

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL USING RELEVANT OPERATIVE AND PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

PARLIAMENTARY PRECINCT

Operative District Plan	Objective/Policy	Assessment	Consistent? Yes/No
OBJ 12.2.1 Containment & Accessibility	To enhance the Central Area's natural containment, accessibility, and highly urbanised environment by promoting the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources.	The further development of this part of the Central Area with additional buildings for Parliamentary purposes will make more efficient use of the land resource, enhance the efficient operation of Parliament, and enhance the intensity and urbanised environment of this part of the Central Area.	Yes: consistent with the objective
POL 12.2.1.2	Contain Central Area activities and development within the Central Area.	The development is consistent with the containment of activities and development within a consolidated Central Area.	Yes: consistent with the policy
OBJ 12.2.2 Activities	To facilitate a vibrant, dynamic Central Area by enabling a wide range of activities to occur, provided the adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated	The proposed more intensive use of this part of the Central Area with additional buildings, paving, landscaping and pedestrian enhancements will make this part of the Central Area more vibrant and dynamic, particularly compared to the existing "back of house" visual appearance and use for surface car parking. Careful attention has been given to avoiding or appropriately mitigating any adverse effects as detailed in the AEE.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.2.1	Encourage a wide range of activities within the Central Area by allowing most uses or activities provided that the standards specified in the Plan are satisfied.	Parliamentary activities, primarily office/administration activities, are ones that are anticipated and provided for by the Central Area provisions. Parliamentary activities can also satisfy the relevant activity standards specified in 13.6.1 and 13.6.2 of the Plan.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.2.2	Ensure that activities are managed to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects in the Central Area or on properties in nearby Residential Areas.	Careful attention has been given to avoiding or appropriately mitigating adverse effects for the proposal as detailed in the AEE. This part of the Central Area is not "nearby" a Residential Area under the Plan. The closest Residential Area is on the opposite side of Hill Street and west of Guildford Terrace and this area will not be adversely affected by the proposal primarily because of the generous separation distance and difference in ground levels. There are residential apartments within the Central Area but these will not be adversely affected because of the generous separation distance and intervening activities, buildings and structures.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.2.4	Control the adverse effects of noise in the Central Area.	The proposed activities will not be generators of excessive noise. A District Plan noise compliance assessment report is in the AEE. This confirms that proposed fixed plant will be able to be operated in compliance with the Central Area noise controls.	Yes: consistent with the policy
OBJ 12.2.3	To recognise and enhance those characteristics, features and areas of the Central Area that	The District Plan recognises that this part of the Central Area, the Parliamentary Precinct, has distinctive characteristics and features relating to its history. It is a place where buildings have been constructed, used, demolished and replaced to meet the evolving needs of	Yes: consistent with the objective

Urban Form & Sense of Place	contribute positively to the City's distinctive physical character and sense of place.	Parliament. The proposal seeks to continue this evolution of this part of the Central Area with buildings that are fit for Parliamentary purposes. The sense of place, this being Wellington as New Zealand's Capital City, will be enhanced by the more compact, more efficient and more integrated Parliamentary Precinct within the Central Area.	
POL 12.2.3.1	Preserve the present 'high city/low city' general urban form of the Central Area.	District Plan Map 32 shows the " <i>general urban form</i> " in terms of building heights that are anticipated by the District Plan for the Central Area. For the adjacent The Terrace area, the building height is 75m above mean sea level, 35-50m above mean sea level for sites between the Precinct and the harbour, and 43.8m for sites along Molesworth St. For the part of the Central Area to the west of Museum St, the District Plan anticipated buildings to 27m above ground level. In this context, the proposed MUS and BAL building heights will both preserve and enhance the "high city/low city" general form for the Central Area that is promoted by the Plan.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.3.2	Promote a strong sense of place and identity with different parts of the Central Area.	As noted above, this part of the Central Area has a distinctive character and features derived from its role as the place of Parliament. The proposal seeks to further enhance this sense of place and identity with additional Parliamentary buildings in a setting that will be better than existing.	Yes: consistent with the policy
OBJ 12.2.4 Sensitive Development Areas	To ensure that any future development of large land holdings within the Central Area is undertaken in a manner that is compatible with and enhances the contained urban form of the Central Area.	The proposal is compatible with both the balance of the Precinct and with its wider Central Area context. It will also enhance the contained urban form of the Central Area by replacing surface car parking with a well-designed Central Area development.	Yes: consistent with the objective
POL 12.2.4.5	Ensure that development within the Te Aro Corridor assists to integrate the inner-city bypass into the urban fabric of southern Te Aro.	The proposal is not located within the Te Aro corridor.	Not applicable
OBJ 12.2.5 Effects of New Building Works	Encourage the development of new buildings within the Central Area provided that any potential adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.	The objective encourages new building development as is proposed. As confirmed by the various technical assessments included in the AEE, potential adverse effects have been appropriately avoided or mitigated mainly through the well-considered design approach.	Yes: consistent with the objective.
POL 12.2.5.1	Manage building height in the Central Area in order to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ reinforce the high city/low city urban form; and ▪ ensure that new buildings acknowledge and respect the form and scale of the neighbourhood in which they are located; and ▪ achieve appropriate building height and mass within identified heritage and character areas. 	As stated earlier and for the reasons given, the proposal will reinforce the high city/low city urban form and thereby respect the form and scale of the adjoining Bowen State Campus and the adjacent Central Areas. The proposal is also assessed by the Urban Design Report appended to the AEE to achieve appropriate building height and mass with reference to the existing buildings and open spaces within the Parliamentary Precinct.	Yes: consistent with the policy

POL 12.2.5.2	Manage building mass to ensure that the adverse effects of new building work are able to be avoided, remedied or mitigated on site.	The proposal is assessed by the Urban Design Report appended to the AEE to achieve appropriate building height and mass with reference to the existing buildings and open spaces within the Parliamentary Precinct.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.5.3	Manage building mass in conjunction with building height to ensure quality design outcomes.	The proposal is assessed by the Urban Design Report appended to the AEE to achieve appropriate building height and mass with reference to the existing buildings and open spaces within the Parliamentary Precinct.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.5.4	To allow building height above the specified standards in situations where building height and bulk have been reduced elsewhere on the site to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ provide an urban design outcome that is beneficial to the public environment; or ▪ reduce the impact of the proposed building on a listed heritage item. Any such additional height must be able to be treated in such a way that it represents an appropriate response to the characteristics of the site and surrounding area.	The effects of the proposed height of MUS and BAL buildings, including the height of MUS above the specified standard of 27m, have been assessed by the Urban Design Report appended to the AEE and considered acceptable. The heritage report prepared by Archifact Ltd appended to the AEE supports this conclusion.	Yes: consistent with policy
POL 12.2.5.5	Require design excellence for any building that is higher than the height standard specified for the Central Area.	This policy is primarily directed towards proposals that involve <i>“unusually”</i> large additional building height, proposals where the additional height sought would result in <i>“a building that is significantly higher than the surrounding building form”</i> , proposals than involve additional building height that result in <i>“exceptional height in comparison to every other building in the city (i.e. in excess of 130m in height”</i> , and <i>“buildings that are tall in relationship to the surrounding neighbourhood”</i> . The proposal is not for buildings that fit the above descriptions. The additional building height for MUS is small (up to approximately 2m) and the overall height of MUS is not large in relation to the building height standards for the Central Area and in the context within which the additional building height is located, refer drawing PA2-25 lodged with the application. Notwithstanding this, MUS has been designed with a high level of professionalism and commitment to design excellence so that it is <i>“not just another office building”</i> (ref Heritage NZ feedback). This is reflected in the very careful attention to context and the adjoining heritage buildings, superior external design and appearance, excellent proposed materials, high level of seismic resilience, unmatched ability for continuity of use in a disaster affecting Wellington, environmental sustainability features, pedestrian enhancements, reduction in commuter car parking, a safer environment, and opportunities to further address the <i>“eurocentric”</i> character of the Precinct. These attributes of MUS and its proposed setting exceed the quality that would satisfy the Central Area Urban Design Guide.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.5.6	Ensure that buildings are designed to avoid, remedy or mitigate wind problems that they create and when existing wind conditions are dangerous, ensure new development improves	The proposal has been designed with input from wind experts WSP Ltd. Their report is appended to the AEE. As far as reasonably practical, the proposal has been designed so that the pedestrian environment is not made worse. A condition of resource consent is proposed that in the detail design of the proposal, wind mitigation is to be considered alongside other desirable design objectives.	Yes: consistent with the policy

	the wind environment as far as reasonably practicable.		
POL 12.2.5.7	Ensure that the cumulative effect of new buildings or building alterations does not progressively degrade the pedestrian wind environment.	As above.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.5.8	Ensure that the wind comfort level of important public spaces are maintained.	As above	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.5.9	Encourage consideration of wind mitigation measures during the early stages of building design and ensure that such measures are contained within the development site.	Wind design advice and wind tunnel testing and reporting have been part of the design process. Further detail design assessment is proposed to seek to improve the pedestrian wind environment alongside other design objectives.	Yes: consistent with policy
POL 12.2.5.10	Provide for consideration of 'permitted baseline' scenarios relating to building height and building bulk when considering the effect of new building work on the amenity of other Central Area properties.	The District Plan in 13.6.3.1.6 provides that south of Museum Street a building of 27m above ground level will be of a scale that " <i>is appropriate</i> " for the heritage area within which it is located. The proposed MUS building height exceeds 27m by a minor amount in the context of this part of the Central Area and the height of existing buildings, refer drawing PA2-25 lodged with the application.	Consideration has been given in the design of the proposal to the building height standards of the Plan as well as to the flexibility that the Plan provides for additional building height.
OBJ 12.2.6 Buildings and Public Amenity	To ensure that new building works maintain and enhance the amenity and safety of the public environment in the Central Area, and the general amenity of any nearby Residential Areas.	The amenity of this part of the Central Area will be enhanced primarily by replacement of surface car parking with buildings in a well-designed setting that has been appropriately informed by CPTED design principles and confirmed by the CPTED Report appended to the AEE. There are no nearby Residential Areas.	Yes: consistent with the objective
POL 12.2.6.1	Enhance the public environment of the Central Area by guiding the design of new building development and enhancing the accessibility and usability of buildings.	Accessibility will be enhanced because the proposal will enable most or all Parliamentary Functions to be located on the Precinct and close to Parliament House. Opportunities for enhanced public accessibility and usability to the ground floor of Parliament House will also be enabled.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.6.2	Require high-quality design that acknowledges and responds to the context of the site and the surrounding environment.	The Urban Design Report appended to the AEE supports the conclusion that the proposal is high-quality in its design and that it appropriately responds to the context of the site and the surrounding environment.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.6.3	Ensure that new buildings and structures do not compromise the context, setting and streetscape value of adjacent listed heritage buildings, through the management of building bulk and building height.	As referenced in the Design Statement, Urban Design Report, and Archifact's Heritage Report appended to the AEE, the proposed new buildings have been carefully designed with reference to the context, setting and streetscape value of adjacent listed heritage buildings, in particular Parliament House.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.6.4	Protect sunlight to identified public spaces within the Central Area and ensure new building developments minimise overshadowing of	There is no identified (listed) public space (Central Area Appendix 7) in the vicinity of the rear of the Parliamentary Precinct, therefore there is no shading on any identified public space during the protected hours.	Yes: consistent with the policy

	identified public spaces during periods of high use.		
POL 12.2.6.5	Advocate for new building work to be designed in a way that minimises overshadowing of any public open space of prominence or where people regularly congregate.	The proposal will delay by many years the potential need to remove the existing sculpture park on the Bowen Street frontage of the Precinct (which the District Plan provides as a future development site with a 27m building height standard) and to replace it with a building for Parliamentary purposes. The proposal will therefore enable the longer retention of the park which is a visual asset as well as one where people regularly congregate.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.6.6	Protect the panoramic view from the public viewing point at the top of the Cable Car.	The Precinct falls outside the 'frame' of the panoramic view (Central Area, Appendix 10) and therefore the proposal will not intrude on any 'focal element' or 'continuum element' of the panoramic view.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.6.7	Protect, and where possible enhance, identified public views of the harbour, hills and townscape features from within and around the Central Area.	The assessment in the AEE is that the proposal does not intrude into any District Plan viewshaft. MUS will be in the view from places along Bowen Street and The Terrace. MUS will not block views of the harbour or hills. MUS will alter the view of the west elevation of Parliament House but not unacceptably so.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.6.12	Maintain and enhance the visual quality and design of ground floor level developments fronting onto streets, parks and pedestrian thoroughfares throughout the Central Area.	District Plan Map 49E identifies what Central Area streets are important for ground level display windows and verandahs to be required. None of the street frontages of the Parliamentary Precinct are so identified. MUS is designed to accommodate an east-west pedestrian thoroughfare at ground floor level. The existing surface car parking area will be replaced with an attractive pedestrian centred plaza.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.6.13	Maintain and enhance the commercial character and visual interface of ground floor level developments facing the public space along identified frontages within the Central Area	District Plan Map 49E identifies what Central Area streets are important for ground level display windows and verandahs to be required. None of the street frontages of the Parliamentary Precinct are so identified.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.6.15	Improve the design of developments to reduce the actual and potential threats to personal safety and security.	CPTED principles have been incorporated into the design of the proposal as described in the CPTED Report appended to the AEE. The report confirms the proposal will improve safety and reduce treats.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.6.16	Promote and protect the health and safety of the community in development proposals.	Health and safety will be promoted by the IL4 standard proposed for MUS, deliveries to the Precinct will be centrally screened and managed within BAL to enhance safety and security, surface car parking with unsafe aspects will be replaced with a plaza that is safe, and pedestrian safety will be enhanced by reduced vehicle use of Museum Street.	Yes: consistent with the policy
OBJ 12.2.7 Building Amenity	To promote the efficiency and environmental sustainability in new building design.	Environmental sustainability measures such as rainwater harvesting, solar panels on roofs, use of timber and natural materials are incorporated into the design of the proposal.	Yes: consistent with the objective
POL 12.2.7.1	To promote a sustainable built environment in the Central Area involving the efficient end use of energy and the use of renewable energy, especially in the design and use of new buildings and structures.	The proposal includes sustainable design and energy efficiency measures as summarised in the reports appended to the AEE.	Yes: consistent with the policy

POL 12.2.7.2	Ensure all new buildings provide appropriate levels of natural light to occupied spaces within the building.	MUS in particular has been designed to optimise natural light, avoid excessive solar gain, and enable visual activation and surveillance between occupied spaces and the surrounding proposed plaza and Bowen Street.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.7.3	Enhance the quality and amenity of residential buildings in the Central Area by guiding their design to ensure current and future occupants have adequate ongoing access to daylight and an awareness of the outside environment.	MUS and BAL are not for residential purposes.	Not applicable
POL 12.2.10.6	Ensure that signs contribute positively to the context of the Parliamentary Precinct Heritage Area.	Signage is proposed to be limited to the identification of the MUS and BAL, wayfinding, and traffic management. Signage will be located and designed in detail at the detail design stage.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.13.3	Ensure that the adverse effects of hazards on critical facilities and lifelines are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	The proposal will improve the robustness of Parliamentary operations and MUS has been specifically designed to provide vital continuity of Parliamentary and Emergency Management services during a major hazard event affecting Wellington.	Yes: consistent with the policy
OBJ 12.2.14 Hazardous Substances	To prevent or mitigate any adverse effects of the storage, use, disposal or transportation of hazardous substances, including waste disposal.	The existing diesel tank pull will be managed in compliance with industry standards. Proposed hazardous substance plant within the basement of MUS will be designed and operated consistent with the hazardous substance assessment report appended to the AEE and in compliance with industry standards and appropriately certified.	Yes: consistent with the objective
OBJ 12.2.15 Access	To enable efficient, convenient and safe access for people and goods within the Central Area.	The proposal will improve the safety and efficiency of the intersection of Museum Street with Bowen Street and The Terrace by reducing the use of Museum Street for vehicle access to and from the Precinct and relocating goods deliveries to the more suitable Ballantrae Place.	Yes: consistent with the objective
POL 12.2.15.6	Manage the supply of commuter car parking.	Commuter parking will be significantly reduced which is consistent with the Council's Parking Policy and its District Plan.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.15.8	Manage on-site parking to ensure any adverse effects on the surrounding street network are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	The proposal will reduce the potential for adverse effects and enhance the positive effects on the surrounding street network as described by the Transportation Report appended to the AEE. Generous provision will be made for e-bike, bicycle and motorbike parking to avoid the need for on street parking. Appropriate end of trip facilities will also be incorporated into the detail design.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.15.9	Require the provision of servicing or loading facilities for each site in the Central Area.	A centralised and dedicated goods delivery and goods/rubbish/ recycling pick up facility serving the whole site is proposed – the Ballantrae Place building.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 12.2.15.10	Ensure that the design and location of servicing or loading facilities is appropriate having regard to the nature of the development and the existing and likely future use of the site.	The design and location of BAL has been informed by identification of the goods delivery and goods/rubbish/recycling pick up loads and frequency required to serve the Precinct and factoring in potential future growth.	Yes: consistent with policy
POL 12.2.15.13	Require all vehicle access to sites to be safe.	The Transportation Report appended to the AEE confirms that the Museum Street and Ballantrae Place vehicle accesses will be safe.	Yes: consistent with the policy

OBJ 12.2.6 Maori Heritage	To facilitate and enable the exercise of tino rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga by Wellington's tangata whenua and other Maori	The proposal provides the opportunity for the exercise of tino rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga by Wellington's tangata whenua and other Maori. These opportunities rely upon resource consent being granted so that change can take place within the Precinct. Some of the opportunities are identified in the Design Statement appended to the AEE. Others will be identified during ongoing consultation with Wellington's tangata whenua and other Maori.	Yes: consistent with the objective
POL 12.2.16.1	Identify, define and protect sites and precincts of significance to tangata whenua and other Maori using methods acceptable to tangata whenua and other Maori.	The site is not within a Maori Precinct identified by the District Plan. However, District Plan Map 18 shows that the Parliamentary Precinct was traversed by "Wai-piro Stream" which is a feature of importance to tangata whenua. It is proposed that this could be reflected in the detail design of the proposal in a way that is acceptable to tangata whenua.	Yes: consistent with the policy
OBJ 29.2.1 Earthworks	To provide for the use, development and protection of land and physical resources while avoiding, remedying or mitigating any adverse effects of earthworks and associated structures on the environment.	The nature, scale and extent of proposed earthworks are both necessary and desirable to appropriately provide for the proposed buildings, services and site levels. Risk to the stability of adjoining property and roads will be avoided by separation distances and expert geotechnical supervision. Adverse effects will be temporary and mitigated by the preparation of Earthworks Management Plans, including for the safe transportation of surplus excavated material to a consented landfill.	Yes: consistent with the objective
OBJ 20.2.1 Heritage	To recognise the City's historic heritage and protect it from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	The historic heritage context for the proposal has been identified and appropriately recognised in the design of the proposal as outlined in the Design Statement, the heritage reports prepared by Archifact Ltd and Ian Bowman, and the Urban Design report appended to the AEE. These assessments and the mitigation proposed supports the conclusion that the proposal is appropriate in its effects on the heritage values of the Precinct.	Yes: consistent with the objective
POL 20.2.1.2	To discourage demolition, partial demolition and relocation of listed buildings and objects while: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • acknowledging that the demolition or relocation of some parts of buildings and objects may be appropriate to provide for modifications that will result in no more than an insignificant loss of heritage values; and • giving consideration to total demolition or relocation only where the Council is convinced that there is no reasonable alternative to total demolition or relocation. 	The policy is to "discourage" partial demolition of heritage buildings, acknowledging that some modifications might be acceptable in certain circumstances. A link bridge between MUS and Parliament House is required for the efficient and safe movement of people between the two buildings and giving direct access to and from the Debating Chamber. It will involve minor physical modification to Parliament House as indicated by Fig 11 in the Design Statement. The link bridge has been carefully designed in the light of the mitigation measures proposed by Ian Bowman.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 20.2.1.3	Promote the conservation and sustainable use of listed buildings and objects while ensuring that any modification avoids, remedies or mitigates, effects on heritage values of the listed buildings or objects and where relevant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensures that modifications to the main elevations are minimised, or if possible are 	The proposed location and height of MUS and BAL are consistent with the District Plan's provision for additional buildings to be located within the Heritage Precinct and south of Museum Street to meet the needs of Parliament.	Yes: consistent with the policy

	unaltered; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> any modifications respect the scale of the building or object; and any modifications maintain the relationship of the building or object with its setting. 		
POL 20.2.1.4	Protect the heritage values of listed buildings and objects by ensuring that the effects of subdivision and development on the same site as any listed building or object are avoided, remedied and mitigated.	This policy applies to the MUS and BAL buildings and the plaza works. The effects of BAL have been assessed by both Archifact's Heritage Report and Ian Bowman's Heritage Report to be acceptable. The effects of the proposed height of MUS, including height above the 27m District Plan building height standard, has been assessed by the Urban Design Report appended to the AEE and considered acceptable. The heritage report prepared by Archifact Ltd appended to the AEE supports this conclusion. The Applicant agrees with Heritage NZ's 2017 feedback that the effects of MUS and the bridge connection to Parliament House can be mitigated by careful and appropriate detail design and a condition of resource consent is proposed to this effect.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 20.2.1.6	Protect buildings, structures, spaces and other features integral to the significance of a heritage area and allow demolition, destruction or relocation, where there are no significant effects on heritage values.	A link bridge between MUS and Parliament House is required for the efficient and safe movement of people between the two buildings and giving direct access to and from the Debating Chamber. It will involve minor physical modification to Parliament House as indicated by Fig 11 in the Design Statement. The link bridge has been carefully designed in the light of the mitigation measures proposed by Ian Bowman.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 20.2.1.7	Ensure additions and alterations to existing buildings, any new buildings or subdivision within a heritage area avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects on the heritage values of the heritage area.	The proposal has been carefully designed to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects on the heritage values of the Parliamentary Precinct, to provide opportunities for Maori heritage values to be better reflected within the Precinct, and to enhance the important heritage role of the Precinct.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 20.2.1.8	Maintain and enhance the heritage values, qualities and character of listed heritage areas.	The proposal has been carefully designed to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects on the heritage values of the Parliamentary Precinct, to provide opportunities for Maori heritage values to be better reflected within the Precinct, and to enhance the important heritage role of the Precinct.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 20.2.1.9	Ensure that signs on listed heritage buildings or objects (or sites on which they are located) or within Heritage Areas do not adversely affect heritage values and qualities and avoid unnecessary or inappropriate signage.	Signage is proposed to be limited to the identification of the MUS and BAL, wayfinding and traffic management. Signs will be located and designed in detail at the detail design stage.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 20.2.1.10	Protect listed trees from destruction and loss, and control the effects of trimming and changes to ground levels or other activities within the dripline of trees, to only allow these activities when they maintain or enhance the	The proposal is to relocate the heritage oak tree and avoid its destruction and loss.	Yes: consistent with the policy

	heritage values recognised in the listing of trees in section 20.1.3 .		
POL 20.2.1.11	Avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of development on the archaeological values of any site.	An archaeological authority under the Heritage NZ Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 has been obtained. This provides for the monitoring of earthworks and the appropriate management of any archaeological material encountered.	Yes: consistent with the policy
OBJ 20.2.2 Maori Heritage	To facilitate and enable the exercise of tino rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga by Wellington's tangata whenua and other Maori	The proposal provides the opportunity for the exercise of tino rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga by Wellington's tangata whenua and other Maori. These opportunities rely upon resource consent being granted so that change can take place within the Precinct. Some of the opportunities are identified in the Design Statement appended to the AEE. Others will be identified during ongoing consultation with Wellington's tangata whenua and other Maori.	Yes: consistent with the objective
POL 20.2.2.1	Identify, define and protect sites and precincts of significance to tangata whenua and other Maori using methods acceptable to tangata whenua and other Maori.	The site is not within a Maori Precinct identified by the District Plan. However, District Plan Map 18 shows that the Parliamentary Precinct was traversed by "Wai-piro Stream" which is a feature of importance to tangata whenua. It is proposed that this could be reflected in the detail design of the proposal in a way that is acceptable to tangata whenua.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 20.2.2.2	Require that the tangata whenua be consulted where a resource consent is required for an activity within a Maori precinct.	The site is not within a Maori Precinct identified by the District Plan. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant has consulted tangata whenua seeking support for the opportunities that the proposal presents for the involvement of tangata whenua, and for wider opportunities across the whole of the Parliamentary Precinct.	Yes: consistent with the policy
POL 20.2.2.3	Facilitate the development of appropriate design guidelines that ensure that tangata whenua involvement in the Maori precincts is reflected in new development.	The site is not within a Maori Precinct identified by the District Plan. No formal guidelines have therefore been prepared over and above what the District Plan currently provides for in its Central Area Urban Design Guide. For this reason, the policy is not applicable. However, as summarised in the AEE, consultation with tangata whenua is ongoing.	Not applicable
OBJ 22.1.1 Utilities	To provide for the efficient development and maintenance of utility networks and the activities of other utility operators throughout the city while avoiding, remedying or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.	Utilities and services will be constructed in compliance with the applicable Codes of Practice and Regulations.	Yes: consistent with the objective
Proposed District Plan	Objective/Policy	Assessment	Consistent? Yes/No
CCZ-O1	Purpose The City Centre Zone continues to be the primary commercial and employment centre servicing Wellington and the wider region....	The proposal is to further develop the Parliamentary Precinct for Parliamentary buildings, activities and employment to serve Wellington, the wider region, and New Zealand's interest at home and abroad.	Yes: consistent with the objective
CCZ-O2	Accommodating Growth The City Centre Zone plays a significant role in accommodating residential, business and supporting community service growth...including...efficient, well integrated and strategic use of available development sites...	The western half of the Parliamentary Precinct is identified in the Plan as being "available development sites" by providing this area with a building height standard of 27m (as opposed to a zero building height standard for the east part of the Precinct in front of PL, PH and EW). MUS and BAL are therefore in locations which are efficient and appropriate for Parliamentary buildings and makes good strategic use of these available development sites.	Yes: consistent with the objective

CCZ-03	<p>Urban Form and Scale The scale and form of development in the CCZ reflects its purpose as Wellington’s primary commercial and employment zone with the highest and most intensive form of development concentrated in the zone relative to other parts of the city.</p>	<p>MUS and BAL will positively contribute to achieving the desired “<i>highest and most intense form of development concentrated in the zone relative to other parts of the city</i>” aspect of this objective.</p>	<p>Yes: consistent with the objective</p>
CCZ-04	<p>Ahi Ka Taranaki Whānui and Ngāti Toa Rangatira are acknowledged as the mana whenua of Te Whanganui ā Tara (Wellington) and their cultural associations, and landowner and development interests are recognised in planning and developing the City Centre Zone.</p>	<p>There is ongoing consultation and involvement in the project by Taranaki Whānui and Ngāti Toa Rangatira as summarised in the AEE and Design Statement, to ensure that the development recognises their interests.</p>	<p>Yes: consistent with the objective</p>
CCZ-05	<p>Amenity and Design Development in the City Centre Zone positively contributes to creating a high quality, well-functioning urban environment, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reinforcing the City Centre Zone’s distinctive sense of place; 2. Providing a quality and level of public and private amenity in the City Centre Zone that evolves and positively responds to anticipated growth and the diverse and changing needs of residents, businesses and visitors; 3. Maintaining and enhancing the amenity and safety of public space; 4. Contributing to the general amenity of neighbouring residential areas; 5. Producing a resilient urban environment that effectively adapts and responds to natural hazard risks and the effects of climate change; 6. Protecting current areas of open space, including green space, and providing greater choice of space for residents, workers and visitors to 	<p>The AEE and the supporting appendices, in particular the application drawings, Design Statement, heritage reports and the Urban Design Report, support the conclusion that the proposal will make appropriate use and development of the available MUS and BAL development sites in a way that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ replace predominantly a hard surface car park with a “<i>high quality, well-functioning urban environment</i>”; ▪ reinforce the distinctive sense of place of the Parliamentary Precinct by bringing Parliamentary activities onto the Precinct and enabling parts of Parliament House to be repurposed; ▪ continue the evolution of the Precinct to meet the diverse and changing needs of the people of New Zealand; ▪ enhance amenity and safety as confirmed by the CPTED report appended to the AEE; ▪ enhance resilience by the design of MUS so essential activities will continue to function in a major natural hazard; ▪ provide pedestrian plaza and planting/green space; and ▪ respond with consideration to the nearby heritage listed buildings. 	<p>Yes: consistent with the objective</p>

	<p>enjoy, recreate and shelter from the weather; and</p> <p>7. Acknowledging and sensitively responding to adjoining heritage buildings, heritage areas and areas and sites of significance to Māori.</p>		
CCZ-06	<p>Development Near Rapid Transit Activities and development near existing and planned rapid transit stops:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are located to enable convenient access by local residents, workers and visitors, particularly around transport hubs; 2. Are of sufficient residential scale and intensity to support a frequent and rapid transit network and associated mixed use development; and 3. Provide vibrant, attractive and easily accessible public space. 	<p>More floorspace on the Parliamentary Precinct, which is adjacent to Wellington’s main public transport hub, is consistent with and will promote this objective.</p>	<p>Yes: consistent with the objective</p>
CCZ-07	<p>Managing Adverse Effects Adverse effects of activities and development in the City Centre Zone are managed effectively both:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Within the City Centre Zone; and 2. At interfaces with: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Heritage buildings, heritage structures and heritage areas; b. Scheduled sites and areas of significance to Māori; c. Identified public spaces; d. Identified pedestrian streets; e. Residential Zoned areas; f. Open Space and Recreation Zoned areas; and 	<p>The proposal has been designed to avoid or to appropriately manage adverse effects. Any remaining adverse effects have been identified and assessed in the AEE (and the appended assessment reports) and mitigation proposed. It is therefore considered that adverse effects have been “<i>managed effectively</i>”.</p>	<p>Yes: consistent with the objective</p>

	g. The Waterfront Zone.		
HH-O2	Protection Historic Heritage Historic heritage is retained and protected from inappropriate use, subdivision and development	The proposal has been designed with consideration given to the effects on the adjacent heritage buildings (PL, PH and EW), including input from heritage experts. The proposal as designed has been assessed to be appropriate by heritage expert, Adam Wild of Archifact Ltd and the mitigation measures recommended by Ian Bowman are reflected in the proposed conditions of consent. It is therefore considered that the proposal is not inappropriate from a heritage perspective, particularly in view of its positive heritage effects.	Yes: consistent with the objective
HH-P4	Enabling Approach to Works Enable works to built heritage that: 1. Increase resilience through seismic strengthening, either in isolation or as part of additions and alterations; 2. Support providing a sustainable long-term use; 3. Increase accessibility and support means of escape from fire; or 4. Provide the opportunity to promote, enhance, recover or reveal heritage values.	The proposal is consistent with this heritage policy to the extent that: <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ MUS will support the sustainable long-term use of PL, PH and EW by locating more Parliamentary activities on the Precinct and close to, and linked into, Parliament House.■ MUS with the link bridge into Parliament House will increase accessibility for MP's and Parliamentary staff.■ The proposal will promote and enhance the heritage values of the Precinct .	Yes: consistent with the policy
HH-P8 And HH-P14	New buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings on the site of a heritage building or structure Provide for new buildings and structures, and modifications to existing non-scheduled buildings and structures on the same site as heritage buildings or heritage structures where it can be demonstrated that the work does not detract from the identified heritage values, having regard to: 1. The extent to which the work:	Both policies are applicable to the proposal and are considered similar in their intent. The design of the proposal has been informed by multiple considerations, including those in Heritage Design Guides. This is referenced in the Design Statement for the proposal. The effects of BAL on the heritage buildings and heritage area have been assessed by both Archifact's Heritage Report and Ian Bowman's Heritage Report to be acceptable. The effects of MUS, including height above the 27m District Plan building height standard, has been assessed by the Urban Design Report appended to the AEE to be acceptable. The heritage report prepared by Archifact Ltd appended to the AEE supports this conclusion. Ian Bowman's report recommends mitigation measures and these are reflected in the proposed conditions of consent.	Yes: consistent with the policies

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is compatible with the scale, form, proportion and materials of the heritage building or heritage structure; b. Respects the identified relationship of the heritage building or heritage structure with its setting; and c. Fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide. <p>New buildings and structures within heritage areas</p> <p>Provide for new buildings and structures within heritage areas where it can be demonstrated that the works will not detract from the identified heritage values of the heritage area, having regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The extent to which the work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Respects any valued neighbourhood patterns of the heritage area including any predominant architectural style or design; b. Is compatible with the scale, form, proportions, design and materials of the heritage area; c. Is sited to maintain a consistent pattern of front façade alignment; and d. Fulfils the intent of the Heritage Design Guide. 	<p>Heritage NZ's 2017 feedback was that the adverse effects of MUS and the bridge connection to Parliament House can be mitigated by careful and appropriate detail design. This advice has been implemented in the design of MUS and link bridge now applied for.</p>	
--	--	--	--