Annexure 6

Minutes for Pre-Application Meeting PRR00035676

Auckland Council, 6 November 2020



Pre-Application Consenting Memo

Pre-Application No. PRR00035676		
Customer	Body Corporate 183777 c/- Haines Planning Limited	
Site address	31 Day Street, Auckland Central	
Proposal	Recladding of existing apartment building with other external alterations, involving building work above the maximum height, volcanic viewshaft plane and road reserve encroachment.	

Please note that there may be hyperlinks throughout the memo which are underlined. Please click on the highlighted text for further information.

Resource Management	t Documents	
Auckland Unitary Plan	Zoning	Business - City Centre Zone
(Operative in Part) (AUP (OP))	Precinct	City Centre Residential Precinct
	Overlays	Regionally Significant Volcanic Viewshafts And Height Sensitive Areas Overlay [rcp/dp] - E16, Mount Eden, Viewshafts
		Historic Heritage Overlay Extent of Place [rcp/dp] - 2739, Karangahape Road Historic Heritage Area
	Controls	Macroinvertebrate Community Index - Urban
	Designations	N/A
	Appeals	N/A
Regional Plans	N/A	
National Environmental Standards	N/A	
National Policy Statements	N/A	
Other Relevant Acts	N/A	
Statutory Acknowledgement Areas	N/A	

Property Information	
Legal Description	AU 16 UP 183777, AU 17 UP 183777, Unit 11A UP 183777
Certificate of Title	This has not been viewed, so there may be easements, building line restrictions and other restrictions that need to be taken into account in preparing any development proposal. If the title is 'limited as to parcels',



	you may need to get this surveyed, particularly where some of the controls, are reliant on accuracy being insured.
Relevant Consenting History (similar applications)	 LUC60339260 (135 Hobson Street): To undertake remediation works to an existing thirteen-storey building to resolve weather tightness issues, including the enclosure of the existing balconies through a new curtain wall system and replacement of the existing building parapet. LUC60304100 (1 Greys Avenue): To reconstruct and increase the extent of the existing machine room and plant room on the roof of the Civic Administration Building, and install a new external mesh mechanical riser and windows on the south elevation of the building (Stage 1A).

Locality Plan



Site constraints Type	Y	Ν	Site constraints Type	Y	Ν
(Potential) Contaminated Land		\boxtimes	Coastal Erosion		\boxtimes
Land Instability	\boxtimes		Coastal Storm Inundation		\boxtimes
Floodplain		\boxtimes	Coastal Storm Inundation (plus 1m sea level rise)		\boxtimes
Overland flow paths		\boxtimes	Cultural Heritage Inventory		\boxtimes



(ephemeral/intermittent/permanent stream)			
Flood Sensitive	\boxtimes	Combined Network	\boxtimes
Arterial Roads	\boxtimes	Building Frontage Control	\boxtimes
Vehicle Access Restriction Control	\boxtimes	Geology (rock breaking)	\boxtimes

Meeting Record	
Meeting Record	
Date and Time	22 October 2020 at 2.30pm
Council Officers	Karen Long (KL) – Team Leader, City Centre Team
	Sarah Wong (SW) – Intermediate Planner, City Centre Team
	Matt Riley (MR) – Consultant Urban Designer, Auckland Design Office
	Noel Luzzi (NL) – Built Heritage Specialist, Built Heritage Implementation Team
	Francis Doesburg (FD) – Development Planner, Auckland Transport
	Christina Hibbard (CH) – Senior Building Surveyor, Building Control
Customer	Cameron Browne – Planner, Haines Planning
	Barry Brown – Structural specialist, Fraser Thomas Ltd
	Leonard Low – Façade specialist, Babbage
	Roger Morrison – Architect, Morrison Architects
	Quintin Yallup – Architect, Morrison Architects
	Dimitar Penchev – Architect, Morrison Architects
	Martyn Cleary - Project Manager, Quantum
	Val Isted - Applicant, Body Corporate representative
Additional Information provided at meeting	Concept plans and elevations were circulated prior to and tabled at the meeting.

Relevant matters	
Planning	 A full building overclad is proposed as part of the building's remediation works, with new aluminium cladding to be erected over the existing concrete panels.
	• The balconies along the north and south elevations will be enclosed, with a new curtain wall structure proposed. The existing lift motor room on the top level will also be reconstructed.
	 Confirmation on whether the proposal complies with the AUP (OP)'s glare standard under H8.6.29 should be provided.



Gross Floor Area (GFA) and Floor Area Ratio The enclosure of the balconies will increase the building, with approximately 6-10m ² per unit prop on the unit's location).	overall GFA of the
As a result, the building's FAR will be increased exceeds the site's Basic FAR (4:1) but is less that Total FAR (6:1). No issues in relation to the Basis exceedance were raised.	an the Maximum
The application should confirm whether any bon will be utilised to help bridge the gap between th the proposed FAR.	
Building height The applicant notes that proposal will exceed bo general height limit, and the height limits set by t Viewshaft across the site.	
Post-meeting note: Standard H8.6.2(2) of the AL that "where height limits shown on Map H8.11.3 overlap, the lowest height limit applies as the first The volcanic viewshaft height is the lower height instance.	and Map H8.11.4 at level of control."
A shading analysis showing the degree of shadin the existing and proposed building should be pro- demonstrate the degree of shading generated by building bulk/ height. MR noted that a model sho and its shading effect on the face of the building sites would be acceptable. The shading diagram building at the same times of the year (solstice a and the differences in shading – these can be do diagram.	ovided, to y the additional wing the building on the adjacent is should show the and equinoxes)
Volcanic viewshaft infringement Having regard to <u>Appendix 20</u> of the AUP (OP) (Viewshafts and Height Sensitive Areas – Values landscape visual assessment and an assessmen the maunga should be provided as part of the ap	Assessments), a nt of the effects on
A consent condition requiring the provision of a s certificate at roof framing stage should be proffer lodgement of the application. This condition has accepted by both Council and submitters in simil which infringed the volcanic viewshaft (refer rele history.)	red at the time of been offered and ar applications
As noted by the applicant, although some parts or reconstructed lift room will be higher than existing	



	 than the infring Rule buildi signif notifie on where a point of the another a not be If no the another a not be 	the existing gement s D14.5(1) ings not c ficant volced. Shoul hy the pro D14.5(1) on for cou submission pplicant/ e required meeting t	In the application of the application of the application of the application. (a) states that any resource consent applications for a therwise provided for that infringe the regionally canic viewshaft (Rule D14.4.1(A6)) must be publicly d the applicant wish to present a different argument oposal does not require public notification under (a), the applicant is advised to present a legal uncil's consideration. Ons are received during the submissions period or submitters do not wish to be heard, a hearing may d. <u>hote:</u> The timeframes for a publicly notified d the relevant RMA sections are as follows:
	Secti 95 97 103A 115 Total	λ.	Timeframe20 working days to make the notification decision20 working days for submissions75 working days to complete the hearing15 working days for a decision to be issued130 working days
Urban Design matters	cladd given • There Stree reaso	ling, design the natu e is some et side, the pn, the pro	e raised in relation to the proposed building gn and aesthetics from an urban design perspective, re of the proposal and its location on Day Street. loss of articulation, as seen on the building's Day rough the enclosure of the balconies. For this ojection into the AT owned airspace is good, as it modulation of the façade.
	south balco a pra reten is sup small	n elevation ony space ctical poin tion of ful oported, a	clarified that, as indicated on the draft north and ns, the full height windows for some enclosed is will slide open, with a safety railing behind. From nt of view, the enclosure of the balconies with the I height glazed opening panels for some balconies as this gives more useable space to the reasonably apartments, while retaining a connection with the nment.
Page 5 of 9	beds revise propo	at ground ed approa osed to re r intervisi	e raised in relation to the loss of landscaping planter d level on the Day Street side. This is subject to a ach to the height/ design of the wall which is place the landscaping beds. This should achieve bility with the street, e.g. through the use of more pril 2020



	 visually permeable materials – particularly at the upper part of the wall – in order to avoid a 'walled off' effect and contribute to an attractive street environment. It was acknowledged that the design approach to this will need to balance privacy for these ground floor units with passive surveillance over the street. The ground floor units have two entries - direct access to the street via stairs and from inside the foyer. Consideration might be
	given to removing the external stairs/ entry for each ground floor unit and replacing them with extended balconies instead, with the foyer access maintained. MR considers that while direct access to ground floor apartments is often desirable, within the short street frontage of this site, they are not an imperative. The space they take up might be better utilised for the private outdoor space of the adjoining units. Taking up this opportunity would be subject to an appropriate design response that, as per the previous bullet point, balances/achieves passive surveillance, privacy, and attractive street environment outcomes.
	 The changes to the roof massing in terms of its projection through the max height / volcanic viewshaft do not raise any urban design issues.
	 In terms of the southern elevation – no issues were raised in relation to this from an urban design perspective, given the building's limited views from Karangahape Road.
Heritage	• The existing building has been identified in the AUP (OP)'s Historic Heritage Schedule as a non-contributing site within the Karangahape Road Historic Heritage Area (HHA) (ID 02739).
	• The traditional architectural pattern of the Karangahape Road HHA shows horizontal (and vertical) partitions, moulding (pilasters, cornices, facings) and a bright colour panel, which the existing building is generally consistent with.
	• The proposed cladding will be more vertically arranged, and will flatten the existing building (this currently has external balconies and bands). A dark colour also appears to be proposed.
	• NL noted that based on the plans provided and at this stage, it is understood that the proposed new cladding will generally not erode the overall significance of the HHA. However, an assessment of the effect of the proposed new cladding on the Karangahape Road HHA context, and its interaction with the surrounding buildings should be provided as part of the application.



	• It is recommended the applicant provide a comprehensive colour scheme (addressing the Karangahape Road HHA context) with the application.
	 The applicant should also provide a realistic view from Karangahape Road showing the proposed building amendments within its surrounding context.
	 NL noted that a HIA may not be required, if the building and its surrounding context are adequately assessed in the AEE.
Auckland Transport	Airspace encroachments for building facades require an encroachment licence. Apply here: <u>https://at.govt.nz/about-</u> <u>us/working-on-the-road/road-processes-for-property-owners/road-</u> <u>encroachment-licences-or-leases/</u>
	• It was noted that AT would accept an application prior to issuing of resource consent and that on reviewing the proposal no initial concerns were identified.
	 Some standards that AT would need to see met:
	 Minimum clearance of encroaching structure above road surface / footpath: 3m
	 Minimum clearance of openable portions of windows above road surface / footpath: 2.5m
	\circ Minimum footpath width as specified by AT: 1.8m
	 Any ornamental façade features attract ongoing licence rental and engineering inspections. See section 5 of the following guidance document or make further inquiries on this matter during the application process: <u>https://at.govt.nz/media/imported/4552/Road%20Surface-</u> <u>Airspace-and-Subsoil-Encroachment-Policy-180113.pdf</u>
Building control matters	• A separate pre-application meeting between the applicant and Council's Building Control team was held in February 2020. CH noted that the overcladding and painting have since been amended, with the proposal now introducing enclosed balconies.
	• No issues were raised in relation to the applicant's PS1 and PS2 approaches; with the applicant noting that further assessments on the building's membrane will be provided by their specialists as part of the building consent documents.
	• The applicant noted that their structural specialist will have a technical discussion with Justin de Silva, Council's structural engineer, in relation to specific structural matters.



	• A separate pre-application between Building Control and the applicant should be held in relation to the producers statement approach changes.
General Noise matters	 A noise report will be required as part of the application, as the enclosure of the balconies will create new noise sensitive spaces within the building.
	 The application should confirm whether the proposed development will be able to comply with the relevant noise standards, or whether consent is required.
	 The building's existing noise situation would be taken into account when considering any noise infringements – Council noted that previous reclad applications have had infringements to the AUP (OP)'s internal noise standards due to their existing building construction.

Important Information

The purpose of a pre-application is to facilitate communication between applicants and the council so that the applicant can make informed decisions about applying for consents, permits or licences.

The views expressed by council staff in or following a pre-application are those officers' preliminary views, made in good faith, on the applicant's proposal. The council makes no warranty, express or implied, nor assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, correctness, completeness or use of any information or views communicated as part of the pre-application process.

The applicant is not required to amend their proposal to accommodate the views expressed by council staff. Further, it remains the applicant's responsibility to get their own professional advice when making an application for consents, permits or licences, and to rely solely on that advice, in making any application for consents, permits or licences.

To the extent permissible by law, the council expressly disclaims any liability to the applicant (under the theory of law including negligence) in relation to the pre-application process. The council acknowledges that the confidential nature of pre-application meetings is important to encourage future applicants to engage with the council and attend pre-application meetings. By attending a preapplication meeting, both parties expect that the meetings are held in confidence and the intention is that the associated information that is provided to the council at these meetings, and the meeting minutes, will remain confidential. However, under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 any person may request any information that is held by the council. There is a presumption that information is made available unless there is good reason for withholding it, which is not outweighed by the public interest in making the information available. This is assessed on a case by case basis.

All consent applications become public information once lodged with council. Please note that council compiles, on a weekly basis, summaries of lodged resource consent applications and distributes



these summaries to all local boards and all mana whenua groups in the Auckland region. Local boards and mana whenua groups then have an opportunity to seek further details of applications and provide comment for council to take into account.

Prepared by: Name:	Sarah Wong
Title:	Intermediate Planner, Resource Consents
Signed:	E
Date:	5/11/2020
Reviewed by: Name:	Karen Long
Title:	Team Leader, Resource Consents
Signed:	Kendig
Date:	6/11/2020