the mixed use zone which display similar characteristics to the subject site. The reason for the collective size of this land is only aggregation of landholdings by the owner.	Yes	No
Oppose	(1) There is no need for a plan change in relation to the objectives and policy direction sought for the zone. (2) The appropriateness of the new Precinct being located	Safety concerns in relation to schools, Birthcare and Blind Foundation from increase in traffic. Morgan Street is a small narrow street between Carlton Gore and George. Vehicle movement is often difficult to such an extent that last one of the owners/residents contacted the Council to see if Morgan Street could be made one way. The proposed height of the towers in PC44 is out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood which has been developing into a pleasant mixed use area and is at odds with attractive urban	Not stated	No
Oppose	Negative effect of PC44	N/A	No	No