

**Summary of Submissions: Plan Modification 163 –Plan Change.
Residential 1 and 2 zones**

Submission Name	No	Scope	Relief requested
South Epsom Planning Group	1		Implementation of proposed plan change 163 as notified.
R M Mackay	2		To change front yard wall/fence height restrictions to be measurable from property side NOT footpath side, to accommodate situations where they also act as retaining wall.
Mr and Mrs K and M Whaley	3/1		Withdrawal/deletion of the plan change in its entirety.
	3/2		In the event that the above is not achieved the submitters seek alterations to the plan change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the extent of the protection sought by the plan change to identified conservation streets based on appropriate field and history research.
	3/3		In the event that the above is not achieved the submitters seek alterations to the plan change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treatment of design consideration in the same manner as the general tree protection controls without consent fees and without a notified resource consent process.
	3/4		In the event that the above is not achieved the submitters seek alterations to the plan change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of constraints to fencing of street boundaries or providing for other fencing styles consistent with or complimentary to the architecture in a manner which is not notified with appropriate guidelines.
	3/5		Fast-tracking of resource consents without third party involvement
R D and F W Sheffield	4		Request that this plan change be withdrawn in its entirety.
J and J A Phillips	5		A decision upholding the proposed plan modification.

S D Mitchell	6/1		[relates to demolition/removal of buildings constructed prior to 1940] The Council should not proceed with the proposed provision change.
	6/2		If the Council is to reduce the rights of individuals in favour of neighbourhoods by implementing this provision, I believe they should be across the board changes, throughout the city, and not victimise a small group of home owners in Residential 1 & 2 zones.
	7/1		[relates to proposed status of external additions and alterations] The Council should not proceed with the proposed provision change.
	7/2		If the Council is to reduce the rights of individuals in favour of neighbourhoods by implementing this provision, I believe they should be across the board changes, throughout the city, and not victimise a small group of home owners in Residential 1 & 2 zones.
D W Waugh	8		Reject the modification to the plan in its entirety.
D Boothe	9		Accept. Allow a maximum of at least 1.8m solid fence, as long as the fence is in keeping with the style of the house.
E A Doran	10		I support the changes in the hope that they will help the council to maintain character in other areas.
C Ross and E A Corbett	11		The council has no right to enforce picket fencing onto the properties in Herne Bay. 2 mtres high fences, of solid build etc. should remain as is.
David Haigh: Grafton Residents Association	12		We support all the proposed changes to the provisions.
D B Fraser	13		Decline. That the proposed changes in plan change 163 for residential zone 2 are declined.
M Sowter	14	Outside scope	Request that Claude Road, Epsom be included in Plan Change 163.

H Harvey	15		Accept
K Ovenden	16		[relates to the proposed fencing provisions in the residential 2 zone] The height limit should be 1.8m.
C J Watts	17		The entire proposal be declined and totally redrafted. Excluding fencing conditions being left at a 2.00 metre height.
Charles Kelly Estate and Mrs M Kelly	18/1		Objection to the provision that the demolition or removal of any building constructed before 1940 will require consent as a restricted discretionary activity.
	18/2		Object to the proposal that external additions and alterations to existing buildings in the zone require resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity.
H Mortland	19		I feel this should not be at the expense of homeowners, rather instead funded through the increasing rate bills that homeowners occur each and every year.
Rod Simpson Family Trust	20		I disagree with this decision to change 163.
R Simpson	21/1		I strongly disagree with the decision to pursue changes to plan 163.
	21/2		Fencing should be above 1.4m to protect the house occupants.
Mr G A Webster	22		Get rid of the resource consent requirement.
Sterling Nominees Limited	23	Outside scope	Valuation Act amended to ensure that the land value with its limitation and also in respect of historic places be not valued as if there was no building erected on the land.
Samson Corporation	24		

P Pohlen	25		Wish to oppose the changes proposed. The existing provisions are working very well.
O Anderson	26		Leave well alone.
O Mackersey	27		[relates to Residential 2 zone] Accept with amendments. Increase wall/fence height to at least 1.8m.
L A Flynn	28		Decline. That the entire proposed plan change (No 168) be declined and a more acceptable level and method of preservation be considered.
G C Gillard and Family	29		To prevent monstrosities being erected without neighbours consideration.
Dr L Robins and Mrs J Robins	30		In order to encourage owners of properties built before 1940 to maintain their properties in a manner in keeping with the form of the surrounding built environment that Council: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. apply a rate levy reduction to all houses in the Residential 1 and Residential 2 zones built before 1940; and 2. consider making available grants toward the cost of major rehabilitation work proposed on such properties; and 3. consider providing interest free loans to owners who wish to undertake major work to maintain or rehabilitate their home.
K and S Nicol H Burke and S McTaggart	31/1 32/1		[relating to proposed changes to Parts 7.2-7.6 of the Isthmus District Plan] Accept with amendments. We seek acceptance of these provisions.
	31/2		[relating to proposed changes to 7.7.4.3] We seek an amendment to the first bullet point as follows: The form, mass, proportion and scale of the building shall be compatible with the special character of the street and, where appropriate, the original architectural style predominating in the street, and shall not ignore, compete or dominate that character (delete remaining words or relocate as information requirements).

K and S Nicol H Burke and S McTaggart	31/3		<p>We seek the following amendment to 6.2.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The house should be designed to reflect the form, mass, proportion and materials of the buildings in the immediate vicinity. Sensitive detailing can be used in conjunction with the more generic issues of form, mass and proportion to produce a contemporary design that responds to, but does not compete with the special character and pattern of development. The effect on streetscape will be an important consideration, and attention to all aspects of appearance from the street is critical, especially the use of materials and detailing. If the building being demolished is a period home, the design of the new building should also take into account this building.
H Burke and S McTaggart	32/2		<p>[relating to proposed changes to 7.7.4.1] We seek the following amendment. In the residential 1 zone, as a consequence of the design criteria and guidelines, new buildings and external additions or alterations to existing buildings will be designed and located in a manner which respects and relates positively to the surviving physical and architectural character of the neighbourhood.</p>
	32/3		<p>[relating to proposed changes to 7.7.4.1] Insert additional paragraph as follows: External additions or alterations to existing buildings will be designed and located in a manner that retains architectural integrity. Where possible, external additions and alterations will also be designed and located in a manner which respects and relates positively to the surviving original physical and architectural character of the neighbourhood.</p>
	32/4		<p>[relating to proposed Architectural Design Guidelines] We seek the addition of further explanatory material on roof additions to square-fronted villas, showing how to simultaneously achieve an harmonious result in terms of the integrity of the existing house and protection of special character in the area.</p>
S Ecclestone	33		<p>Accept with amendments. I want the building restrictions proposed to be amended. I want the height restrictions on boundary fence/wall to be either eliminated or the maximum height of fence/wall to be raised to 1.9 metres.</p>

R Norman and J A Johnson	34		The proposed plan modification accepted in its entirety.
R Walton: Walton Architects Limited	35		Accept with amendments. That substantial new building work within Residential 1 and 2 zones should be judged by a different set of criteria. That such building work should not be judged as to materials, details and window ratio/proportion..... That this should include new buildings and new additions that are suitable articulated from the original so as not to detract from that original.
S Wood	36	Outside scope	That Robley Crescent should not be included in the plan change.
W Walker and P Beattie	37/1		We do not support the proposal as it currently stands. The wording should be more precise so as to avoid arbitrary and unfair application of the plan in different areas.
	37/2		We do not support the proposal that pre-1940 buildings in Zone 2 areas require resource consent before removal or demolition. This requirement is not relevant to Zone 2.
J Eady: International Society of Divine Love.	38	Outside scope	We oppose our property being designated as being in the "character" zone with all the consequent regulations.
K Oldham	39/1		Amended Clause 4.3.1.2 (Front Fence) I request the following clause is deleted: The wall, fence or other structure has sufficient visual permeability so that outlook from the street to the traditional spaciousness and landscape qualities of the front yard is maintained and
	39/2		Clause 7.5.1 I request the following changes: 1. Insert the word "may" before " include" in the introduction of the list in Clause 5.5.1 2. Delete "transparent and interactive relationship between building and street"

K Oldham	39/3		<p>Clause 7.6.2.1 and 7.7.4.3S</p> <p>I request the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove the word "indigenous" from the following reference to replacement planting of indigenous trees. [7.6.2.1] 2. Remove the following clause: By ensuring that the spacious and well-landscaped front yards which are typical of land in this zone retain a reasonable degree of visibility from the street.[7.7.4.3S]
	39/4		If Plan Change 163 is modified as I have requested above I would fully support it.
E C Bye	40		Oppose new control on front yard fence height in the residential 2 zone
Dr G C Bye	41		[relating to plan change provision for front yard height in Residential 2 zone] Decline.
S R Anderson and J L Anderson	43/1	Outside scope	That the proposed Change in so far as it applies to the Glendowie area be declined.
	43/2		Rather than imposing a blanket change, where houses of a particular heritage or interest exist that they be specifically identified.
Alders and Company Limited	44		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed plan change would not offer any compensation or relief. • The proposed plan change would adversely effect the owners of properties zoned residential 2, by removing their present right to erect non-permeable front yard fences/walls and gates to a height of two metres. • The proposed plan modification would effectively blanket all residential 1 and residential 2 zoned land. <p>The submitter seeks that the provisions of the proposed plan change be amended to address the concerns referred to in this submission.</p>
Preventing Injury Through Action. Driveway Run-over Prevention Group	45		Address concerns regarding the implications of the proposed change to the District Plan regarding the placement of garages on Residential 1 and 2 properties. We believe that this would encourage homeowners to install long driveways and garages at the rear of their sections, which would in turn increase the risk of driveway run-over injuries to small children.
	74		

Auckland City Council	46/1		The submission seeks to address three issues relating to the proposed plan modification as notified. The first is to clarify the meaning of “substantial demolition” so that the word “substantial” is able to be measured, and to ensure that the recommended threshold of 30% addresses multiple applications for demolition.
	46/2		The second is to remove the word “residential” in relation to demolition so that it applies to any building on the site except for an accessory building.
	46/3		The third addresses additional assessment criteria for external alterations to ensure that effects relating to demolition are considered if the demolition is below the recommended 30% threshold.
	46/4		Amend clause 3 of the plan modification as follows: 3. <i>Insert the following subclause immediately under the heading of clause 4.3.2.6 RESTRICTED DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITIES:</i> <i>Except as provided for by Section 94C(2) of the Act, the normal tests for non-notification under sections 93 and 94 of the Act will apply to the following discretionary activities:</i> <i>The total or substantial demolition or removal (more than 30% by volume) of any residential building (excluding accessory buildings) constructed prior to 1940 in the Residential 1, 2a, 2b and 2c zones.</i> <i>The Council will restrict the exercise of its discretion for those matters specified in the Plan for these particular activities. <u>The 30% threshold applies to the combined volume of demolition of any building after 29 May 2005.</u></i>
	46/5		Amend clause 10 of the plan modification as follows: <i>The total or substantial demolition or removal of buildings (more than 30% by volume and excluding accessory buildings) is controlled so that consideration can be given to the extent the building contributes to the special characteristics and qualities of the streetscape. <u>Demolition or removal below this threshold will be considered as an external alteration.</u> The exclusion of accessory buildings from this provision does not extend to the demolition of an accessory building on a property scheduled (i.e site and surrounds) in the Plan. Refer to clause 5C.7.1.3 for such accessory buildings.</i>

Auckland City Council	46/6		<p>Amend clause 13 of the plan modification as follows:</p> <p><i>The total or substantial demolition or removal of buildings (more than 30% by volume and excluding accessory buildings) is controlled so that consideration can be given to the extent the building contributes to the special characteristics and qualities of the streetscape. <u>Demolition or removal below this threshold will be considered as an external alteration.</u> The exclusion of accessory buildings from this provision does not extend to the demolition/removal of an accessory building on a property scheduled (i.e site and surrounds) in the Plan. Refer to clause 5C.7.1.3 for such accessory buildings.</i></p>											
	46/7		<p>Amend table under clause 15 of the plan modification as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="846 598 1989 890"> <tr> <td data-bbox="846 598 1220 890"><i>The total or substantial demolition or removal (more than 30% by volume) of any building (excluding accessory buildings) constructed prior to 1940 in the Residential 1, 2a, 2b and 2c zones</i></td> <td data-bbox="1220 598 1317 890"><i>D**</i></td> <td data-bbox="1317 598 1413 890"><i>D**</i></td> <td data-bbox="1413 598 1487 890">-</td> <td data-bbox="1487 598 1561 890">-</td> <td data-bbox="1561 598 1635 890">-</td> <td data-bbox="1635 598 1709 890">-</td> <td data-bbox="1709 598 1783 890">-</td> <td data-bbox="1783 598 1856 890">-</td> <td data-bbox="1856 598 1930 890">-</td> <td data-bbox="1930 598 1989 890">-</td> </tr> </table>	<i>The total or substantial demolition or removal (more than 30% by volume) of any building (excluding accessory buildings) constructed prior to 1940 in the Residential 1, 2a, 2b and 2c zones</i>	<i>D**</i>	<i>D**</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>The total or substantial demolition or removal (more than 30% by volume) of any building (excluding accessory buildings) constructed prior to 1940 in the Residential 1, 2a, 2b and 2c zones</i>	<i>D**</i>	<i>D**</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				
	46/8		<p>Amend clause 20 of the plan modification as follows:</p> <p><i>The effects on the special character of a streetscape are an important consideration in the Residential 1 and 2 zones. To help protect this special character, the total or substantial demolition or removal (more than 30% by volume) of any building (excluding any accessory building) constructed prior to 1940, has been made a Discretionary activity in these zones. The Council has restricted the exercise of its discretion to those matters specified. This will allow the Council to consider the historic qualities of the building as well as the effect of the demolition or removal on the architectural qualities and special characteristics of the streetscape and surrounding area. <u>Demolition or removal below this threshold will be considered as an external alteration.</u></i></p>											

Auckland City Council	46/9		<p>Amend clause 21 of the plan modification, additional assessment criteria U as follows:</p> <p><i>U. Demolition or removal of buildings (more than 30% by volume and excluding accessory buildings) constructed prior to 1940 in the Residential 1, 2a, 2b and 2c zones</i></p> <p><i>In considering an application to demolish (either totally or substantially) or remove any building (excluding any accessory building) constructed prior to 1940, the Council must be satisfied that the objectives and policies for the zone have been met.</i></p>
	46/10		<p>Amend clause 21 of the plan modification, additional assessment criteria Q and S which relate to assessment criteria for alterations in the Residential 1 and 2 zones by adding the following assessment criteria to both:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Where the external alteration involves the demolition or removal of less than 30% by volume of an existing building constructed prior to 1940, the extent to which the demolition or removal of the building will detract from the continuity and streetscape as a whole.</u> • <u>Where the external alteration involves the demolition or removal of less than 30% by volume of an existing building constructed prior to 1940, whether any historical qualities and original design features of the existing building remain.</u>
Auckland Regional Council	47/1		<p>Clause 7, page 5 Amend the last bullet point to read <i>"controls on demolition <u>and removal of buildings.</u>"</i></p>
	47/2		<p>Clause 7 Page 5 The wording of the first and last sentence of the final paragraph should be strengthened to reflect the proposed enhancements to the provisions, which now focus on protection rather than preservation. For instance under Clause 8, page 5 it states the controls are applied to protect the particular elements and qualities: <i>The Plan does not intend that properties in the special character be kept from change...Rather it is intended that the elements or qualities that give the zones their uniqueness be retained as afar as practicable during the development of an area, and that the development as a whole is sympathetic to, and respects, such elements, ensuring that the special character of the area is retained.</i></p>

Auckland Regional Council	47/3		Clause 24, part Q, bullet point 4. Amend to read: <i>'Changes to the street frontages of an...'</i>
	47/4		Clause 24, part Q, bullet point 5 and part S, bullet point 2. This criteria should be amended to avoid the use of materials similar to those traditionally utilised to construct one particular element of a building to create a different element.
	47/5		Clause 24, part U , bullet point 2 This clause doesn't sufficiently provide for the protection of a diverse and representative range of buildings that have their heritage value. For example a building may have been built for a different purpose from other buildings in the street (ie. to fulfil a combined residential/retail function), or to take advantage of the characteristics of a particular section (i.e a two storey building on a small section) or added during a period of evolving building styles (ie transitional villa) may not be considered to share original features with other buildings in the street. It is recommended that additional wording be added to this clause to provide for these scenarios.
	47/6		The term "protection" should be included and defined in the Definitions section of the District Plan.
D and R Ballantyne	48/1		Decline Zone 2 Front Yard Fence/Wall Height.
	48/2	Outside scope	If any of the proposed changes are approved, consideration should be given to an appropriate period before the changes are to be applied.
N Benton	49		Proposed changes to removal and alteration (renovation) of existing houses in res 1 and 2 zones and changes to fencing requirements. That the council decline these plan changes.
Mr G Lane, Mr and Mrs T Farmer, Mr and Mrs D Farmer.	50		The deletion of all provisions that impose limitations on the height of fences and walls within front yards of sites in the Residential 2 zone.

E J Barratt	51		<p>Clause 7.8.1.7 Yards. A Front Yard Residential 2A, 2B, 2C and 3B zones. Alter the words "on a corner site one yard may be reduced to 3.0m." insert the following: - "Provided that this front yard requirement shall not apply to properties zoned Residential 2B in Laurie Avenue, Parnell." Such other or consequential relief that will give effect to this submission.</p>
Hall Family Trust	52		Withdrawal or cancellation of the Plan Change in its entirety.
R J N Brassey	53/1		<p>Clause 7.5.1.1 Reword to provide for the retention, as far as practicable, of the elements or qualities that give the zones their uniqueness during the development of an area.</p>
R J N Brassey	53/2		<p>Clause 7.7.4.3 Strengthen controls over alterations to facades on street frontages, whilst providing for expansion in less visible parts of the roof space.</p>
	53/3		<p>Clause 7.7.4.3 Change wording to prevent use of materials in inappropriate applications.</p>
J H Bremner	54		<p>Accept with amendments. We would like to see us have the ability to keep all the wall at 2m high but have it appropriate to the area in terms of materials. This would be 60/40% rule is ridiculous and should be aborted.</p>
A Brothers	55		I sincerely hope that this plan is unsuccessful.
G Bryant	56		<p>Accept with amendments. Owners of recognised period houses (properties) in these zones be offered discounted rates which would encourage these properties to be maintained to a high standard.</p>

G Burgess	57		More flexibility in the overall controls.
C and G P Cameron J P Eaglen	58 73		Decline.
G R Campbell	59		56 St Mary's Bay Road Should Council adopt the 3m+ 45degree limit, this would place a harsh restriction on my plans for altering my existing dwelling. With this in mind, I wish to register my objection to this provision of the proposed district plan change.
W C Chan AC Choy L C C Chan	60 63 65		Decline the proposed plan change 163.
T Y Chan: Aotearoa Waka Party	61		Decline amendments.
St Cuthberts Education Trust Board	62/1		Fencing Residential 2 Delete proposed provisions
	62/2		Delete restricted discretionary activity provisions re demolition of pre 1940 buildings in Residential 2 zones.
A C Choy	63		To "decline" the proposed plan 163.
Hobson Community Board	64/1		The Board presents suggestions on the proposals in Plan Change 163 for consideration by Auckland City in the interests of Hobson Ward residents. Auckland City must ensure that additional delays and cost to resource consents to private homeowners seeking minimal alterations (or alterations not visible from the street) to their properties are kept to a minimum.

Hobson Community Board	64/2		Requests Auckland City recognises that it is not always desirable for design to encourage vehicles to the rear of properties and reconsider this part of the Plan Change proposal with a view to allowing full garaging to the front of properties, greater flexibility and reducing the length of driveways on private land.
	64/3		The Board recognises the need for some residents to resort to high fencing for protection from intrusion would have to be considered on a case by case basis and seeks assurance that the Plan change incorporates sufficient flexibility to achieve this.
J L Baker and D E Cooper	66/1		Oppose – rather late for forbidding demolition of old buildings, 30 years too late.
	66/2		New ways of raising funds is long overdue and that increased costs for whatever reason should be curtailed or minimised.
D V L Cox	67		Accept with amendments. Clause 7.6.1 Reinstate original sentence which gave the Council flexibility in consenting to a variety [of] fencing options in Res 1 zone. “ In addition, it is recognised that the need for the protecting of children, the security of households and property not be unnecessarily compromised...”
C R J Davis	68		It would be unsound and unreasonable to proceed with the inclusion of the Residential 2 proposal until and unless the officers and councillors have inspected these scattered and random Residential 2 zones and justify the inclusion of those properties in the proposal.
Mr E Cuthbert	69		Leave the decision on whether to have a high or low fence up to the property owners themselves as high fences and locked gates save the property owners having to put bars on their windows feel safe.
J Dobrowolski	70		Items 1 and 30: Clauses 4.3.1.2(G) and 7.8.1.15 That the proposed insertion of items 1 and 30 as identified be deleted from the Plan Change.

J Dixon: Joyze Boyze Trust	71		It is inconsistent for the council to have bylaws that limit the height of a fence when they have no regulations limiting the height of hedges. The height of hedges needs to be controlled along with the height of fences.
K Lowe	72/1		Amend the Plan Change as follows: Retain the operative rules which make alterations and additions which are not visible from the street or public places restricted controlled activities subject to compliance with the bulk and location standards;
	72/2		Introduce issues, strategies objectives, policies and assessment criteria in the Plan Change relating to alterations and additions which are not visible from the street or public places which recognise the importance of allowing period houses to be adopted and modernised to allow the efficient use of that resource.
	72/3		Such consequential and further amendments as are necessary to give effect to the concerns outlined in this submission.
J P Eaglen	73		Decline plan change.
E J Kears and C M Kears	75		We object to the whole plan.
Eastern Bays Community Board	76/1		We submit that the proposed plan modification Plan Change 163 Plan Change Auckland City Operative District Plan (Isthmus 1999) be adopted.
	76/2	Outside scope	The board has identified several properties that ideally should be protected under the residential 2B zoning but are not presently listed as such.
	76/3	Outside scope	The board believes other sites designated in 1993 presently included in the Residential 2B zoning should not now be listed as such.
	76/4	Outside scope	The Board has also identified several other buildings within the Eastern Bays Ward, not currently listed in the Residential1 or Residential 2B zones, which in the in opinion of the board, need to be

Eastern Bays Community Board	76/4 cont'd		protected and included in either Residential 1 or Residential 2B as the case may be.
Western Bays Community Board	77		The Western Bays Community Board strongly supports the proposed Plan Change 163.
B Farmiloe: ShoreSafe	78		Reconsider proposed changes through consideration of child safety issues.
C Syme K Donnelly J W Colebrook and C C MacKenzie	79/1 81/1 118/1		To reject Proposed Private Plan Change 163 in its entirety, or
	79/2 81/2 118/2		To require sufficient amendments to the Plan Change so that; There is a balance between private costs and public benefit that is equitable, Potentially appropriate land use is not compromised by overly specific and narrowly focussed rules, The council promote alternative methods of working with the Residential 1 and 2 community rather than imposing rules and other unsubstantiated costs upon the community, There is clarity, certainty and simplicity of interpretation, The plan Change properly reflects a thorough and robust Section 32 analysis that is not simply and application of previous methods, i.e. rules.
H Firth	80/1		Proposed Section 7.7.4.3 U Greater emphasis should be placed on the particular dwellings character, location, streetscape, degree of modification and present surrounding environment.
	80/2		The criteria regarding structural or physical condition should be removed.
	80/3		If a pre 1940 dwelling has been modified so as to reduce original character then demolition should be a permitted activity,
	80/4		Demolition should also be a permitted activity if the surrounding character (due to modifications or new dwellings) does not warrant preservation of a dwelling.

K Donnelly	81/3		That there is an appropriate range of heritage controls within all provisions in the District Plan.
M Fox	82/1		The decision I wish the Council to make is to refuse to accept the change.
M Fox	82/2	Outside scope	That before this change be approved, the zoning of the entire area affected be reviewed
	82/3	Outside scope	That Residential 1 is inappropriate to any area where the section sizes are consistently over 55 square metres and all such areas should be rezoned
	82/4		That the 3 meters/45 degrees height in relation to boundary rule that applies to Residential 1 should be changed forthwith to the more appropriate rule that applies to almost the entire remainder of the Isthmus.
	82/5	Outside scope	That a full review and report, with examples, of Council's planning staff's enforcement of the existing rules governing Residential 1 be carried out before this change be proceeded with.
M C J Fullam	83		Accept.
S S Ferguson (Late submission)	84/1		I oppose the modification change regarding demolition or removal of any building constructed prior to 1940 being a notified resource consent. I seek an amendment that neighbours have little or no say.
	84/2		I seek an amendment, allowing the 2.0m height to remain in place if a 400mm garden strip is allowed for, to plant out the solid concrete block along the road boundary.
S Goodman	85/1		I strongly support the principle of this proposed plan change.
	85/2		I oppose specific aspects of the proposed plan change. 1. Design controls. I would propose that a lesser design standard be applied where the effect is not visible. 2. Fencing. The restrictions proposed do not take into account local conditions.

M G Gascoigne	86		I request that the proposed plan change 163 be substantially altered (particularly with regard to removal of old buildings, enforcement of traditional window types and fences) after due consultation with affected parties.
K A Goodwin (late submission)	87		Oppose [relates to fencing only]
P J Goodfellow	88/1		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amendment to Objective 7.3.2. 2. Amendment to Residential 2 zone Objective 7.6.2.2 3. New Objective for Residential 2 zone 4. Changes of activity status for demolition, external additions and alterations, and new buildings in the Residential 2 zone. 5. Proposed Rules relating to fencing in the front yard for the Residential 2 zone. Decline the modifications to the Plan that this submission relates to.
	88/2		Retain the existing objectives, policies, rules or other methods.
P Dempsey AW Young and D J Mahoney Princess Investments Limited	89/1 93/1 94/1		Demolition of buildings. Retain "The total or substantial demolition or removal of any residential building (excluding accessory buildings) constructed prior to 1940 in the Residential 1, 2a, 2b and 2c zones" as a permitted activity....
	89/2 93/2 94/2		Demolition of buildings. As an alternative to (a) above, amend all the references to the activity of "The total or substantial demolition or removal of any residential building (excluding accessory buildings) constructed prior to 1940 in the Residential 1, 2a, 2b and 2c zones" from restricted discretionary activity status and/or discretionary activity status and make this activity a restricted controlled activity in respect of which public notification is not required under the Plan.
	89/3 93/3 94/4		Demolition of buildings. Make any consequential amendments to PPM#163 arising from the deletion of "The total or substantial demolition or removal of any residential building (excluding accessory buildings) constructed prior to 1940 in the Residential 1, 2a, 2b and 2c zones" as a restricted discretionary and/or discretionary activity and replacing this activity as a permitted activity as a permitted

P Dempsey AW Young and D J Mahoney Princess Investments Limited	89/3 93/3 94/4 cont'd		activity or alternatively as a non-notified restricted controlled activity.
	89/4 93/4 94/5		Demolition of buildings. As an alternative to (a), (b) and (c) above, make the changes sought in (a), (b) and (c) in respect of Residential 2 only.
P Dempsey AW Young and D J Mahoney	89/5 93/5		External additions and alterations. Retain "external additions or alterations to existing buildings in the Residential 1, 2a, 2b and 2c zones" as restricted controlled activities.
	89/6 93/6		External additions and alterations. As alternative relief to (e) above [93/5] retain controlled activity status for this activity in the Residential 2 zones only.
	89/7 93/7		Front fence controls. Delete the proposed new Development Control for "Fences, Walls or other structures in the Residential 1 and 2a, 2b and 2c zones" and the consequential proposed new "Development Control Modification" from PPM#163 and retain the existing controls relating to fences and walls in the Plan.
	89/8 93/8		Front fence controls. As alternative relief to (g) above [93/7] delete the proposed new provisions relating to fences and walls from applying to the Residential 2 zones only.
	89/9 93/9		Make any consequential changes to PPM#163 arising from the above
G and P Gordon	90		6 Harbour Street, St Mary's Bay Accept with amendments. That either the new rule requiring a resource consent to demolish a house in residential 1 zone built prior to 1940 is deleted or that specific reference is made to the Plan excluding 6 Harbour Street from complying with this rule.

Parnell First	91/1		Adopt the proposals set out in Proposed Plan Modification requiring demolition of houses in the residential 1 and 2 zones to be restricted discretionary activities, (amendments to clause 4.3.2.6) and the associated assessment criteria, explanations, tables, objectives/policies supporting this provision.
	91/2		Adopt the proposals set out in the Proposed Plan Modification requiring alterations to existing buildings and new buildings to be restricted discretionary activities, (amendments to clause 4.3.2.6) and the associated assessment criteria, explanations, tables, objectives/policies supporting this provision.
	91/3		Reject the proposals relating to controls on fencing in front yards (Part B clause 4.31.2 and associated amendments) and include fencing or front yard structures as part of the consent process for new buildings/alterations to existing buildings.
	91/4		Reject the changes to the front yard landscaping control and instead, requiring carparking in front yards to be controlled activities subject to assessment of a front yard landscaping plan which shows that a single carpark with/without structure is compatible with the character and cohesion of the site and neighbourhood.
Mr A Holler and Ms K Rouse (Late submission)	92		To decline proposed plan change and retain current zoning.
Princess Investments Limited	94/3		Demolition of buildings. Delete the additional assessment criteria proposed to be inserted under Clause 7.7.4.3 "Further criteria to be considered", as item "U" "Demolition or removal of buildings building (excluding accessory buildings) constructed prior to 1940 in the Residential 1, 2a, 2b and 2c zones".
M Donnelly	95/1		To reject Proposed Private plan change 163 in its entirety.
	95/2		To require sufficient amendments to the Plan Change so that; There is a balance between private costs and public benefit that is equitable, Potentially appropriate and sustainable land use is not compromised by overly specific and narrowly focussed rules,

M Donnelly	95/2 cont'd		The Council promote alternative methods of working with the Residential and 2 community, rather than imposing rules and other unsubstantiated costs upon the community, There is clarity, certainty and simplicity of interpretation, That there is an appropriate range of heritage controls within all provisions in the District Plan. The Plan Change properly reflects a thorough and robust Section 32 analysis that is not simply an application of previous methods, i.e.rules.
Glen Innes Injury Prevention Coalition	96		[Address] concerns regarding the implications of the proposed change to the District Plan regarding the placement of garages on Residential 1 and 2 properties. We believe that this would encourage homeowners to install long driveways and garages at the rear of their sections, which in would turn increase the risk of driveway run-over injuries to small children.
The Green Group	97/1		The cost of research into the heritage matter should not be one inflicted upon individual landowners. It should be borne by Council.
	97/2		The requirement for resource consent to demolish a house should be removed and applied only in circumstances where demonstrable merit is recorded and agreed and compensated for and recorded in a schedule in the District Plan.
R Lovell-Smith, S Grimes, L Hawcroft	98/1		We therefore support every aspect of the Proposed Plan Change except that we think that front yards and front fences and walls should remain under current requirements.
	98/2		Also we do not think new garages and driveways should be allowed on the front sections of historic houses.
C Hawley	99/1		<p>Part B: G Development Control Modification.</p> <p>(i) <u> If in the Residential 1 zone</u> Add text as shown: expand to include wider context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Materials used are sympathetic to the existing building on the site</u> and to the adjacent period buildings <u>and do not detract from the special character of the streetscape;</u> • <u>If in the Residential 2 zone</u> <p>(ii) Delete "any" and add "period"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scale and form of walls, fences and other structures does not destroy or detract from the

C Hawley	99/1 cont'd		continuity or harmony of any existing period walls or fences on the street;
	99/2		Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend the second bullet point under clause 7.2 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to recognise, maintain, and where possible enhance <u>and protect</u> the recognised character and amenity of established residential environment;
	99/3		Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend clause 7.3.2 Objective: <i>To identify, maintain and enhance <u>and protect</u> the recognised character and amenity of residential environments.</i>
	99/4		Policies Add text as shown. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By adopting measures aimed at enhancing and <u>protecting</u> the heritage elements, characteristics and qualities of certain residential areas.
	99/5		Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend clause 7.4.2, 2 nd and 3 rd paragraphs Add text to show the clarity of intention. Use “lot size” rather than “site size” and “trees” rather than “planting”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These areas are a key part of Auckland’s heritage, but their character and amenity values is are vulnerable fragile and could be damaged by unsympathetic or discordant land development, building forms and densities. • Controls are applied to conserve the particular element(s) or qualities which give each area its character, such as development intensity, form, site, size, lot size, building style, mature planting, trees and overall streetscape.
	99/6		Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend clause 7.4.6, 4th paragraph. Residential areas that warrant particular consideration due to their special character and quality have more restrictive controls applied in order to protect and enhance their uniqueness- <u>and the particular elements or qualities that are characteristic of the streets and areas within that warranted inclusion in the zone.</u>

C Hawley	99/7		<p>Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend clause 7.5.1.1, last paragraph before Special Character Residential Zones. Add “overall streetscape” ...such as development intensity and form, lot sizes, building style, mature trees, overall streetscape, etc.</p>
	99/8		<p>Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend clause 7.5.1.1 under Special Character Residential Zones ...comprise features that are considered to justify conservation <u>protection</u> on the premise that they are a scarce legacy to this generation. Specific measures have been incorporated in the Plan to ensure that these environments are able to be appreciated by retained for future generations. ...</p> <p>Special character or heritage quality is apparent when: add to third bullet point</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the scale and/or style of subdivision <u>pattern</u> and/or building has a high degree of coherence and continuity, and/or has remained relatively free of intrusions intrusive , out of character, unsympathetic development; <p><u>The special character zones sit within a continuum of heritage provisions in the Plan. The highest level of protection is for-accorded to the scheduling of specific scheduled features(buildings, trees and other items) within the Plan, ...</u></p> <p>Last bullet point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • control on total or substantial demolitions and /or removal of buildings. <p>...In particular areas, the controls will also secure the protection <u>retention</u> of extensive areas of trees which provide special neighbourhood character.</p>
	99/9		<p>Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend 7.5.1.3: 3rd paragraph The Plan seeks to regulate the type and intensity ... In the Residential 1 to 4 zones they are applied to conserve <u>protect</u> the particular elements, or qualities and characteristics which give each area its special character and amenity, such as development intensity and form, lot size, building style, mature trees etc. ... <u>The Plan seeks to control the type and/or height of fences or walls</u> and other structures <u>constructed within the...</u></p>

C Hawley	99/10		<p>Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend 7.6.1.1</p> <p>Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By maintaining the authenticity of character of areas and included in the zone in relation to activities and development, and by discouraging <u>preventing</u> other work which is not in sympathy with the identified special_character. • By encouraging <u>requiring</u> renovation and new building construction to be undertaken in a manner which maintains <u>and protects</u> the historic form and pattern of buildings and streetscape in the zone <u>areas to which the zone is applied.</u> <p>Page 6, 1st bullet – add/delete text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By imposing provisions which seek to protect, maintain and as appropriate enhance the amenity of the streetscape appearance of these areas through controlling fences, walls and/or structures in the front yard and through ... <p>3rd bullet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By encouraging, where practical, <u>requiring the construction of garages and carports to be located to the rear of, underneath (where appropriate in terms of topography), or alongside the building on the site to ensure the front garden and facade remain visible to the streetscape.</u> <p>4th bullet, delete significantly and add text shown:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By protecting buildings constructed prior to 1940 where they significantly <u>which contribute individually and/or with others to the overall special character of the streetscape by controlling the total or substantial demolition and/or removal of such buildings (excluding accessory buildings).</u>
	99/11		<p>Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend 7.6.1.2, 3rd paragraph</p> <p><u>As the streetscape is an important element in the Residential 1 zone, it is expected that the provision of off-street parking in the form of a car parking pad or a single width garage or carport will be limited in location, to the rear of, underneath (where appropriate in terms of topography), or alongside, the building. They shall not obscure the visibility of the building from the street. (under certain circumstances) if located to the front of the existing building on the site (particularly within the front yard). It is expected that double garages or carports will be similarly located to the rear of, alongside or underneath (where appropriate in terms of topography) the existing building on the site, to ensure that visibility of the existing building from the street is maintained.</u></p>

C Hawley	99/11 cont'd		4 th paragraph Concrete block or stucco walls should not be permitted where traditional wooden picket fences predominate.
C Hawley	99/12		<p>Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend 7.6.2.1. Add text for consistency and to include wider context. Delete 'significantly'. Use 'areas' rather than land. <u>To protect the architectural values and qualities of buildings which contribute to the special character of the streetscape.</u></p> <p>Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>By ensuring renovation of existing buildings and new buildings maintains the historic form and pattern of buildings, open space and distinctive streetscapes of land areas included in the zone.</u> • <u>By maintaining the architectural values and qualities of period housing predominant ate in the street.</u> • <u>By protecting buildings constructed prior to 1940 where they significantly which contribute individually and/or with others to the overall special character of the streetscape by controlling the total or substantial demolition and/or removal of such buildings (excluding accessory buildings).</u> <p>Objective To conserve <u>protect the landscape and streetscape qualities ...</u></p> <p>Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By maintaining the quality of spaciousness which characterises land areas <u>included in the zone.</u> • By protecting and <u>requiring the retention of</u> conserving the larger those trees, located on private property, roads and reserves, which contribute to or give areas land <u>included in the zone</u> a distinctive character.

C Hawley	99/12 cont'd		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By encouraging <u>requiring, where appropriate, replacement planting of indigenous trees ...</u> • <u>By ensuring that the spacious and well-landscaped front yards which are typical of land areas in this zone retain a reasonable degree of visibility to and from the street.</u>
	99/13		<p>Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Add text to 7.6.2.2 Although <u>While</u> parts of these areas do not display the period housing characteristics of the Residential 2 zone, these areas do overall they exhibit a special landscape quality. ... Broadly based design criteria are applied to resource consent applications for <u>new</u> building construction in order to maintain consistency of architectural mass, form, proportion and materials as appropriate in the subzones and to be sympathetic to the architectural values and character of period housing predominant in the street.</p> <p><u>Controls are applied on the height of walls, fences and other structures in the required front yard to ensure outlook</u> visibility to and <u>from the street ...</u></p> <p><u>The total or substantial demolition or removal of buildings (excluding accessory buildings) is controlled so that consideration can be given to the extent the building contributes individually and/or with others to the overall special characteristics and qualities of the streetscape...</u></p>
	99/14		<p>Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend 7.6.2.3 A special level of ... <u>The provisions of the Residential 2 zone are expected to ensure that new building construction is sympathetic to the existing ... that give land in this zone its special character.</u></p>

C Hawley	99/15	<p>Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend Table 7.7.1 Amend Table 7.7.1 ACTIVITIES IN THE RESIDENTIAL HE-RESIDENTIAL- 1-7 ZONES as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Activities</th> <th colspan="10">Zones</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>1</th> <th>2a, 2b, & 2c</th> <th>3a</th> <th>3b</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> <th>6a</th> <th>6b</th> <th>7a & 7b</th> <th>7c</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Construction and/or relocation of residential units (within the density limits specified in Clause 7.7.2.1) or any new building or structure (including accessory buildings)#</td> <td>C* D**</td> <td>C* D**</td> <td>C*</td> <td>C*</td> <td>C*</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Any wall, fence or other structure other than a picket fence as provided for in 7.8.1.15 below not defined as a building located within the yard required by Clause 7.8.1.7A</td> <td>C*</td> <td>P</td> <td>C*</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Activities	Zones											1	2a, 2b, & 2c	3a	3b	4	5	6a	6b	7a & 7b	7c	Construction and/or relocation of residential units (within the density limits specified in Clause 7.7.2.1) or any new building or structure (including accessory buildings)#	C* D**	C* D**	C*	C*	C*	P	P	P	P	P	Any wall, fence or other structure other than a picket fence as provided for in 7.8.1.15 below not defined as a building located within the yard required by Clause 7.8.1.7A	C*	P	C*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
	Activities	Zones																																												
		1	2a, 2b, & 2c	3a	3b	4	5	6a	6b	7a & 7b	7c																																			
Construction and/or relocation of residential units (within the density limits specified in Clause 7.7.2.1) or any new building or structure (including accessory buildings)#	C* D**	C* D**	C*	C*	C*	P	P	P	P	P																																				
Any wall, fence or other structure other than a picket fence as provided for in 7.8.1.15 below not defined as a building located within the yard required by Clause 7.8.1.7A	C*	P	C*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P																																				
99/16	<p>Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend 7.7.2, Explanation i). <i>A limited range of permitted activities ... to enable the Council to ensure that the particular elements which give each area its character and qualities are conserved <u>protected</u>.</i></p>																																													
99/17	<p>Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend 7.7.4.1 <u>New building construction ...</u> <u>Adherence to the specified ... alterations to existing buildings are sympathetic to those elements and qualities aspects of the area's environment ...</u> <u>The Council considers ... alterations to existing buildings may be are <u>appropriate</u> where criteria can be met. <u>However, the Council has retained discretion to ... consent.</u></u></p>																																													

C Hawley	99/17 cont'd		<p>a) Residential 1 zone <u>In the Residential 1 zone, ... In this respect new structures will should be designed so as to visually relate to ...</u></p> <p>b) Residential 2a, 2b, 2c Zones <u>The Plan has design ... the zone. Retention of the tree-filled quality of these areas is important and buildings must be located with this in mind and mature trees retained.</u></p> <p><u>Demolition or removal of buildings (excluding accessory buildings) constructed prior to 1940 within the Residential 1, 2a, 2b and 2c zones.</u></p> <p><u>The effects on ... prior to 1940, is has been made a Discretionary activity in these zones. The Council has restricted the exercise of its discretion to those matters specified. This will allow the Council to consider the historic qualities of the building as well as the effect of the total or substantial demolition or removal of the building on the architectural elements and qualities and special characteristics of the streetscape and surrounding area.</u></p>																																																
	99/18		<p>Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend table under 7.7.4.2</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="757 821 2105 1252"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="757 821 1164 861">Discretionary Activity</th> <th colspan="11" data-bbox="1164 821 2105 861">Particular Matters to be Addressed</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="757 861 1164 893"></th> <th data-bbox="1164 861 1243 893">1</th> <th data-bbox="1243 861 1321 893">2</th> <th data-bbox="1321 861 1400 893">3</th> <th data-bbox="1400 861 1478 893">4</th> <th data-bbox="1478 861 1556 893">5</th> <th data-bbox="1556 861 1635 893">6</th> <th data-bbox="1635 861 1713 893">7</th> <th data-bbox="1713 861 1792 893">8</th> <th data-bbox="1792 861 1870 893">9</th> <th data-bbox="1870 861 1948 893">10</th> <th data-bbox="1948 861 2027 893">11</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="757 893 1164 1085">Construction and/or relocation of residential units (within the density limits specified in Clause 7.7.2.1) or any new building or structure</td> <td data-bbox="1164 893 1243 1085"></td> <td data-bbox="1243 893 1321 1085">±</td> <td data-bbox="1321 893 1400 1085">±</td> <td data-bbox="1400 893 1478 1085">*</td> <td data-bbox="1478 893 1556 1085"></td> <td data-bbox="1556 893 1635 1085">*</td> <td data-bbox="1635 893 1713 1085"></td> <td data-bbox="1713 893 1792 1085"></td> <td data-bbox="1792 893 1870 1085"></td> <td data-bbox="1870 893 1948 1085"></td> <td data-bbox="1948 893 2027 1085">* —</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="757 1085 1164 1252"><u>The total or substantial demolition or removal of any building (excluding accessory buildings) as provided for in Clause 7.7.1</u></td> <td data-bbox="1164 1085 1243 1252"></td> <td data-bbox="1243 1085 1321 1252"></td> <td data-bbox="1321 1085 1400 1252"></td> <td data-bbox="1400 1085 1478 1252"></td> <td data-bbox="1478 1085 1556 1252"></td> <td data-bbox="1556 1085 1635 1252"></td> <td data-bbox="1635 1085 1713 1252"></td> <td data-bbox="1713 1085 1792 1252"></td> <td data-bbox="1792 1085 1870 1252"></td> <td data-bbox="1870 1085 1948 1252"></td> <td data-bbox="1948 1085 2027 1252">* —</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Discretionary Activity	Particular Matters to be Addressed												1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Construction and/or relocation of residential units (within the density limits specified in Clause 7.7.2.1) or any new building or structure		±	±	*		*					* —	<u>The total or substantial demolition or removal of any building (excluding accessory buildings) as provided for in Clause 7.7.1</u>											* —
Discretionary Activity	Particular Matters to be Addressed																																																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11																																								
Construction and/or relocation of residential units (within the density limits specified in Clause 7.7.2.1) or any new building or structure		±	±	*		*					* —																																								
<u>The total or substantial demolition or removal of any building (excluding accessory buildings) as provided for in Clause 7.7.1</u>											* —																																								

C Hawley	99/19		<p>Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend 7.7.4.2</p> <p>4. Buildings In general new buildings <u>or structures</u> should be of a similar or complementary scale and appearance to that of other residential buildings or structures within the surrounding area. Where this is not practicable, Buildings should not overshadow or become overly dominant of neighbouring buildings. ...</p> <p>.....</p> <p>11. Tree Plan to Accompany Applications All applications for resource consents in the Residential <u>1</u>, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3b and 4 zones shall be accompanied by an accurate plan of the positions of identifying existing trees on the site of the and their positions and size of, the location of the development proposals ...</p>
	99/20		<p>Amend 7.7.4.3</p> <p><u>Q. External additions or alterations to existing buildings on a site in the Residential 1 zone</u></p> <p>Amend 1st and 7th bullets, add new bullet after 6th</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The form, mass, proportion ... The provision of this analysis is dependent on ...</u> • <u>Any existing traditional fencing along the road frontage boundary shall be preserved or reinstated at the completion of development; and</u> • New fences should reflect the character of existing traditional fencing elsewhere in the street, and • <u>Where garages or carports are to be adjoined to the existing building on the site, they shall be located to the rear of, underneath (where appropriate in terms of topography), or alongside, the building. not be located other than They shall not obscure the visibility of the building from the street. Consideration shall be given to alternative locations on the site for the garage or carport where visibility of the building will be obscured; and</u> <p><u>R. Construction or relocation of residential units or any new building or accessory building in the Residential 1 zone</u></p> <p>Amend 4th bullet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Buildings shall be located on a site so that the siting of the building reflects the historical</u>

C Hawley	99/20 cont'd		<p>Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. <u>subdivision and development patterns existing in the street, particularly in situations where development is occurring on an amalgamated site. This ensures the 'grain' of the area (in terms of the size, spacing and rhythm of street-front buildings) is maintained; and</u></p> <p>Add new bullet after 6th</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Any existing traditional fencing ... the completion of development; and</u> • New fences should reflect the character of existing traditional fencing elsewhere in the street, and <p>Amend 9th bullet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Garages and carports shall not obscure the visibility of the existing building from the street, and shall, where possible, shall be located to the rear of, underneath (where appropriate in terms of topography), or alongside, the building on the site (particularly in relation to double garages/carports). The Council may consent to the location of a single car width garage or carport (approximately 2.9m wide) in the front yard where it is satisfied that:</u> <p>Council needs to be satisfied that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No practical location is available elsewhere on the site; and • <u>Any structure associated with the parking provision shall be is minimal in of an appropriate scale, and designed in a manner which is coherent with the original architectural character of any building on the site; and</u> • <u>The garage or carport shall not obscure the visibility of the existing building from the street;</u> • <u>There is no reserved on street parking ('residents only' parking) available on the street.</u> <p><u>S. External additions and alterations to existing buildings in the Residential 2a, 2b and 2c zones</u></p> <p>Amend bullets 1,2 and 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The form, mass, proportion and scale of the external addition or alteration shall be compatible with the original architectural style of the existing building on the site; Where the building is a period building, the additions or alterations will also be sympathetic to the original architectural style predominant in the street.</u> • <u>Materials used shall be the same or similar as existing materials of the building and where the building is a period building, they will also be sympathetic to the traditional character and materials of existing period buildings in the street. <u>And</u></u>
----------	-----------------	--	--

C Hawley	99/20 cont'd		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The additions and alterations shall be located so that mature larger trees on the site and/or on adjoining land are retained, where this is not practical achievable, replacement planting, particularly of indigenous trees where appropriate, shall be required to maintain the landscape qualities of the site.</u> <p><u>T. Construction or relocation of residential units or any new building or accessory building in the Residential 2a, 2b and 2c zones</u></p> <p>Amend bullets 2, 3 and 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Materials used shall be in sympathy with and shall have a clear relationship to the traditional character and materials of buildings along the street; and</u> • <u>New buildings shall not detract from the continuity and harmony of traditional period building forms in the street or detract from the coherence of the streetscape; and</u> • <u>The building shall be located so that mature larger trees on the site and/or on adjoining land are retained, and where this is not practical achievable, replacement planting, particularly of indigenous trees where appropriate, shall be required to maintain the landscape qualities of the site.</u> <p><u>U. Demolition or removal of buildings (excluding accessory buildings) constructed prior to 1940 in the Residential 1, 2a, 2b and 2c zones</u></p> <p>Delete 3rd bullet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether any historical qualities and original design features of the existing building are visible from a public place; and
	99/21		<p>Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity.</p> <p>Amend 7.8.1.7</p> <p>A. Front Yard</p> <p><u>Residential 1 and 3a Zones Zone</u></p> <p>On sites other than rear sites, not less than 60% <u>50%</u> of the front yard shall comprise landscaped permeable surface. This landscaping requirement shall apply on each frontage of a corner site. ...</p> <p>Residential 1 and 3a Zones</p> <p><u>In the Residential 1 zone, the landscaping requirement for the front yard is less than that for other special character zones in recognition that areas in this zone are generally characterised by a highly</u></p>

C Hawley	99/21 cont'd		built up appearance. It is also recognised that sites are generally small and narrow and that off-street parking can, under certain circumstances, be provided within the front yard, where reserved on-street parking ('residents only' parking) is not available in the street.
	99/22		Part C: Amendments to Part 7 – Residential Activity. Amend 7.8.1.9 <i>It is recognised that in these zones there is often limited opportunity to provide off-street parking on the generally small, highly developed sites which characterise these zones. To preserve the amenity of both the property and the traditional heritage streetscape For this reason off-street parking can shall be located to the rear of, underneath (where appropriate in terms of topography) or alongside, the building on the site., under certain circumstances be provided in the front yard, either in carports or garages, paved open spaces or in excavated basement garaging under dwellings. However, such developments are dealt with as <u>controlled discretionary</u> activities and assessed in terms of the criteria outlined in <u>CLAUSE 7.7.3.2 Additional Criteria for Specific Activities of the Plan</u> <u>7.7.4.3 Further Criteria to be considered.</u>'</i>
	99/23		Part D: Amendments to Appendices and Annexures Amend Appendix 13 – Oppose 1 st sentence. 4.1 Special Character Protection of Conservation "The focus on protection in the special character zones is by nature general, ...or by requiring that individual period houses are retained.
	99/24		Part D: Amendments to Appendices and Annexures 6.2.2 Double Sites Oppose the facilitation of site amalgamation which involves removal of more than one house and the construction of a single large dwelling.
	99/25		Part D: Amendments to Appendices and Annexures 7.5 Construction or Alteration of Garages, Carports and Other Accessory Buildings Oppose carparking provisions in front yard of Residential 1 properties. Delete all 5 bullets. Carparking should only be permitted alongside, underneath or to the rear of the property. The guidelines should be confined to the guidance for good design of parking in these locations only. Figures 31 and 32 captions appear to be incorrect re what is depicted on diagrams.

C Hind	100/1		I seek the following decision from the local authority: Recognition of the importance of providing for off street parking in the St Mary's Bay area by providing as simple a process as possible, and recognition of the architectural merit of divergent fence types and heights.
	100/2		Part 4 – General provisions and procedures Part B 2: Clause 4.3.2.5 Restricted controlled activities (bullet point 1) i. That external additions or alterations in the Residential 1 zone be retained within the Restricted Controlled activities classification. ii. Amend the clause by adding the following bullet point <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garages and carports in the Residential 1 Zone are Restricted Controlled Activities.
	100/3		Part 4 – General provisions and procedures Part B 5: Clause 4.3.2.6 Restricted discretionary activities (bullet point 2) Amend bullet point 2 but adding after 'buildings on the site' ... "excluding garages and carports"
	100/4		Part 7 – Residential activity Part C 9: Clause 7.6.1.1 Objectives and Policies (res 1 – Built) Amend bullet point 6 under policies to add to the end after 'streetscape' ... "except on sites where there is no option but to develop garages and carports within the front yard"
	100/5		Part 7 – Residential activity Part C 10: Clause 7.6.1.2 Strategy Retain the 3 rd paragraph starting "As the streetscape ... is maintained."
	100/6		Part 7 – Residential activity Part C 15: Table 7.7.1 Activities Res 1-7 Zones I. Amend the 2 nd row down by adding after 'site' ... "excluding garages and carports which will remain restricted controlled activities" II Delete the 3 rd row down starting 'Any wall ...' And retain the deleted 4 th row starting 'Picket fences ...'

C Hind	100/7		<p>Part 7 – Residential activity Part C 21: Clause 7.7.4.2 I. Amend the 2nd row down by adding after ‘site’ ... “excluding garages and carports which will remain restricted controlled activities”</p>
	100/8		<p>Part 7 – Residential activity Part C 24: Clause 7.7.4.3 O. External additions or alterations to existing buildings on a site in the Residential 1 zone. I. Amend the 7th bullet point, starting ‘Where garages’ ... By adding ... “except on sites where there is no option but to develop garages and carports within the front yard” R. Construction or relocation of residential units or any new building or accessory building in the Residential 1 zone. II. Amend the 9th bullet point, starting ‘Garages ... By deleting the final sub bullet point ‘There is no reserved on-street parking ... on the street”.</p>
	100/9		<p>Part 7 – Residential activity Part C 30: Clause 7.8.1.14 Delete proposed rule 7.8.1.15 specific to the Residential 1 Zone and retain the existing requirements for fences.</p>
	100/10		<p>Amendments to appendices and annexures Part D 2: Appendix 13 7.3 New Fencing – Residential 1 zone V. Delete the 3rd bullet point starting ‘Solid walls ... slightly lower’ entirely.</p>
	100/11		<p>Any further relief, including consequential amendments to other provisions of the proposed plan change and/or District Plan that may be necessary to give effect to the issues raised by the submitter</p>
Housing New Zealand Corporation.	101/1		<p>That the proposed plan change be confirmed but subject to certain amendments and modifications sought by HNZN. Concern over the rule and criteria relating to the total or substantial demolition or removal of any building built prior to 1940 in the Residential 1, 2a, 2b, and 2c zones.</p>

Housing New Zealand Corporation.	101/2		HNZC wishes that ACC investigate the establishment of financial incentives to assist landowners in the retention of pre 1940s buildings.
D Hudig	102		<p>The guidelines should not (or at least very sparingly) allow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any addition of a storey to a villa does not comply with the plans for multi-storey villas from the relevant period. • The use of an existing non compliant building ground coverage (as an existing use) to make further extensions. • Where a property has existing infringements of the District plan and it is proposed to make external additions neighbour's consent must be a prerequisite to permission being granted...and the public using the footpath and the street etc. Must also be taken into account in line with Council's objective 2.3.3 "to protect and enhance residential amenities". • Building footprint in excess of maximum in residential 2. The proposed ground coverage rules must be very strictly enforced. • There should at least be as a minimum a trade off between excess ground coverage and additional storey(s). The Proposed Plan Modification should be amended to record a contraction of the rate of any possible complying second (or subsequent) storey by the additional ground coverage footprint applicable above the 30%.
M P Joseph	103		The discretionary activities in section 4.3.2.6 should be considered without public notification or the need to obtain the written approval of, or service of notice on affected persons.
	104		The controlled activities in section 4.3.2.5 should be considered without public notification or the need to obtain the written approval of, or service of notice on affected persons.
	105		I support the final paragraph of Section 7.5.1.1 on page A8 that requires the Council to develop and promote traffic management techniques, service provisions etc.
	106/1		<p>Accept with amendments.</p> <p>The demolition or removal of buildings (excluding accessory buildings) constructed prior to 1940 in the Residential 1, 2a, 2b and 2c zones should be a conditional activity and not a discretionary activity.</p>

M P Joseph	106/2		Buildings which have been modified since 1940 so as to reduce their heritage characteristics should be exempted – particularly in the Residential 2B zone.
	107		Accept with amendments. Amend the maximum building coverage for Residential 2B to 35% of net site area.
	108		7.8.1.9 Vehicular Use of Residential Sites Delete this rule
	109		Accept with amendments, Reduce the minimum percentage of landscaped permeable surface required in Residential 2a, 2b, 2c and 3b zones to 50%.
	110		Development control modification in the Residential 2 zones should be a controlled activity. Accept with amendments. Delete the words "and 2" from 4.3.1.2 G Make any appropriate changes to the relevant "controlled activities" rules.
	111/1		Accept with amendments Delete the inclusion of Residential 2 zone from the phrase "New building construction (including external additions and alterations) in the Residential 1 and 2 zones" on Page B13
	111/2		Make any necessary changes to the "controlled activities" rules of the plan.
N Kennedy	112		Decline I object the proposed plan change 163 for residential zone 2b.
G E Kroon	113/1		Decline Carry out through Section 32 report.
	113/2		Exclude from Plan change areas where few 'original' period homes exist and where areas lack coherency or decline plan change.

G E Kroon	113/3		Carry out meaningful consultation with affected community that ensures costs, benefits are fully explained.
S L Latimour	114		<p>I strongly oppose the key provisions identified on your card posted to me. If the Council or any other party wishes to appropriate part of the value of my property in order to provide what it considers to be something of public benefit that should only be done with the payment of full independently assessed compensation for the loss that will be caused.</p> <p>No mandate for Council from property owners in residential 1 and 2 to impose the changes nor to conclude that "most" property owners believe "the special character and architectural design of buildings needs to be maintained".</p>
R N Lerew: Lerew Family Trust	115		<p>Accept with amendments. That the change from "currently restricted controlled" to: "requiring a resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity" be deleted for this street i.e. Robley Crescent Glendowie.</p>
D M Lindberg	116/1		<p>I seek the following amendment from Council. In table 7.7.1 "External additions or alterations to existing buildings on the site" in the residential 2B zone REMAIN A CONTROLLED ACTIVITY.</p>
	116/2		<p>There should be an allowance for some discretion to erect fences that don't meet the requirements of 7.8.1.15.</p> <p>I seek the following amendment from Council. That the erection of any wall, fence or other structure other than a picket fence as provided for below not defined as a building located within the yard required by Clause 7.8.1.7A in the residential 2 zone be included in table 7.7.1 as a DISCRETIONARY activity.</p>
	116/3		<p>Residential Activity 7.7.4.3 Remove "so that restoration/renovation of the building is practical and reasonable" from the end of this statement.</p>

D M Lindberg	116/4		<p>Residential Activity 7.7.4.3</p> <p>I seek the following amendment from Council.</p> <p>That the following note be deleted</p> <p>“there is an expectation that all of the above assessment criteria will be satisfied or the council may refuse consent”.</p>
New Zealand Events Limited	117		I fully support the proposed plans for stopping the demolition or alteration of properties built before 1940 in Residential zones 1 and 2 unless there is council approval.
J W Colebrook and C C MacKenzie	118/3		The present ‘Architectural Design Guidelines’ be entirely replaced by a document or set of documents, including any interpretive guidelines, derived from full consultation, that is substantially more effective, more enlightened and suitably addresses all the issues we have outlined in our submission.
W D Mackenzie	119/1		<p>I support the proposed plan modification and seek amendments.</p> <p>Addition to 7.7.4.3R page 14 starting “Garages”</p> <p>“The Council may consent to the location of a single car width garage or carport”</p> <p>Delete “garage or “from previous sentence.</p> <p>3rd sub bullet point delete “The garage”</p> <p>Delete “There is no reserved on-street parking (residents only parking) available on the street”</p> <p>Add sub bullet point “The site is at least 9 metres wide”.</p>
	119/2		<p>Add to 7.8.1.15</p> <p>Hedges are to be restricted to 1.8metres in height.</p>
	119/3		Incorporate the above amendments to the proposed alteration to the District Plan No 163.
G R Campbell	120		Should Council adopt the 3m+45degree limit, this would place a harsh restriction on my plans for altering my existing dwelling. With this in mind, I wish to register my objection to this provision of the proposed district plan.
P de Zeeuw and M Le Coultre	121/1		<p>The assessment criteria for new and relocated buildings within the Residential 2 zones proposed in Part C, Section 24,</p> <p>Replace the word “shall” with “should” or similar wherever it occurs within the assessment criteria.</p>

P de Zeeuw and M Le Coultre	121/2		Require consideration of the needs and desires of the applicant particularly in terms of space, privacy, security, indoor-outdoor flow, adequate light and warmth, the ability to gain views, off-street parking and reduced maintenance.
	121/3		Clearly state within the assessment criteria that the use of contemporary design and materials is not necessarily incompatible with the zone and will be acceptable in many instances.
P de Zeeuw and M Le Coultre	121/4		Clearly state within the assessment criteria that new buildings do not need to repeat any design flaws inherent in buildings within the surrounding area such as inappropriate wall to window ratios.
	121/5		Such other relief to other parts of the plan change as is necessary as a consequence of the amendments sought in this submission. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this submission.
Shepperson Family Trust I McManus Opes Trustee Company Limited P de Zeeuw and M Le Coultre	122/1		Increase the maximum building coverage for houses within the Residential 1 and 2 zones to such extent as is necessary to enable the urban design outcomes sought by Plan Change 163;
	142/1		
	147/1		
	148/1		
	122/2 142/2 147/2 148/2		Increase the maximum height limit for houses within the Residential 1, 2b and 2c zones to 10 metres to enable two storeys plus a pitched roof to be constructed or other worthwhile urban design features contemplated by Plan Change 163;
	122/3 142/3 147/3 148/3		Amend the building in relation to boundary control within the Residential 1 and 2 zones to allow new homes and additions and alterations to reflect the historic pattern and spatial relationship of development in the surrounding area, as desired by Plan Change 163

Shepperson Family Trust I McManus Opes Trustee Company Limited P de Zeeuw and M Le Coultre	122/4 142/4 147/4 148/4		Acknowledge that a "pitched roof" need not necessarily be of the gable form ("I" type) as those in the area, but may take the form of an inverted gable ("V" or "butterfly" type) of a similar angle, or be a mono-pitch as per the traditional lean-to on a villa.
	122/5 142/5 147/5 148/5		Add an assessment criterion to paragraphs Q, R, S and T set out in Part C Section 24 of the plan change and a suitable provision within the Design Guideline acknowledging that landowners have a reasonable expectation of being able to build a two storey home and that it may not be feasible to provide a pitched roof or eaves on some such homes given the topography and the constraints of the District Plan development controls.
	122/6 142/6 147/6 148/6		Such other relief to other parts of the plan change as is necessary as a consequence of the amendments sought in this submission. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this submission.
I McManus	123/1		Part C section 15 Amend the plan change to make it clear that walls, fences and other structures within the front yard are not to be assessed as non-complying activities and, if these structures are intended to have an activity status within this table, apply a restricted discretionary activity classification to these structures.
	123/2		Part C section 15 Revisit the effect of removing the "activity" of picket fences within the front yard on the legibility of the preceding clause and amend accordingly.
	123/3		Part C section 15 Delete the reference to "substantial" demolition or clearly define what "substantial" means in this context, to the satisfaction of the submitter.
	123/4		Part C section 15 Such other relief to other parts of the plan change as is necessary as a consequence of the amendments sought in this submission. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this submission.

I McManus Opes Trustee Company Limited P de Zeeuw and M Le Coultre	124/1 134/1 149/1		Part B: section5 Amend the proposed rule or the definition of building to exclude retaining walls, fences, pools, tanks, and minor structures such as garden sheds; or
	124/2 134/2 149/2		Part B: section5 Amend the proposed rule or the definition of building to exclude retaining walls, fences, pools, tanks, and minor structures such as garden sheds where constructed to the rear of a house
	124/3 134/3 149/3		Such other amendments to other parts of the plan change as are necessary as a consequence of the amendments sought in this submission. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this submission
I McManus	125/1		7.8.1.15 FENCES, WALLS OR OTHER STRUCTURES IN THE RESIDENTIAL 1, 2a, 2b and 2c ZONES Amend the above clause to specify only a maximum height for fencing and to confirm that the maximum height does not apply to side boundaries, to the satisfaction of the submitter; or
	125/2		Such other amendments to other parts of the plan change as are necessary as a consequence of the amendments sought in this submission. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this submission
P de Zeeuw and M Le Coultre Opes Trustee Company Limited Shepperson Family Trust I McManus	126/1 127/1 128/1 145/1		Architectural Design Guidelines Add a sentence or two to the end of section 2.2 of the guideline to give other examples of situations where a photographic record of the existing and neighbouring development will be adequate in lieu of a streetscape plan. The examples should include works such as carports, accessory buildings, minor additions and alterations to the front or side of a house, and more substantial additions to the rear of a house.
	126/2 127/2 145/2		Amend the requirement for a site and context analysis to reflect the type and quality of base information and plans available from the Council.

Shepperson Family Trust	128/2		Amend the requirement for a site and context analysis to reflect the type and quality of base information and plans available from the Council including the availability of up to date photographs.
P de Zeeuw and M Le Coultre Opes Trustee Company Limited Shepperson Family Trust I McManus	126/3 127/3 128/3 145/3		Such other amendments to other parts of the plan change as are necessary as a consequence of the amendments sought in this submission. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this submission
I McManus	129/1		Part C section 25 Undertake a proper analysis of the height of existing buildings in relation to the road boundaries of corner sites so that the Council can determine the appropriateness of the proposed control, and then amend the control so that it does not trigger an infringement for the majority of cases where people wish to extend their homes by following the existing height of the roofline or eaves.
	129/2		Such other amendments to other parts of the plan change as are necessary as a consequence of the amendments sought in this submission. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this submission.
	130/1		Part B Section 1 Amend the assessment criteria to: Clearly state that solutions other than a picket fence are acceptable;
	130/2		Part B Section 1 Require consideration of the needs and desires of the applicant for privacy, security or noise mitigation (especially on busy roads)
	130/3		Part B Section 1 Provide additional flexibility where the front yard is the primary north facing outdoor space on the site; and

I McManus	130/4		<p>Part B Section 1 Require consideration of the particular site circumstances, for example, whether the site differs from others in the area by virtue of its location, its use, the character of the existing or proposed development, the activities on the adjoining sites, or the character of development on the adjoining sites.</p>
	130/5		<p>Such other amendments to other parts of the plan change as are necessary as a consequence of the amendments sought in this submission. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this submission</p>
	131/1		<p>Part C section 24 Replace the word "shall" with "should" or similar wherever it occurs within the assessment criteria.</p>
	131/2		<p>Part C section 24 Require consideration of the needs and desires of the applicant particularly in terms of space, privacy, internal layout, indoor-outdoor flow, adequate light and warmth, access to views, off-street parking and reduced maintenance.</p>
	131/3		<p>Part C section 24 Require consideration of whether the proposed additions and alterations will facilitate the retention of the existing building notwithstanding the fact that they might result in the loss of some of the original character of the building.</p>
	131/4		<p>Part C section 24 Clearly state within the assessment criteria that additions and alterations do not need to repeat any design flaws inherent in the original structure or in the surrounding area, such as inappropriate wall to window ratios, particularly where the additions and alterations are proposed to the rear of the building.</p>
	131/5		<p>Part C section 24 Clearly state within the assessment criteria that the use of contemporary design and materials is not necessarily incompatible and will be acceptable in many instances, particularly to the rear of a building.</p>

I McManus	131/6		Part C section 24 Remove the "expectation" that additions and alterations will comply with all of the assessment criteria.
	131/7		Such other amendments to other parts of the plan change as are necessary as a consequence of the amendments sought in this submission. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this Submission
	132/1		Part C section 24 Replace the word "shall" with "should" or similar wherever it occurs within the assessment criteria.
	132/2		Part C section 24 Require consideration of the needs and desires of the applicant particularly in terms of space, privacy, security, indoor-outdoor flow, adequate light and warmth, access to views, off-street parking and reduced maintenance.
	132/3		Part C section 24 Clearly state within the assessment criteria that new buildings do not need to repeat any design flaws inherent in buildings within the surrounding area such as inappropriate window to wall ratios.
	132/4		Part C section 24 Clearly state within the assessment criteria that the use of contemporary design and materials is not necessarily incompatible with the zone and will be acceptable in many instances.
	132/5		Part C section 24 Amend the assessment criteria for garages and carports to acknowledge that in many cases such structures will inevitably obscure the view of the existing buildings to some extent and that it is a question of degree.
	132/6		Part C section 24 Delete the reference to reserved on-street parking from the assessment criteria for garages and carports.

I McManus	132/7		Part C section 24 Remove the "expectation" that new buildings will comply with all of the assessment criteria.
	132/8		Such other amendments to other parts of the plan change as are necessary as a consequence of the amendments sought in this submission. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this submission
Shepperson Family Trust	133		Section 6.5 of the Architectural Design Guidelines proposed Appendix 13 of the District Plan Retain this section as is.
Opes Trustee Company Limited	135		
I McManus	136		
P de Zeeuw and M Le Coultre	137/1		Reduce the level of control proposed over the removal of buildings, the construction of new buildings, external additions and alterations and fencing to a level commensurate with the lesser status of a special character zone relative to a conservation zone or scheduled site.
Opes Trustee Company Limited	138/1		
Shepperson Family Trust	139/1		
I McManus	157/1		
	137/2 138/2 139/2 157/2		Explicitly recognise within the plan change assessment criteria and explanations that many older homes no longer meet peoples expectations in terms of space, internal layout, indoor-outdoor flow, adequate light and warmth, energy efficiency, privacy, security, garaging and reduced maintenance, and that the Council in administering the plan change needs to allow reasonable flexibility for residents to upgrade their properties to meet these needs and expectations.
	137/3 138/3 139/3 157/3		A firm commitment to the waiving of resource consent charges for new homes and renovations within the special character zones, the provision of rates relief for houses within the zones, establishment of a fund to assist homeowners in the restoration of their homes, access to low interest loans to assist in the renovation of homes and other positive measures that recognise the benefit to the community of retaining the character of the identified areas.

P de Zeeuw and M Le Coultre Opes Trustee Company Limited Shepperson Family Trust I McManus	137/4	Outside scope	A firm commitment to a major investment in upgrading the public realm within the special character areas.
	138/4		
	139/4		
	157/4		
	137/5 138/5 139/5 157/5		Such other amendments to other parts of the District Plan or Plan Change as are necessary as a consequence of the amendments sought in this submission. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this submission.
	140/1 141/1 143/1 146/1		Amend the 3 rd paragraph of section 4.3 of the Design Guideline to replace “strictly in character” with “in character”.
140/2 141/2 143/2 146/2		Amend the various assessment criteria for new buildings and additions and alterations within the main body of the plan change to explicitly recognise and reinforce the statements in section 6.5 of the Design Guideline that applicants should endeavour to produce an authentic contemporary design response and avoid slavishly imitating older homes (or the features thereof).	
140/3 141/3 143/3 146/3		Amend the various assessment criteria for the removal of buildings constructed prior to 1940 to recognise that such buildings are not to be accorded the same status as scheduled buildings or buildings within conservation areas.	
I McManus	143/4		Replace the 4 th bullet point under the heading “Exterior Alterations to Pre-1890s Houses” under Section 5.4 of the Design Guideline with the following: It is preferable to use matching weatherboards, window frames, mouldings and decorative features, however, a contemporary design response including the use of contemporary materials may also be acceptable, particularly to the rear of the building.

I McManus	143/5		Add a further bullet point to the bullet points under Section 5.5, 5.6, 5.7 and 5.8 of the Design Guideline along the lines of the following: It is preferable to use matching weatherboards, window frames, mouldings and decorative features, however, a contemporary design response including the use of contemporary materials may also be acceptable, particularly to the rear of the building.
P de Zeeuw and M Le Coultre Opes Trustee Company Limited I McManus Shepperson Family Trust	140/4 141/4 143/6 146/4		Such other amendments to other parts of the plan change as are necessary as a consequence of the amendments sought in this submission. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this submission.
I McManus	144		Part C, Section 27 Confirm the proposed amendment.
I McManus P de Zeeuw and M Le Coultre Opes Trustee Company Limited	150 151 152		Part B section 3 Delete Part B section 3 as quoted [in submission].
I McManus	153/1		Part C section 9 Add policies to the effect of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By recognising that older buildings need to be upgraded from time to time so that they can continue to provide an appropriate standard of living for their occupants and that this process of improvement supports and is essential to the continued retention of these buildings and the broader character of the areas. • By recognising that the additions and alterations required to buildings in the zone can sometimes be extensive and that this will inevitably result in the loss of some original character. • By recognising that contemporary design and materials can be employed without necessarily detracting from the character of an area.

I McManus	153/2		Amend the last policy along the lines of the following (additions shown underlined): By protecting buildings constructed prior to 1940 where they significantly contribute to the special character of the streetscape and a similar contribution cannot be made by an appropriately designed new building
	153/3		Such other amendments to other parts of the plan change as are necessary as a consequence of the amendments sought in this submission. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this submission
Opes Trustee Company Limited P de Zeeuw and M Le Coultre I McManus	154/1 155/1 156/1		<p>Part C section 24 Add assessment criteria to the effect of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the building makes efficient use of the site; • Whether the retention of the building will have a significant impact on the efficient development of the remainder of the site; • Whether there are other factors such as protected trees which when combined with a requirement to retain the building will cause significant hardship for the applicant; • Whether the building is part of the original development in the area or has been subsequently relocated to the site; • Whether the building can be upgraded to meet the applicant's needs and if so whether it is practicable and cost effective to do so when compared to the cost of constructing a new building; • Whether the building can be extended and upgraded to provide the type and quality of accommodation people have come to expect in the area and, if so, whether this is practicable and cost effective, and whether the modifications would be so significant as to substantially change the character of the building; • Whether the applicant has applied for resource consent to construct a new building in its place and whether the design of the new building will mitigate the loss of character resulting from removal of the existing building by reflecting and contributing to the character of the area; • The level of financial assistance that the Council is willing and able to offer to the applicant in order to retain and upgrade the building and/or compensate for the loss of development potential; • The effect of retaining the building on the value of the site.

Opes Trustee Company Limited P de Zeeuw and M Le Coultre I McManus	154/2		Part C section 24 Replace the last bullet point with a criterion to the effect of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent of works required to rehabilitate the building.
	154/3 155/3 156/3		Part C section 24 Replace the last bullet point with a criterion to the effect of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent of works required to rehabilitate the building.
	154/4 155/4 156/4		Part C section 24 Remove the "expectation" that applications will comply with all of the assessment criteria.
	154/5 155/5 156/5		Part C section 24 Such other amendments to other parts of the plan change as are necessary as a consequence of the amendments sought in this submission. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this submission.
I McManus	158/1		Provide page and paragraph numbering within the Design Guideline for easier cross-referencing.
	158/2		Amend/insert Figure 32 so that it matches the associated text.
P de Zeeuw and M Le Coultre Opes Trustee Company Limited Shepperson Family Trust	159/1 160/1 161/1		Part C section 12 Add a policy to the effect of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By recognising that older buildings need to be upgraded from time to time so that they can continue to provide an appropriate standard of living for their occupants and that this process of improvement supports and is essential to the continued retention of these buildings and the broader character of the areas (even if it also results in the loss of some character).

P de Zeeuw and M Le Coultre Opes Trustee Company Limited Shepperson Family Trust	159/2		Part C section 12 Amend the last policy along the lines of the following (additions shown underlined): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By protecting buildings constructed prior to 1940 where they significantly contribute to the special character of the streetscape and a similar contribution cannot be made by an appropriately designed new building
	160/2		
	161/2		
	159/3 160/3 161/3		Such other relief to other parts of the plan change as is necessary as a consequence of the amendments sought in this submission. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this submission.
	162/1 163/1 164/1		Replace the word "shall" with "should" or similar wherever it occurs within the assessment criteria.
	162/2 163/2 164/2		Require consideration of the needs and desires of the applicant particularly in terms of space, privacy, security, indoor-outdoor flow, adequate light and warmth, the ability to gain views, off-street parking and reduced maintenance.
	162/3 163/3 164/3		Clearly state within the assessment criteria that new buildings do not need to repeat any design flaws inherent in buildings within the surrounding area such as inappropriate wall to window ratios.
	162/4 163/4 164/4		Clearly state within the assessment criteria that the use of contemporary design and materials is not necessarily incompatible with the zone and will be acceptable in many instances.
162/5 163/5 164/5		Such other relief to other parts of the plan change as is necessary as a consequence of the amendments sought in this submission. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this submission.	
G McKeown	165		The 1.4m fence rule should not be applied to the street either. While it may be more time-consuming it would be more appropriate to look at streets in Res2 zones on a case-by-case basis, rather than apply rules that are blunt instruments and do not fit particular streets.

D G McMillan	166		I support the proposed plan modification completely.
A D Matson	167/1		Accept with amendments. I seek further consideration and possible re-evaluation of '1940' as the threshold condition for new rules applicable.
	167/2		Definitions are required for 'alteration', 'demolition', and 'substantial demolition'.
A D Matson	167/3	Outside scope	Clear definition of Council's criteria for heritage evaluation of individual scheduled buildings need to be included somewhere in the plan to allow the transparent and robust evaluation of heritage significance in accordance with Plan and RMA purpose
Strathclyde Nominees Limited	168/1		Reinstate the land use activity status of the following activities as they appear in the operative district plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction or relocation of residential units or any new building – retain controlled activity status. • To appoint any wall, fence or other structure other than a picket fence – retain controlled activity status.
B Mrkusich V S Mrkusich	169 183		I would like the council to decline the proposed plan change 163.
J R Mungall	170/1		I wish to object to the change of height of wall/fences being reduced to 1.4 metres.
	170/2		I hope this new proposal will be abandoned in favour of the status quo.
D A Nolan	171/1		Decline the Plan Change
	171/2		Carry out proper consultation with affected residents, architects, planners, valuers and so on and then, if needed, introduce a more focussed, less expensive, better targeted Plan Change making holistic changes to both design criteria and development controls.

D A Nolan	171/3		<p>The following specific submissions are made if the general relief is not allowed.</p> <p>PROVISIONS RELATING TO DEMOLITION/REMOVAL OF BUILDINGS IN RESIDENTIAL 2 ZONES.</p> <p>Delete all references within the text of the Plan Change to constraints being placed on the demolition or removal of existing houses or other buildings in the Residential 2 zones.</p>
	171/4		<p>PROVISIONS RELATING TO SOLID FENCES AND WALLS IN RESIDENTIAL 2 ZONES.</p> <p>Deletion of all references to solid wall and fences within the Residential 2 zones as a discretionary activity, and a return to the existing provisions of the District Plan. If necessary, and if such control does not exist at present, enable restricted controlled activity assessment over the detailed design of any full height solid walls.</p>
	171/5		<p>PROVISIONS RELATING TO MODERN MATERIALS IN RESIDENTIAL 2 ZONES.</p> <p>The Submitter seeks the following specific relief (or words to like effect):</p> <p>Insert the following text at the end of clause 7.5.11 Special Character zones:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Nothing in this plan should be interpreted as discouraging the use of modern materials and design concepts on homes within Residential 2 zones, including the use of concrete, aluminium joinery, flat roofs etc.</p>
	171/6		<p>AMENDMENT OF RESIDENTIAL 2 ZONES' DEVELOPMENT CONTROLS.</p> <p>The Submitter seeks the following specific relief from the Council:</p> <p>(a) Delete the Plan Change and, if necessary, replace it with a new plan change that deals with the development controls and the urban design control and criteria, holistically and together.</p> <p>(b) If that relief is not allowed, amend all development controls in the Residential 2 zones (including Clauses 7.8.1.1, 7.8.1.2, 7.8.1.3 and 7.8.1.4) to readily enable new homes to include pitched roofs and an expression of eaves, and to have a wider footprint on the site, without infringing the relevant development controls.</p>
	171/7		<p>STATUS OF APPLICATIONS IN RESIDENTIAL 2 ZONES FOR ALL NEW HOUSES AND ADDITIONS TO EXISTING HOUSES (etc)</p> <p>The Submitter seeks the following specific relief from the Council:</p> <p>Amend the Plan Change in respect of the Residential 2 zones to reinstate the activity status and notification or non-notification provisions in all respects that are currently contained in the operative district plan.</p>

D A Nolan	171/8		<p>OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES APPLYING TO RESIDENTIAL 2 ZONES.</p> <p>Delete all changes to the objectives and policies, or if that is not allowed, amend them to the satisfaction of the Submitter to address the concerns raised, including placing a greater focus on the urban design quality of proposed new buildings and not making them subservient to or dependant upon the architectural style of other houses, except where a new building is located immediately adjacent to, a particular house or group of houses of special architectural significance, where it ought to be complementary to such house or houses while still allowing modern materials and design.</p>
	171/9		<p>MISCELLANEOUS ASPECTS RELATING TO RESIDENTIAL 2 ZONES.</p> <p>(a) Clause 7 –list of features (page 4).</p> <p>(b) Clause 12-7.6.2.1, second set of policies, 3rd bullet relating to indigenous trees (the same point arises in clause 24, Further Criterion T)</p> <p>(c) Clause 24, 7.7.4.3 Further Criterion T (pages 15 and 16)</p> <p>(d) Appendix 13 – where all items referred to in (a) to (c) above and elsewhere in this submission are repeated or addressed together with;</p> <p>(1) The complete omission to address the performance controls constraining development.</p> <p>(2) The failure to adequately recognise features that modern day residents wish to enjoy.</p> <p>(3) 6.4</p> <p>Delete all of the provisions referred to or if that relief is not allowed, amend them to address the Submitters concerns.</p>
	171/10		All further, consequential and other relief necessary to give effect to the concerns of the Submitter as set out in this submission.
Parnell Heritage	172/1		Parnell Heritage supports the principles of the proposed plan change.
	172/2		Parnell Heritage is concerned about the prescriptive nature of parts of the proposal and emphasis the need for development to be compatible with the surrounding area.
	172/3		Areas bordering the Residential 1 and 2 zones require interface provisions to mitigate the affects of adjacent developments.

Parnell Heritage	172/4		The scope of the plan change should be extended beyond houses built before 1940 to include more modern buildings of significance.
134 Mountain Road Limited.	173		[relates to the proposed fencing provisions in the residential 2 zone] Accept with amendments. We seek the decline of the plan change or, failing that, its amendment in the alternative to take account of the above submission.
New Zealand Historic Places Trust	174/1		Modification of the provisions relating to fencing to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow certain fencing designs (including not only low picket fences but also other specified styles that are authentic, historically documented in the zone and sufficiently transparent) as permitted activities. • Allow other designs to be considered as restricted discretionary activities, with criteria including (but not restricted to) the preservation of streetscapes, the use of materials that may have occurred naturally.
	174/2		Modification of the criteria relating to materials used for additions and alterations to discourage the use of 'traditional' materials in non-traditional applications.
J Parker D Parker Parker Brothers Limited	175/1 176/1 177/1		We seek that PM 163 be withdrawn Or
	175/2 176/2 177/2		We seek that incentives that would allow appropriate renovation within character areas be added to the District Plan. These should include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A revised height in relation to boundary rules to be more appropriate to the height of buildings and sloping sites common in the Residential 1 and 2 Zones (for example 5m+45degree); • A higher maximum height rule of at least 10m in all Residential 1 and 2 Zones; and • A height rule that includes an allowance for a 1m infringement through the height limit as of right for gable roof forms. • Existing buildings that do not comply with the height to boundary rules should be able to be extended a limited distance (up to 3m for example) along the existing roof line.

J Parker D Parker Parker Brothers Limited	175/3 176/3 177/3		<p>If the Council proposed to continue with PM163 it is requested that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrictions on front wall heights be removed. • Neighbours approvals and notification of demolition consent applications be specifically excluded. • Part C7 be deleted. • That restrictions on two car garaging be removed. • That demolition, alterations, additions and new buildings continue to be controlled activities in the Residential 1 and 2 Zones. • Part C12 be deleted. • That the new assessment criteria in Part C24 be deleted or significantly modified to permit houses to be made appropriate for modern living. • That Part D be deleted.
Parnell Mainstreet	178/1		Parnell Mainstreet Inc. believes that the Auckland District Plan should include controls on building, demolition and renovation to safeguard the city's heritage.
	178/2	Outside scope	Extend the protection proposed for pre-1940 buildings to all zones.
D D Reeves	179		<p>Accept with amendments.</p> <p>Under 4.3.1.2G.....Fences Wall... in Residential 1 zone:</p> <p>Insert an additional assessment criterion by which Council may grant a discretionary activity resource consent to the effect that where a building on a corner site has identifiable front and side facades that any walls, fences or other structures may be of a higher or more solid nature towards the rear of the property so long as the fences, walls et along the front and the majority of the side road boundary conform to the other essential criteria to achieve the desired consistency of streetscape and visibility of architectural character.</p>
G T Ricketts and F M Ricketts	180/1		Decline the Plan Change , or amend the Plan Change to address the Submitter's concerns as set out...
	180/2		<p>PROVISIONS RELATING TO SOLID FENCES AND WALLS.</p> <p>Deletion of all references to solid wall and fences within the Residential 2 zones as a discretionary activity, and a return to the existing provisions of the District Plan.</p>

Melanesian Mission Trust Board General Trust Board Anglican Trust for Women and Children	181/1		That the proposed plan change, in particular Rules 5, 15, and 30 in the Plan Modification , be made less restrictive and be amended to a 'restricted controlled activity' status; and
	182/1 190/1		
	181/2 182/2 190/2		Removal of the 'Notes' sections throughout the Plan Change.
N R Rasmussen	184/1		To reject Proposed Private Plan Change 163 in its entirety, or
	184/2		To require sufficient amendments to the Plan Change so that; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a balance between private costs and public benefit that is equitable, • Potentially appropriate land use is not compromised by overly specific and narrowly focussed rules, • The council promote alternative methods of working with the Residential 1 and 2 community rather than imposing rules and other unsubstantiated costs upon the community, • There is clarity, certainty and simplicity of interpretation, • Minor additions and alterations to dwelling within the Residential 1 and 2 zones remain as controlled activities or are permitted where they meet specific guidelines. • Proposed changes to fencing requirements are removed as they are unnecessary and unduly onerous. • The plan Change properly reflects a thorough and robust Section 32 analysis that is not simply and application of previous methods, i.e. rules.
New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	185/1		The following decisions are sought: Recognition in the policies and rules of the change for the positive "recycling" effects of building demolition, removal and relocation.
	185/2		Withdraw the plan change: and /or
	185/3		Modify and/or limit the scope of the change in relation to building removal, demolition and

New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	185/3 cont'd		relocation following an assessment on a street-by-street or house-by-house analysis of character/heritage within residential 1 and 2 zones.
	185/4	Outside scope	Schedule specific buildings within residential 1 and 2 zones following such proper character/heritage assessment.
	185/5		Delete discretionary activity status in table 7.7.1 for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relocation of residential units • The total or substantial removal of any building constructed prior to 1940.
	185/6		In the alternative Delete any requirement for building removal, relocation and demolition being subject to "the normal tests" for non-notification as drafted at paragraph 3 (page2) of the change.
	185/7		Expressly provide for activities to be considered without public notification or the need to obtain the written approval of or the service of notice on affected persons in relation to building removal, demolition and relocation.
	185/8		Deletion of the general or further criteria to be considered requiring the satisfaction of all the assessment criteria (eg the drafting in the change states in relation to the assessment criteria "there will be an expectation that all of the... assessment criteria will be satisfied or the Council may refuse consent").
	185/9		Decline re-siting buildings within sites.
Read Prescription Services Limited and W M Wood and T F wood	186	Outside scope	Delete 1 New Bond Street from the residential zone and replace with business zoning.
Sang Architects and Company Limited [Late submission]	187		I would like 2.0m high solid fences to remain allowable.

K E Sims	188/1		Accept with amendments. For new buildings in Residential 1 zone notification be given to affected parties before resource consent is granted.
K E Sims	188/2		Views of affected parties be taken into account before council approves design.
	188/3		If new buildings in Res 1 zone continue to not need input from affected parties UNLESS SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES apply please clearly define those special circumstances.
D Smirk	189		Accept with amendments. Remove demolition/removal of houses and external alterations.
A and M Shanks	191		There is a growing trend to make homes gated communities with large high solid fences, which distracts from the character and pleasantness of the area.[Epsom] We consider the proposed plan change will reduce this disturbing trend and therefore support it.
Layne Stephens Properties Limited	192/1	Partly outside scope (in relation to Conservation Areas)	FENCING. Residential 1 – retain existing provisions [but also apply them to Conservation Areas – outside the scope of the plan change]
	192/2		FENCING RESIDENTIAL 2 Delete proposed provisions.
	192/3		EXTERNAL ADDITIONS/ALTERATIONS RESIDENTIAL 1-2 ZONES Retain existing provisions.
	192/4		NEW BUILDINGS RESIDENTIAL 1-2 ZONES Retain existing provisions.

Layne Stephens Properties Limited	192/5		Delete restricted discretionary activity provisions re demolition of pre 1940 buildings in Residential 1 – 2 zones.
	192/6		Delete proposed changes to Rule 7.8.1.3 (Building/Height in Relation to Boundary).
	192/7		Retain existing Objectives and Policies Residential 1 Zone.
	192/8		Amend front yard rules Residential 1 zones to reduce landscaping requirements to allow a path and two carparks.
D A Snelling	193		Decline To maintain the status quo over this amendment and not change 7.7.1- activities in Residential zone and its ensuant table.
New Zealand Institute of Architects. Auckland Branch	194/1	Outside scope	We seek option of urban design assessment by peer review be introduced into the plan change to allow submissions that go outside the proposed restrictions be allowed to be assessed on other merits
	194/2		We object to making any building prior 1940 covered under this clause. We think that the date should be reconsidered to be prior to 1910.
	194/3		Clause 4.3.2.6 RESTRICTED DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITIES Amend to insert the following bullet points... We seek that these bullet points should be struck out.
	194/4		Fences, Walls and other structures in the Residential 1 and 2 zones (ii) if in the Residential 2 Zone: We seek that any fence, wall or other structure be allowed to be designed to relate to the streetscape without having regards to the "Architectural Design Guidelines for the Residential 1 and 2 zone".

New Zealand Institute of Architects. Auckland Branch	194/5		<p>Amendment to clause 7.5.1.1 “Special Character Residential Zones”</p> <p>Particularly:</p> <p>“Features that contribute to the special character of an environment include: ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Traditional pitched roof forms * A transparent and interactive relationship between building and street” <p>We see no practical requirement for the rules as drafted, and would prefer as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Roof forms * Relationship between building and street
	194/6		We seek that fencing height and type be designed to relate to the existing streetscape / context rather than the specific rules embodied in 7.8.1.15 Fences, Walls or other Structures.
	194/7		<p>Amendment to clause 7.6.1.3 Expected Outcomes</p> <p>In most old neighbourhoods, the pattern of settlement can be clearly read in the variety of ages of the building stock, which in turn offers a far richer exposition of local histories. This is the process that needs to be recognised in this rule – heritage design controls should not be applied to sites where new building occurs in the absence of a loss of any heritage elements.</p> <p>We also object to the inclusion of “new buildings” in the assessment criteria and design guidelines developed in parallel to this rule change for both Residential 1 and Residential 2 zones</p>
	194/8		<p>Amendment to clause 7.6.2.1 Objective and Policies (Residential 2)</p> <p>Our objections are on the same basis as the discussion above relating to clause 7.6.1.3.</p>
	194/9		<p>Amendment to clause 7.6.2.2 Strategy</p> <p>We seek that this is struck out.</p>
	194/10		<p>Amend table 7.7.1 Activities in the Residential 1-7 zones</p> <p>We seek reclassification of new building work in these zones as a Controlled activity.</p>
	194/11		<p>Amendment to clause 7.7.4.1 General Explanation</p> <p>We seek that this is struck out.</p>
	194/12		<p>Amendment to clause 7.7.4.3 Further Criteria to be considered</p> <p>We seek that this note of intent is deleted</p>

New Zealand Institute of Architects. Auckland Branch	194/13		Amendment to clause 7.7.4.3 Further Criteria to be considered Furthermore, additions where not part of the streetscape [i.e. not visible from the street] and not dominating the existing building should be allowed more flexibility in terms of materiality, detail and window and door proportion. We therefore ask that the rule as written is reviewed in this light
	194/14		Amendment to clause 7.7.4.3 Further Criteria to be considered We object to new buildings being included with the criteria for accessory buildings as the context for each is significantly different. We seek different rules for new building work in the zones.
	194/15		Amendment to clause 7.7.4.3 Further Criteria to be considered "....Any traditional fencing along the front boundary shall be preserved or reinstated at the completion of the development...." This rule potentially works against the unification of the site as a whole [structures and landscape] and needs to be reconsidered.
	194/16		Amendment to clause 7.7.4.3 Further Criteria to be considered "....Buildings shall not present blind or near-blind facades to the street..." We propose that it be removed.
	194/17		Amendment to clause 7.7.4.3 Further Criteria to be considered "....Buildings shall maintain the predominance or pitched roof forms in the vicinity of the site..." We prefer the deletion of the word pitched as it pre-supposes and potentially over-rules the streetscape context.
	194/18		Amendment to clause 7.7.4.3 Further Criteria to be consideredNote there is an expectation that new building construction in the Residential 1 zone will satisfy all of the assessment criteria or Council may refuse consent Inclusion of "all" is far too prescriptive We seek that this note of intent is deleted

New Zealand Institute of Architects. Auckland Branch	194/19		<p>Amendment to clause 7.7.4.3 Further Criteria to be considered "S. External additions and alterations to buildings in the Residential 2a, 2b and 2c zones.... Note there is an expectation that new building construction in the Residential 1 zone will satisfy all of the assessment criteria or Council may refuse consent"</p> <p>We seek that this note of intent is deleted</p>
	194/20		<p>Amendment to clause 7.7.4.3 Further Criteria to be considered "U. Demolition or removal of buildings (excluding accessory buildings) constructed prior to 1940 in the Residential 1, 2a, 2b and 2c zones</p> <p>We suggest that the physical condition category be separated from the other criteria in terms of needing to be fulfilled to enable removal. The acceptable means of demonstrating the physical condition should be spelt out in the plan so that there is clarity for all parties.</p>
	194/21		<p>Amendment to clause 7.8.1.15 Fences, Walls, or other structures in the Residential 1, 2a, 2b and 2c zones</p> <p>We seek that fencing height and type be designed to relate to the existing streetscape / context rather than these specific rules.</p>
	194/22		<p>Maximum Height and Height in Relation to Boundary in Res 1 and Res 2 zones</p> <p>We suggest that for the Residential 1 and 2 zones the rules be reviewed in light of the plan change, with discretion being written into the plan for infringements of height where this results in a significant contribution in terms of scale and form of development in relation to streetscape, and in particular heritage character.</p>
A H Sloane	195		Why should we have height limit on fencing?
Safekids New Zealand	196		<p>Oppose the provisions within Plan Change 163 that provides for car garaging within Residential 1 and 2 to be preferential sites at the rear, beside or underneath properties, rather than on street frontages.</p> <p>Safekids notes this policy may result in an increase in the length of private driveways. This will</p>

Safekids New Zealand	196 cont'd		increase the number of small children who are injured when vehicles are reversing or manoeuvring around these houses.
J and K Strevens	197/1		Clause 4.3.1.2 Residential 2 zone. There should be some reference to sympathetic materials.
	197/2		Clause 7.4.2 There needs to be greater flexibility in the bulk and location controls in the special character zones so that the special character may be conserved.
	197/3		Clause 7.6.2.1 The purpose ...to protect the landscape qualities of the residential areas..is subverted by the reference to "indigenous" trees.
	197/4		Clause 7.7.3.2 The preservation of the existing fencing requirement as far as possible is welcomed but it needs to be made clear that where pre-1940 fencing does not comply with the detailed requirements later in the plan it can be replaced.
	197/5		Clause 7.7.4.1 This needs to be made a little wider in residential zone 2a so that it covers the additions which may contrast with the existing elements but which have, in the tradition of the style of the building (eg cottage style), been used as additions or part of that style.
	197/6		Fences and Walls The details requirements need to be rewritten. The plan does not allow for fences with sections of flat top on a sloping street and need to be rewritten to do so. The important permeability is from about 1 metre up and the design controls should be changed to reflect that.
	197/7	Outside scope	Architectural Design Guidelines The Council needs to include a section in the plan which imposes upon itself the requirement to maintain the berms to a quality commensurate with the quality of the street.

J and K Strevens	197/8		Special Character Protection The sentence "limitation actually dilutes the character by blurring the line between what is authentically historic and what is new and is therefore not recommended" should be deleted.
	197/9		The reference to (especially indigenous species) should be deleted.
	197/10		The pleasure to the neighbourhood given by permeable fences should be recognised by adding a levy of \$5 per metre on the rates on those properties where the fence does not meet the requirements for permeability.
D D Reeves	198		Accept with amendments. Amend Part C: 30 to read: Residential 1 zone: No fence, wall or other structure... other than a picket fence up to 1.2m in height shall be constructed within the front yard...
N Thompson	199/1		Delete the provisions referred to [Part B : 3 and 5, Part C: 9, 10,15,20 and 24 Q R and U] along with all necessarily consequential amendments to give effect to those deletions.
	199/2		In the alternative, consent for the demolition of pre-1940 buildings in the Residential 1 zone should only be required if the building has heritage character or architectural merit, and the construction and/or relocation of new buildings in the Residential 1 zone should remain a restricted controlled activity.
B Trafford [Late submission]	200		The heritage proposals are not acceptable and the existing rules should be retained. Proposal 163 is not required and must be abandoned.
A and R Roberts	201		Clause 24 Demolition Paragraph U Applications for the demolition of buildings also need to consider the standard housing provided by the existing dwelling. We therefore request the criteria for assessment under Paragraph U be extended to include the consideration of the standard of housing, and not simply limited to the structural or physical condition

Herne Bay Peninsula Group	202/1		Additions/Alterations/New buildings in Residential 1 and 2 Zones (Table 7.7.1) The Submitter seeks a change in activity status to option 1 (fully discretionary) or option 2 (restricted discretionary allowing for notification and service)
	202/2		Demolition (Table 7.7.1) The Submitter also seeks a new rule in the District Plan to ensure that a demolition consent cannot be issued unless a replacement building has been approved by Council.
	202/3		Building in relation to boundary control for road frontages in the Residential 1 zone (Clause 7.7.1.3) While the Submitter supports the Council's proposal to introduce a building in relation to boundary control, it wishes to see that control apply to all road frontage boundaries in the Residential 1 zone.
	202/4		The Submitter seeks new rules to control inappropriate effects on amalgamated sites or combined allotments.
	202/5		Retention of special character of pre-1940 buildings Amend Clause 7.6.2.1 Objectives and Policies. Amend the second policy to read: " by maintaining the architectural values of pre-1940 period housing predominate in the street."
	202/6		Retention of special character of pre-1940 buildings Amend Clause 7.7.4.1 Objectives and Policies. Amend the last sentence (a) to read: "...new structures should be designed so as to visually relate to and rest harmoniously alongside , original pre-1940 buildings or elements as the case may be, whether original style and details is used or not."
	202/7		Retention of special character of pre-1940 buildings Amend Clause 7.7.4.1 Objectives and Policies. Amend paragraph (b) to read: "... designed and located in a manner which respects and relates positively to those elements and aspects that contribute to the special character of an area, and in particular to the pre-1940 period housing and landscaping which is characteristic of areas included in the zone."

Herne Bay Peninsula Group	202/8		Retention of special character of pre-1940 buildings Amend Clause 7.7.4.3 Further Criteria to be Considered. Amend paragraph Q bullet point 1 to read: “...materials of the additions and alterations are sympathetic to the original architectural pre-1940 style predominant in the street.”
	202/9		Retention of special character of pre-1940 buildings Similar amendments are also sought to paragraphs such as R, S and T and other like provisions.
S Lees and P Watts [Late submission]	203		Accept. Yes to all key provisions
C R Woodhams	204/1		Leave the resource consent at restricted controlled.
	204/2		Map C16 Exclude the blocks shown on map C16 as 2b from you plans to protect older inner city housing.
A and R Roberts	205/1		Clause 12: Policies Objective. There is a need to recognise that there are exceptions to existing front yard areas within the Residential 2 zones, and that not all properties in this zone, have spacious front yards. Important also to recognise the resident’s need for privacy from the road
	205/2		Clause 30 Fencing in Residential 2b zone We oppose the fencing height limitation of 1.4metres (1.8 metres with 40% visual permeability), as it is too prescriptive. Discretion needs to be available for those properties, which would suffer from a lack of privacy, under this proposed rule.
E and P Wright.	206		Decline
S Yates Planning Limited	207/1		The submitter seeks that the Consent Authority approves in part and declines in part the plan modification.

S Yates Planning Limited	207/2		Demolition of Residential 1 and 2 should be a restricted discretionary non-notified control, with the ability to notify the application under special circumstances.
	207/3		The Residential 2b zone dwellings should be excluded from the demolition control, or alternatively the 2b heritage stock separately sub-zoned and further controlled.
	207/4		A points schedule should be the objective method to consider building quality of proposed demolitions.
	207/5	Outside scope	Residential 3a zone dwellings should be included a restricted discretionary non-notified control regarding demolition.
	207/6	Outside scope	The submitters suggest a zoning & Conservation Area review as alternatives to manage housing heritage stock.
	207/7		Front yard controls fail to achieve a fair or identifiable result and should be deleted.
R E Wall	208/1		Strongly oppose the key provisions identified.
	208/2		No owner of property should be placed at the discretion of Council (or anyone else) as to whether he can remove his existing house on his land and build a new one.
R F Power	209		Control of front yard fence/wall HGT, Res 2 zone. Each case should stand on its own merit, as determined by property owners, within present (and long term) parameters.
C Chen	210		I seek support from Council to "decline" the proposed plan 163.
Numbers not in use.	211, 212		

P D Mataga [late submission]	213/1		Accept with amendments. Allum Street. Exclude the 2a zone on Allum Street Kohimarama from the provisions of the Proposed Plan Modification #163.
	213/2		Delete the references to indigenous trees in sections 7.6.2.1 and 7.4.4.3.
	213/3		Restore the original wording to “protecting and conserving” rather than “requiring the conserving of” in section 7.6.2.1.
Starship Children’s Health [late submission]	214		Remove the preferential requirement for rear of section garaging
Royal New Zealand Plunket Society (Inc) [late submission]	215		Driveway injuries and fatalities are an increasing concern for families and design and layout of properties has been recognised as a contributing factor in many of these incidents. We support the comments made by Driveway Run-over Prevention Group around the possibility of an increase in exposure to risk by this proposed District Plan change.
M K Coe [late submission]	216/1		Decline the Plan Change or amend the Plan Change to address the Submitters concerns as set out more particularly... All further, consequential and other relief necessary to give effect to the concerns of the Submitter as set out in this submission, including (without limitation) any necessary additions, deletions, or amendments to any issues, objectives, policies, rules, cross references or other provisions or text of the District Plan.
	216/2		Delete all references within the text of the Plan Change to constraints being placed on the demolition or removal of existing houses or other buildings in the Residential 2a-c zones, and ensure that constraints on demolition or removal of existing houses or buildings within the Residential 2a-c zones apply only where the Council has specifically scheduled the house or building for heritage protection purposes under the existing provisions of the District Plan.

M K Coe [late submission]	216/3		Insert following text at the end of Clause 7.5.11 Special Character zones: <u>Nothing in this plan should be interpreted as discouraging the appropriate use of modern materials and design concepts on homes within Residential 1 and 2 zones, including the use of concrete, aluminium joinery, flat roofs etc.</u>
	216/4		Delete the Plan Change and replace it with a new plan change that deals with the development controls and the urban design controls and criteria holistically and together.
	216/5		If that relief is not allowed, amend development controls (including 7.8.1.1, 7.8.1.2, 7.8.1.3, 7.8.1.4) to really enable new homes to include pitched roofs and an expression of eaves, without infringing the relevant development controls.
A Stokes [late submission]	217		Accept with amendments One way of mitigating effect of increased traffic noise is to build solid walls/fences.
J and S Burns [late submission]	218		We ask that the council do not proceed with proposed plan 163.
Number not in use.	219		Refer submission 100
P Turner C Cook Auckland Heritage and Property Rights Group	220/1 221/1 222/1 230/1 231/1 232/1 239/1		Delete the Plan Change in its entirety OR
	220/2 231/2 239/2		Vary the Plan Change to limited areas specifically identified as being of particular heritage or architectural value. AND

P Turner C Cook Auckland Heritage and Property Rights Group	220/3 231/3 239/3		Remove the requirement for neighbour involvement in respect of consents to remove dwellings or for the design of new buildings or alterations.
P Turner C Cook P Turner C Cook	221/2 232/2		Amend the Plan Change so that it applies only to identified houses or specific localities that contain characteristics that significantly contribute to the city's heritage OR
	221/3 232/3		Amend proposed paragraph 2 Part B so that in clause 4.3.2.5 RESTRICTED CONTROLLED ACTIVITIES, the reference to Residential 2a,2b and 2c zones are reinstated. AND
	221/4 232/4		Delete proposed paragraph 5, Part B so that the additional bullet points below are not added in clause 4.3.2.6 RESTRICTED DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITIES AND
	221/5 232/5		Delete proposed paragraph 3, Part B.
P Turner	222/2		Remuera Road between Portland Road and Remuera Village State in the Plan Change that it does not apply to this section of Remuera Road, AND
	222/3		Otherwise vary and amend the Plan Change to provide that it only apply to the parts of the Residential 1 or 2 zone that contain buildings or collections of buildings that are identified as having a particular character worthy of protection.
	223		Part B paragraph 3 Delete paragraph 3

<p>P Turner C Cook Auckland Heritage and Property Rights Group.</p>	<p>224 234 42</p>		<p>Amend section 7.6.2.1 OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES as follows:</p> <p>Objective To protect the architectural values of buildings <u>which have been identified as significantly contributing contribute to the special character–historic values of the streetscape city and to ensure that new buildings constructed do not detract from their place in the streetscape..</u></p> <p>Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>By ensuring renovation of existing buildings and new buildings do not detract from the character values of identified heritage houses or the heritage amenity of adjoining sites. maintain the historic form and pattern of buildings, open space and distinctive streetscapes of land included in the zone.</u> • <u>By maintaining the architectural values of period housing where these are predominate in the street or identifiable and contiguous locality and collectively contribute to the heritage values of the city.</u> • <u>By protecting significant heritage buildings identified by the constructed prior to 1940 where they significantly contribute to the special character historic values of the city streetscape.</u>
<p>P Turner C Cook</p>	<p>225 236</p>		<p>Part C – Residential Activity, Paragraphs 3 to 7. Either delete Paragraphs 3 to 7 or amend them in the following manner;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3....of special character zones being identified in the Isthmus (namely parts of the Residential 1 to 4 zones); • 3....Controls are applied to protect the amenity of each area, such as development intensity, form, site size, building size, mature planting. The identification of particular areas within each zone that have value in terms of heritage and the added requirement for closer assessment before allowing modification to these sites will enable the protection of the city's heritage resources. • and the particular elements or qualities that are characteristic of the streets and areas that warrant inclusion in identified character areas within the zone. • 7. Specific measures have been incorporated in the Plan to ensure that these environments are able to be appreciated by future generations but it is acknowledged that it is not necessary for whole zones to be frozen in time to achieve this. For this reason, certain

P Turner C Cook	225 236 cont'd		features of significant heritage value or clusters of features of moderate heritage value that collectively represent a certain type or style of development or lifestyle that occurred in that area at one time and will add culturally to the city by its protection, have been identified to be subject to further assessment criteria before their modification
P Turner C Cook Auckland Heritage and Property Rights Group	226/1 235/1 241/1		Part C – Residential Activity, Paragraphs 1 and 2. Amend paragraph 1 in the following manner; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to recognise and where possible enhance the character and amenity of established residential environments and to protect any heritage features that significantly contribute to the city's heritage;
	226/2 235/2 241/2		Part C – Residential Activity, Paragraphs 1 and 2. Amend Paragraph 2 in the following manner: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To identify and protect key heritage features in a neighbourhood by way of scheduling activities and to enhance where possible the character and amenity of residential environments.
	227 237 242		Part C, Paragraph 24 – Proposed addition to 7.7.4.3 Further criteria to be considered. Delete Clause S and Clause T
	228 238 243		Appendix 13 – Design Guidelines. The Design Guidelines should be revised and removed from having the effective status of district plan rules with which “compliance is required”. Instead, the design guidelines should continue to have the status of information for applicants and landowners in the zone, and be criteria (as relevant) to the assessment of activities requiring resource consent.
	229		Amendment to Building in relation to boundary requirement Delete the proposed amendment.
C Cook	230/2		Marine Parade, Herne Bay State in the Plan Change that it does not apply to Marine Parade in Herne Bay

C Cook Auckland Heritage and Property Rights Group	233 240		Part B, Paragraph 3 relating to public notification of applications. Delete paragraph 3.
Ferns Family Trust	244/1		Oppose the plan change 163 on the following grounds. The existing rules provide sufficient safeguards and checks and balances for building in the residential 1 and 2 zones.
	244/2		It is completely unreasonable to place an arbitrary date on the age of an existing dwelling in deciding whether it is of "architectural merit" and worthy of preservation.
	244/3		The Council would be far better served by providing incentives for responsible development rather than attempting to place socialistic burdens and restrictions on property owners.
	244/4		The imposition of a maximum height on front fences of 1.4 metres is entirely inappropriate.
S Young [late submission]	245	Outside scope	Seek amendments If preservation of the period is the primary reason for maintaining current residential use then I propose an area or areas be carved out as living museums
K Ross	246		Allow heights up to 1.8m and to allow styles of fencing in character with the house and surrounding streetscape.